

We'd sincerely like to thank the reviewers for the feedback they generously offered — your comments have pointed out some opportunities for clarification and potential changes in our framing that we think will help strengthen the paper.

1AC and R5 bring up that one of the potential hazards with historical analysis is that it tends to strip away context in pursuit of ahistoric conclusions. This is an excellent point, and the reference to Rosenberg's work in particular is especially beneficial to us, as his work (in 1982 and later 1994) offers a concise description of the spirit of the method we adopted here, and articulates a limited use case for this approach.

In our revision, we'll attempt to clarify two things:

1. that this particular contribution offers to fill some of the gaps in crowd work and suggests potential futures (perhaps specifically offering “to narrow our estimates and thus to concentrate resources in directions that are more likely to have useful payoffs” [2]); and
2. that the overarching method here may be a powerful tool for researchers attempting to make sense of (seemingly) new phenomena (for example, arguing “that past history is an indispensable source of information to anyone interested in characterizing technologies” [3]).

R5 also points out that we give attention to Grier's work and the case study of human computers, perhaps at the expense of the other case studies (that is, the cases of the matchstick girls and railroad workers). While we occasionally bring to light other cases (such as the industrial workers during the Second World War), we'll attempt to bring the two major case studies to a similar level of attention as we afford Airy's human computers, making these three case studies into more equal threads which recur throughout the paper.

R3 noted our decision to cluster crowd work research in a particular way, which consolidated some research — for instance, the work into “professional development” — into the broader topic of “complexity”; the concern R3 raises is well taken, and we'll dedicate some space to reflect on the decisions we made with regard to clustering research topics.

R4 and R5 offer a number of works (e.g. by **Hounsell**, **Roe Smith**, and Williamson, separately) for a more comprehensive discussion of scientific management. We agree that these works will substantively add to a reader's understanding of scientific management. We'll attempt to crystallize the body of work concisely, and point out that there's much more to be said about these topics.

References

- [1] David Alan Grier. *When computers were human*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- [2] Nathan Rosenberg. *Exploring the black box: Technology, economics, and history*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [3] Nathan Rosenberg. *Inside the black box: technology and economics*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [4] Vanessa Williamson. “On the Ethics of Crowdsourced Research”. In: *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49.1 (Jan. 2016), pp. 77–81. DOI: 10.1017/S104909651500116X. URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/article/on-the-ethics-of-crowdsourced-research/B1BDFB1111B416DD0B71540CD6E7D94F>.