Dear editors, dear reviewers

Many thanks for all the constructive comments on the submission «Four Ideologies of Globalization”. Based on your comments, the paper has been substantially improved in terms of both theory and empirics. Below is a short overview of the most important changes made.

1. Following Reviewers 1 and 3, the theoretical discussion has been considerably substantiated. It became clear from the comments that there was a need for a stronger discussion on what the analytical morphological approach implied and how it was in this paper used and refined to conduct an inductive associational analysis at the level of arguments based on conceptualization drawing on political philosophy. Reviewer 2 asked for less theory and a quicker move to empirics. I felt this was hard to reconcile with the demands from reviewers 1 and 3 and was convinced by the arguments of the latter two that more theoretical discussion was needed in order to underpin and explain the logic of the analysis. The theory section has been thoroughly revised and rewritten.
2. Reviewer 1 rightfully pointed out the imbalance between the four different ideologies. While liberalism is a full-blown, traditional or ‘thick’ ideology, the other three are not. This is indeed a good point and in fact an important finding of the study, which was not highlighted in the previous version. This imbalance is now explicitly acknowledged and the theoretical distinction between thick and thin ideologies is now integrated in the paper. This leads to the argument that the present approach allows for fine-grained analysis on just how thick or thin empirically observed ideologies are, which in turn opens up this so far dichotomous distinction toward a more nuanced, gradual, discussion and theoretical perspective on the varying thickness of different ideologies. The choice for each of the labels for the four observed ideologies has also been strengthened in the discussion.
3. Reviewer 1 asked for a more nuanced articulation of some of the paper’s central claims. The particular examples mentioned have been addressed. Moreover, this criticism – in combination with the point above that three out of four observed ideologies are not ‘thick’ (yet) – has led me to revise the title of the paper and stress the intermediate phase of ideology formation which the paper observes. “The Making of…” acknowledges the focus on speech acts as behavior, the conclusion that three out of four observed ideologies are thin, the observation that a significant number of justifications remain contested and the fluctuations observed in robustness checks (see revision 6 below).
4. Some of the tables reporting empirical analyses have been relocated to a new online appendix. As commented on by reviewers 2 and 3, they distracted from the main argument and it saves space. This reduces the amount of tables in the main text from 8 to 4.
5. As suggested by reviewer 3, a more elaborate discussion on the four bones of contention derived from Zürn and De Wilde is presented in the theory section and clearer arguments on the operationalization of these bones are given.
6. A robustness check is done on the location of justifications and moral foundations in the two dimensional ideological space. The new online appendix now includes visualizations of the unweighted analysis reported in the main text in comparison to weighted checks by issue, country and issue x country reporting means of means. By and large, these robustness checks corroborate the main argument, but it also shows variations in decontestedness of key concepts. This leads again to nuanciation of the main argument, as also reflected in the new title. In line with this, the paper now includes a more detailed step-by-step discussion of the analysis as recommended by reviewer 3.
7. In line with revisions 2 and 6 discussed above, the concept of decontestation so central to Freeden’s theory is fleshed out more in-depth and a better argument is made how that is used to identify the possible amount of ideologies observed in a two-dimensional space and how it works out in practice. This addresses reviewer 3’s concern that it remained unclear why there were four observed ideologies.
8. As requested by reviewer 2, the method section now includes a brief discussion of how the present claims analysis data relates to previous projects such as EUROPUB and SOM.

As a result of the above revisions, this paper has improved in relation to the previous version and addresses the reviewers’ concerns. Many thanks again to the reviewers for all these helpful comments that have propelled the manuscript forwards. I hope it can now carry your approval.

Yours sincerely,

The author