Dear editors and reviewers,

Please find here the thoroughly revised version of the manuscript «Media Logic and Grand Theories of European Integration” for your consideration in JEPP. In light of the very constructive reviews, the following changes have been made.

First, I have made a clearer distinction between known facts and theorized logics or effects. Facts are now better supported by references, as for example indicated by reviewer 1. As reviewer 2 commented, the distinction between fact and theory was not sufficiently clear in the earlier version. I have clarified this now, and introduced explicit hypotheses. This underpins the main theory generation aim of the paper.

Second, I have expanded the conclusion in light of the correct observation by both reviewers that the conclusion in the earlier version was lacking. It now contains a reflection on the findings and implications for future research.

Third, the added value of confronting media logic with postfunctionalism has been underlined, through the explicit formulation of two discursive intergovernmentalism hypotheses in this section.

Reviewer 2 asks explicitly about variation in media coverage over time. I have now addressed this more clearly in the discussion on the constraining dissensus, arguing that variation across time and space in media coverage allows member state leaders to circumvent the constraining effects of dissensus to some degree.

The introduced hypotheses thus serve several purposes: they underline the theory generation aim of the paper and the theoretical rather than factual nature of many of its assertions, they show the added value of confronting media logic with each of the three grand theories and they also clearly link the four key dynamics identified in the introduction and conclusion to the middle section of the article.

While I think reviewer 1’s suggestion of a table is helpful, I have decided to leave it out in the end because of word limit constraints. The clear identification of hypotheses should nevertheless provide an alternative easily accessible visualization of the main arguments of the paper. Reviewer 1 also asks the question what the net effect is of the identified dynamics. While the paper cannot answer this, the question is now explicitly taken up in the conclusion. To address reviewer 2’s question about the relevance of Hoffmann’s national doctrine, I have made a clearer link to Diez Medrano’s national narrative argument here. Reviewer 2 also questions the discussion about constructivist critique of rational underpinnings. It is well spotted that a focus on media effects inherently contains a constructivist element and that all three Grand Theories strongly rely on rational choice assumptions. But they also contain some constructivist elements (seeing intergovernmentalism more broadly than just LI). I considered an explicit discussion of ontology but ultimately decided against it for reasons of word space. The paper uses a strategy of theoretical confrontation to generate hypotheses about dynamics of integration. I think this is sufficiently clear now.

I hope you agree with me that the paper has substantially improved as a result of these revisions.

Yours sincerely,

The Author