Dear Prof Leon Oerlemans,

Section Editor SAJEMS

First of all, we thank you so much for your time and constructive comments on our paper. They definitely help to improve the paper significantly. The following changes we adjusted on paper based on your guidelines and reviewer concerns and comments.

**1-In the abstract of the paper, it is suggested that the paper reports on a case study. I think it is better to speak about a theoretical or a conceptual study as case studies normally refer to an empirical content;**

-In the abstract of the manuscript we replace a case study into a theoretical study.

**2- The reviewer argues that your manuscript is a variation on the (empirically tested) model developed by Liu et al. (2012: p. 358). After reading Liu et al.'s study, I agree with the reviewer's observation. I think it is your task to explain to the reader in which way(s) your model differs from the Liu et al. model and why that is needed and/or relevant. A suggestion to deal with this is to explain to the reader why it is important to use an interaction model and not a mediation model (as Liu et al. do). Therefore, I invite you to add a section to the theoretical part of your manuscript in which you explain why you have chosen to model an interaction effect and not a mediation effect.**

According to your valuable suggestion and concern, we added a following paragraph in the introduction section of the manuscript on page no.4. As well as we also added a new section 2.1 complementarities and main effects in the paper.

To the best of our knowledge; no prior research, including Liu et al. (2012) in SCM has examined the direct and complementary effect of SCI practices and justice on supply chain performance (SCP). This study is a step towards filling this gap. First, it demonstrates the direct effects of SCI practices and justice on firms SCP. Second, it’s considered the complementarities between supply chain justice and integration practices are crucial from the perspective of their influence on SCP. Hence, we argue that the firms have a higher likelihood of the SCP, if they have both a strong SCI practices and a strong perception of justice in the supply chain integration.

**2.1 Complementarities and main effects**

Edgeworth (1881) originally introduced the concept of “complementarities” in which he described the activities as complements, if doing (more of) any one of them increases the returns to doing (more of) the others. Ennen & Richter (2010) proposed that firms’ some activities and practices are mutually complementary which tend to be adopted together, with each enhanced the contribution of the other.

A complementary interaction of firms practices and resources could create super additive synergies. Hence, the inter-firm’s design variables and practices contribute maximally to the overall success of integration (Barua & Whinston, 1998). Ranganathan et al. (2011) suggests the complementary or interaction of capabilities and practices are the core motivations for supply chain relationships as they help to create value that cannot be generated independently.

Many researchers have investigated the indirect effect of SCI practices (Yang & Burns, 2003; Schloetzer, 2012; Wiengarten et al., 2010), and justice (Liu et al., 2012) on performance by using various types of mediating variables. For instance, Liu et al. (2012) examined the effects of justice aspects on dyadic relationship performance through a mediating variable of mutual coupling behaviors. Taking the previous studies’ shared concern for SCI practices and justice dimensions as our point of departure. However, different from Liu et al. (2012), we used the complementary effect and argue that neither an SCI practices, nor justice components by itself is independently sufficient to sustain SCI and achieve superior SCP. Instead, these phenomena to operate tandem to achieve desired outcomes of SCI.

Therefore, this study is interested to conceptually propose the direct and complementary effects of SCI practices and justice on firms' supply chain performance. Thus, we argue that complementarities between supply chain justice and integration practices will be the greater than the sum of its parts because of the synergistic effects of bundling of both together. Further, the complementary association of supply chain integration practices and justice components will develop and sustain the relationships which will turn into supply chain performance.

The complementary concept offers a useful perspective to understand the complex relationships between supply chain justice and integration practice. In our study, complementarity indicates a condition of increasing returns in which adopting (doing more) of integration practices has a higher payoff when simultaneously adopting (doing more) a complementary activities (e.g. ensure the high levels of justice perceptions) in supply chain integration.

- Moreover, we also did some minor English language changes in the paper, that are highlighted in red color in the manuscript.

-We also included the acknowledgments in the paper.

Once again thank you and best regards,

Muhammad Ziaullah

E-mail: ziacadgk@gmail.com
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