The authors would like to thank the editor and the anonymous reviewers for their encouraging comments and excellent suggestions on this paper. The manuscript has been carefully revised accordingly. Detailed revisions are listed below and highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript.

**Reviewer C: Comment 1**

• Within the first paragraph, it would be useful to provide a few examples of different digital analytics. This would be able to better situate the following claim, “While there are often large volumes of data, it is unclear whether it provides information relevant to improve work routines

(Järvinen, & Karjaluoto, 2015), or simply overwhelms employees through information overload.”

***Response:*** Broadly, we re-wrote the opening paragraph based on your suggestions and the suggestions of the other reviewer. In response to this comment, we have added a parenthetical list of examples of different digital analytics in the opening paragraph to help illuminate common forms of digital analytics as well as another parenthetical in the above-mentioned quoted statement as well.

**Reviewer C: Comment 2**

• It might also be useful to add one additional preview paragraph to talk more specifically about the present study/case.

***Response:*** We have added a number of sentences in the closing paragraph of the opening section to help frame and preview the study more clearly, and situate the within the literature. These added sentences also foreshadow contributions from this research.

**Reviewer C: Comment 3**

• I’d encourage the authors to do a little more on AST—it seems like the major theoretical framework that is the keystone of the study; however, there is little at the beginning of the lit review to engage in ongoing debates and contentions surrounding AST. That is, where does the present study stake claims within AST theorizing? The authors get at this a little on page 5, but the argumentation could be further developed.

***Response:*** Thank you for this suggestion. We have added additional text to the introduction of AST on page 5 and the first research question (RQ1) in order to better situate the nuances of the theoretical framework and how the framework has been applied historically. Further, this text addresses how AST has been developed and serves as a unique lens that aligns with emerging technology and external stakeholders. Additionally, we have added text in the development of RQ2 that further gets at the “why” that we are seeking to explore.

**Reviewer C: Comment 4**

Additionally, the authors claim on page 5, “Furthermore, the swift-moving nature of ICT development has the potential to outpace the capabilities of the organization to absorb all its functions and uses (Cao et al., 2013). As a result, it is unclear how employees in external communication roles may use ICTs and/or more traditional methods to gather and integrate external stakeholder feedback.” This seems to be an important statement that gets at the importance of the study; how might the authors bring this out more fully earlier in the paper?

***Response:*** Thank you for this suggestion, this is certainly an important element of the study since the onus is to better understand how more information, given the realities and norms of those working in digital external communication contexts, is not always helpful or adapted. We have added an additional sentence and citation to the introduction, the sentence beginning with, "Additionally, digital technologies that provide digital analytics are developing…”

**Reviewer C: Comment 5**

Define digital analytics, digital signals, digital cues

***Response:*** Thank you for this attention to detail. We have defined digital analytics in the first paragraph of the introduction, with the following sentence, “Digital analytics are aggregated measures that can help an employee to understand the efficacy of communication efforts with analytics software purporting to deliver synthesized or at-a-glance information; metrics are specific measurements that summarize analytics.” We have clarified under digital signals (in “The Feedback Process” section) that for this study we are defining digital signals and digital analytics interchangeably (e.g. digital analytics as signals). We only used the term digital cues once, and we changed it to digital analytics to reduce confusion and not introduce a new term unnecessarily.

**Reviewer C: Comment 6**

Consider using APA formatting on the headers; both “The Feedback Process” and “AST in Large Multinational Organization” headers are at the same level as “Adaptive Structuration Theory as a Basis for Examining Feedback.” Similar feedback on the “Human Relationships through Technology” sections.

***Response:*** We have corrected this in the manuscript and added the appropriate second and third level headers.

**Reviewer C: Comment 7**

Why interviews?

***Response:*** We have added a statement at the beginning of the Methods section to clarify that we believed that because AST involves personal routines and work roles, and the exploratory nature of the study, that interviews were the appropriate method.

**Reviewer C: Comment 8**

Regarding the participant sample, it would be useful for the authors to say more about the context of the convenience sample.

***Response:*** We have expanded and added a more extensive description of the participant sample and their qualifications to provide more insight into the interviews.

**Reviewer C: Comment 9**

Regarding the data analysis, what are examples of the first and second cycle codes? What is a theme?

***Response:*** We have added descriptors for each level of coding to the Data Analysis section to illuminate the organization and structural process used in coding the interview transcripts. This further adds applied examples of Saldaña’s coding structure.

**Reviewer C: Comment 10**

• How did the author anonymize participant information?

***Response:*** Thank you for this question. We have added a sentence on anonymizing the data as well as how the data was stored.

