**Addressing Reviewer Comments**

**Comment #1**: “In order to improve its flow and coherence, it is suggested that the article is restructured.  First, in can present a careful and in-depth literature review, focused on some theoretical issues (perhaps the aforementioned 3 topics which are already discussed to some extent in the paper).  Then, it can present carefully Novartis philosophy, values, or strategy, and explain the relevant HRM recruitment policies and practices. A third section can discuss the links between theory and practice, and offer conclusions or any recommendations.”

*Action plan:* the entire essay was restructured, and got separated into the following sections:
A. Theoretical Analysis of Staffing Systems (p. 4), which is a careful examination of the literature review

B. The Case of Novartis (p.8), which explores the company’s practices on staffing

C. Linking Theory and Practice in Novartis (p.11), which serves as a constructive criticism section on how well Novartis implements what the literature suggests

**Comment #2**: “The section titled 'overview of the staffing system' is not very coherent.  It contains a long section on innovation and learning which does not fit well with the rest of the section that discusses recruitment (see p4. the paragraph starting 'what is understood from Novartis' overall staffing system....')”

*Action plan*: this comment was practically addressed through the restructuring of the whole project into the above sections

**Comment #3**: “p8. phrase starting "on October 28th" onwards.  This section discusses
company goals and products regarding innovation at great length. Is it really needed?”

*Action plan:* what can now be found in p.9 (second paragraph, “A great example of how much Novartis keeps up with innovation”), is a revised, shortened version which stays to the point on what I want to say about innovation, since this is a very important point, but in less length, as the reviewer suggests.

**Comment #4**: “The story with the penalty for discrimination is a very interesting point (p.10), including the company's reaction to it.  It probably deserves further attention in the lit. review and the analysis.”

*Action plan:* the reviewer’s current comment refers to the section where I talk about Novartis’ law suit for discrimination issues and human rights. After consulting my professor as well as my university’s career counselor, it was suggested that I do not write on this section even more extensively than I already have, because it discusses a very negative issue of a company where I am interested in working in the future. It was a risk from the beginning to include this section in my project, however, once I discovered this issue while researching the company, I considered it an ethical responsibility to bring it in my paper and examine it as well. Nevertheless, I would not like to spend an even bigger part of my paper analyzing it, since I believe that this issue has already been given enough attention. I am willing to further discuss this with you if you deem it absolutely necessary that I write more on this section, however, for the time being, I would appreciate to leave it as it is.

**Comment #5**: “There are some minor typos and syntax errors (p2. Verb missing in the
first phrase, spelling of ‘depended’ when it means ‘dependent’)”

*Action plan:* I reread and checked the draft for such typos

**Comment #6:** “The section on succession planning is very short.  Since there is no
major conclusion related to it, you should probably not refer to this extensively.”

*Action plan:* The reviewer is right about this section not offering much to the overall paper, especially since no major conclusions were drawn on this subject. I therefore chose to address this issue by omitting this section and focusing on a more in-depth discussion of the other sections.