

To the Academic Editor,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript 'Open or ajar?: openness within the neoliberal academy' and for providing a thorough editorial review with helpful comments and suggestions for revisions.

We have worked on our manuscript and addressed a number of these comments in our revised version. For instance, several claims have been tightened up in response to your comments including our assertion that the CEO of CILIP's claim to have coined the term 'openwashing' is "demonstrably false". In cases where we presented statements without evidence - such as in the case of UK HEIs favouring proprietary systems - we have added evidence in references. We believe the paper to be well-referenced based on an informal review from an LIS academic colleague who was kind enough to look at the paper for us in its pre-print form. As such, we have adjusted several statements in the paper to incorporate further scholarly references and better reflect the evidence at hand. We have also addressed some minor issues with the references and endnotes. We believe this has substantially improved the article prior to peer review.

In response to your suggestion to use "clearer language and conclusions", we have clarified several areas of our argument and in our conclusion. We recognise that we're using the language of the discourse that we, as authors, specialise in i.e. a critical humanities discourse underpinned by critical theory and philosophy and that this may be unfamiliar for a global audience. However we believe our conclusions to be cogent and coherent based on the arguments of the paper. Where there is ambiguity in our conclusions, this is because we don't believe it to be our place to direct a universal practice of openness in Higher Education. Indeed this is a throughline of the argument and while we wish to gesture towards a possible future for openness discourse, we are wary of limiting other possibilities by dogmatically focusing on one particular route.

To specifically address the comment that our critique of neoliberalism can be easily dismissed as political and not scholarly, we hope to have addressed this by adding further evidence and tightening up the phrasing for certain statements. However, as a fundamental principle of our work, we follow a tradition of recognising scholarly work as political and political work as scholarly: separating these two into exclusive domains can be seen as intellectually insincere. Our work, like all other scholarly work, is underpinned by our politics and we are trying to openly acknowledge the political ramifications of our argument. We, the authors, have both published scholarly work in the past and have been through processes of peer review: we both well understand the opportunities of peer review and would welcome the space to further enhance this piece through a process of open peer review.

Again, we thank you for the time spent reading and reviewing our manuscript and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Bowie and Kevin Sanders

sb174@soas.ac.uk

kjsanders@riseup.net