**Reviewer C: Comment 11**

• Given that the author used a convenience sample, I’d encourage the author to consider a researcher's positionality/reflexivity statement if appropriate.

***Response:*** Thank you for this suggestion. We had removed a prior reflexivity statement due to length restrictions but have revised that deletion. An abridged version of the reflexivity statement has been added back into the manuscript, with its own heading, under the Participant Sample section.

**Reviewer C: Comment 12**

Results: Preview paragraph to introduce the findings, and themes (with brief descriptions).

***Response:*** The Results section now begins with a high-level introduction of all the results, which weaves together the four research questions to create a big-picture view of how this research impacts AST and the context explored in order to create a path or “journey” through the details of the results.

**Reviewer C: Comment 13**

How might the authors write more analytically about the results? At present, the results are descriptive but could be framed around the key issues of AST in organizations that they set out to interrogate more strategically.

***Response:*** In your prior comment you suggested a preview paragraph with brief descriptions of findings. We feel this has been helpful in organizing the results in the mind of the reader and also weaving the research questions together in a way that helps to illuminate the big picture of the work. Each research question aimed to explore an aspect of the AST process from gathering information, using the information, the value of the information, and the actual implementation of the feedback into the feedback loop of communication with external stakeholders. Additionally, we added the RQ number to the preview paragraph for each statement to further organize and strategically address the findings in light of both AST and the questions posed to participants.

**Reviewer C: Comment 14**

The first major section of the discussion leans heavily on DeSanctis and Poole, 1994; are there others that might also be able to converse with the author’s work? The biggest opportunity for development in the manuscript is in this section as I’d encourage the authors to strategically frame the importance of their findings.

***Response:*** Since the foundations of AST are well-known and contextualized earlier in the literature review, we made several additions to integrate and speak to more modern research on AST in the discussion, particularly in light of other emerging technologies that have been examined through AST. In doing so, we hope to show that AST is able to be applied and can be used as a continued lens even today when technology dominates so much of modern life.

**Reviewer C: Comment 15**

To that end, the Discussion section might do well with a more streamlined organization. What does the study contribute to our understanding of AST? How does it engage DeSanctis and Poole (and others)? What does the present study tell us that is unique, novel, different, or innovative about AST? These answers are there within the results, but I’d encourage the authors to clarify this point.•

***Response:*** Thank you for this suggestion. We feel that this study’s greatest contribution is to the notion that more information is not always better, particularly if it is not able to be fully realized and contribute meaningfully to the adaptive structuration process or be helpful in terms of communication feedback loops. Taking into account your prior suggestion of integrating the work of other authors, we were able to show that this waterfall of digital or emerging technology feedback is overwhelming in many contexts and may have unforeseen challenges across those that rely on this information to better communicate or collaborate with others in the workplace. To this aim, we feel the addition of integrating modern implications of AST (see above) and similar findings helps to add credence and bolster what appears to be an accumulation of findings regarding AST in modern technological contexts.

**Reviewer C: Comment 16**

Alternatively, the qualitative study is guided by four research questions—are all needed for the paper? How might these be synthesized or integrated to better tell the story of the paper?

***Response:*** We debated this point at length, and ultimately we believe that the four research questions hold value in that they provide and give importance to different elements of the AST process, the information or feedback gathering, the valuation of the feedback, the use of the feedback and the ability to actually implement or synthesize the information as well as speaking to what often happens with modern technology, that there is too much feedback or information, and how one grapples with that when making iterations. We hope that the introduction paragraph in the beginning of the Results section helps to illuminate this overarching process. We did consider reducing the number of research questions and framing them more broadly, but in trying to make that revision we found that the manuscript lost focus.

**Reviewer C: Comment 17**

Do the authors seek to offer theoretical or practical contributions? Or both? (Note: I see the authors offering both, but they could be organized differently to better clarify the study’s unique contributions).

***Response:***This article seeks to contribute theoretical implications in that AST provides a means to challenge the idea that “more data is better” especially from the perspective of the employees or individuals actually dealing with the information, in this case digital analytics. That being said, we want to make sure that the practical contributions are also clear, because this research is grounded in the day-to-day of real people who are doing this type of work, and struggling to make sense of increasing expectations as well as information overload. To that end, we have edited our practical implications to be more actionable and specific and to make clear what specifically we feel could be helpful to practitioners when using digital analytics tools as feedback. This can be found highlighted in the conclusions section.

**Reviewer D: Comment 1**

First, the study warrant is not clear. From the very beginning, you laid out the theoretical foundation of the paper but the synergy between the theory and the framing of RQs was lost. Because of that, the rationale behind each RQ was not strong. All the RQs do not read as theory driven.

