



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	From Sensemaking to Coordinated Action: A Process Theory of Managerial Sensegiving and Interpretive Convergence
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
You provide a solid process theory that replaces the need for total consensus with functional variance reduction. The manuscript explains how managers communicate to align team frames. I value your focus on outcomes based organizational adaptation. Still, I want to offer deep critique to elevate your work to the highest standard. Below are my specific observations.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title and Abstract The title clearly captures your dual focus on managerial communication and interpretive convergence. The abstract effectively maps the four mechanisms: informational, cognitive, affective, and social identification. To improve the abstract, you must clarify the exact empirical contribution. The text mentions seven process propositions but lacks a clear statement on how you plan to validate them. State explicitly whether this is purely a conceptual paper or if it includes empirical tests.
Introduction



Your introduction establishes a powerful premise: organizations coordinate despite persistent disagreement. You correctly argue that prior research isolates individual cognition from collective action. This gap is well defined. However, I advise you to expand on the AI augmented hybrid process. You introduce AI tools abruptly in the text. I feel you need to establish the boundaries of AI influence much earlier. Explain briefly how AI alters human cognition before you introduce the hybrid model.

Methodology

You adopt an abductive process approach. You seamlessly blend cognitive theories with process models. The illustrative vignette about a global pharmaceutical company clarifies your abstract concepts. Nevertheless, to strengthen the manuscript, you must provide more detail on your theory synthesis steps. How did you select the literatures for the affective and social identification mechanisms? Did you employ a specific search strategy? Readers need to replicate your theoretical steps to trust your conclusions.

Results and Process Model

Your definition of interpretive dispersion is precise. You define it as variance in frames among team members. You categorize five dimensions: cognitive, priority, causal, temporal, and affective. Your proposition that marginal coordination gains eventually fall below communication costs is brilliant. The logic is sound. Figure 1 and Figure 2 add immense visual clarity to your recursive cycles. I suggest you clarify Proposition 6. Proposition 6 claims AI substitutes for cognitive and social identity mechanisms. Why does AI carry perceived objectivity? Provide more psychological literature to support this specific claim. Furthermore, you state that psychological safety moderates the dialogue phase. Elaborate on how steep hierarchical structures in certain cultures might prevent this safety entirely.

Discussion

You brilliantly contrast your variance reduction logic with strategic consensus research. Table 1 separates your constructs from related concepts perfectly. Your proposed study designs are practical and robust. For Study 1, you recommend latent growth curve analysis to track variance reduction. Yet, you must discuss the dark side of managerial influence more deeply. You mention pseudo convergence. Expand on how toxic leadership might weaponize this process to enforce silent compliance rather than genuine alignment.

Conclusion and References

The conclusion successfully summarizes the shift from cognitive interpretation to collective adaptation. You summarize the core insight beautifully. Finally, I noticed your reference list is extensive and current. Ensure all journal names follow a consistent format. Some entries lack issue numbers.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>	
The paper has an interesting theoretical idea and I appreciate the effort of the author to explain how interpretive differences may become coordinated action. However, I see one major problem in the internal logic of the proposed model. Since this issue affects the main mechanisms and several propositions, I think the theory is not yet sufficiently consistent for publication.	
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>	
My major concern is the contradiction about whether the four mechanisms are actually necessary for interpretive convergence. The manuscript clearly states that informational, cognitive, affective, and social-identification mechanisms are all necessary and that no single mechanism is sufficient. However, Proposition 6 later argues that AI may allow teams to cross the functional threshold mainly through informational grounds, while also saying that AI substitutes for cognitive and social-identification mechanisms. In the same proposition, the paper then says that identity-based dispersion was not addressed. Proposition 7 creates another difficulty because it now states that AI substitutes for informational and cognitive mechanisms, but not affective and social-identification mechanisms. This becomes more problematic because the measurement section later explains that the functional threshold is likely a joint condition across several dimensions rather than one single variance value. These claims cannot easily stand together. The author needs to decide clearly whether the four mechanisms are necessary, substitutable, or only conditionally important, and whether convergence requires reduction across all dispersion dimensions or only some of them. Until this basic causal logic is resolved, the propositions, especially the AI extensions, become difficult to interpret and empirically test.	

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			