We sincerely thank the reviewers for the feedback they offered. Your comments have identified several opportunities for clarification and potential changes in our framing that we think will help strengthen the paper.

1   RISKS OF A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

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 **rosenberg1994exploring**'s work in particular is especially beneficial to us, as his work (in **rosenberg1982inside** and later **rosenberg1994exploring**) offers a concise description of the spirit of the method we adopted here, and articulates a use case for this approach.

In our revision, we will to clarify:

1. that our 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" [**rosenberg1994exploring**]); and

2. that our method of connecting history to modern socio-technical phenomena 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" [**rosenberg1982inside**]).

2   CASE STUDY FOCUS

R5 also points out that we give attention to **grier2013computers**'s work and the case study of human computers, perhaps at the expense of the other case studies. Our goal had been to equally highlight 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.

3   TOPIC SELECTION

R3 and R4 noted our decision to cluster crowd work research around three questions that consolidated some research — for instance, the "quantity-quality dilemma" (R4), "professional development" (R3) and "incentive structures" (R3) — into other broader topics. This critique is well taken. We will dedicate some space to reflect on the decisions we made with regard to clustering research topics.

4   RELATED WORK

R4 and R5 offer a number of works (e.g. by **Hounsell**, **Roe Smith**, and **williamson2016** 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.