***Response:*** Thank you for this suggestion. Your comment is similar to that of another reviewer and therefore careful consideration has been applied to address both of your concerns. You will find additions highlighted in the introduction wherein AST is connected to digital analytics in terms of importance. In the literature review several clarifying statements have been added that highlight why AST is important in the context of emerging technology and increased feedback as well as clarifying the connection between digital analytics and the feedback process. These additions continue through RQ1 as a way to set up the relevance of AST to digital analytics and understanding how external communicators are using digital feedback. Additionally we added clarification to the end of the literature review to summarize how these research questions, together, provide a holistic overview of the AST feedback cycle, from how feedback is gathered, the perceived value of the feedback, organizational constraints or obstacles, as well as considering that there may be too much information in modern digital contexts.

**Reviewer D: Comment 2**

Take RQ1 as an example. It does not follow the flow from the last paragraph. The so what is also missing. Since you talked about the focus on the external context and external stakeholders, I would recommend including these wording in RQs. Additionally, maybe consider adding the wording of digital analytical data in the framing of RQs?

***Response:*** This comment is also similar to a comment from another reviewer. We have added several statements prior to RQ1 that help to summarize and synthesize why this is important i.e. the “so what.” What it really comes down to is organizational efficiency and the value of expedient and nimble external communication, rather than just assuming that current processes are efficient. Additionally we incorporated your suggestion to include digital analytics in all of the research questions, which is also highlighted, and have revised each of the research questions accordingly.

**Reviewer D: Comment 3**

Second, can you provide examples about the application of AST, and feedback in the literature review. Currently it reads quite dry. In the method section, you provided more information about a particular context, DCM, which can be brought up to the literature review section to help the

audience better understand the key issue examined.

***Response:*** We agree with you that providing additional examples adds context and drives interest in the literature review. To that aim we have added several statements throughout the literature review that address this. We have, however, kept DCM in the methods section since it was germane to the particular methodology, but we hope that making other connections in the literature review also help to bridge this gap. Additionally, we made some connecting statements in the introduction to help set up the foundation of the work.

**Reviewer D: Comment 4**

Third, generally the writing needs to be clarified. a). Take p.5 as an example, you mentioned the extension of AST from the group setting to an external context. But you did not explain what you mean by the external context? What does that mean about interaction with stakeholders? Why is it important? Can the findings from group setting/work setting be generalized to stakeholder communication in the so called external setting?

***Response:*** We have added several sentences transitioning AST from group settings to an external context and what that might mean when using digital technology, specifically that it becomes more complex but is also a necessary part of communicators’ roles. We have also added several clarifying statements throughout the manuscript to apply this theory-driven research into applied examples.

**Reviewer D: Comment 5**

b). Can you also explain who the external stakeholders are? Without definition or example, it is hard to understand why their feedback on how employees do their job matters. Based on what you wrote in the method section about DCM, a member of a general public can be a stakeholder, who can be turned into a customer, a user etc. Lack of clarity fails to justify study warrant.

***Response:*** Your previous comment helped us to think about this and we have added several examples of what external stakeholders may look like and why they are inherent to modern day organizational communication throughout the literature review which we hope addresses your concerns and helps to bring the work into a modern situational context.

**Reviewer D: Comment 6**

My next comment is about the method. a). You used a convenience sample. Can you offer more detail on that, and also discuss whether there are any biases that would influence the results and result interpretation. b). Regarding the coding process, did you only use one coder? There might be limitations related to that.

***Response:*** In light of the personal nature of the sample, we have added a reflexivity statement as well as a statement that addresses coding in order to make the need for a primary coder understood.

**Reviewer D: Comment 7**

p.20 The first paragraph under the section (Feedback, Digital Analytics and Metrics, and Emerging Structures), you stated “the second research question…”, it should be the first RQ

***Response:*** Thank you for correcting this oversight; we have updated the manuscript accordingly.

**Reviewer D: Comment 8**

P.22 you wrote: “The third research question asked how senior leaders’ framing of digital analytics impacts perceptions of feedback across a given organization.” That is not true. You were really summarizing what you found to answer RQ3.

***Response:*** We clarified the research question and then what was found to help make the introduction to the paragraph more clear.

**Reviewer D: Comment 9**

Study warrant. On p.27, you wrote “According to Harvard Business Review (Waller, 2020), modern organizations aspire to embody a work culture that celebrates data-driven decision making.” This could be cited in the literature review to justify your study.

***Response:*** We have added this citation and study to the opening of the article and appreciate the suggestion.