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    Comments to the Author  
    This paper deals with a general but intriguing topic. By asking, “how does it look like on the other side” the author(s) indicate a focus on the patterns of Turkish parliamentary discourses on the EU membership process. Although it gives a good insight into the everlasting Turkey-EU history through the eyes of the Turkish parliament, it also has serious weaknesses that need to be addressed before acceptance.   
  
    Right at the beginning, in the abstract, the author(s) argue a “scarcity of systematic analyses on the evolution of Turkish political discourses on EU membership”. This phrase seems to motivate the author(s) to start such research. However, it is simply not true. There is a growing literature covering parliamentary discourses (both in the EU side and Turkey) and matters relating to bilateral relations, including the membership. Here some old ones: Loizides and Ersin (2006), Taniyici (2010) and some relatively new additions: Türkeş-Kılıç (2020) and Demirsu and Müftüler-Bac (2019). Rather than Aydın-Düzgit (2012) and Akşit et al. (2011), none of the above takes a much-deserved place in the paper. Therefore, the author(s) should add a specific section that reviews the current literature and shows us what is distinctive about theirs.

    On page three, as a contribution to the literature, the author(s) propose this educated guess: “how diminished EU conditionality affects the structure of political discourse in third countries”. Nevertheless, it is pre-given, general and overwhelmingly covered in the existing literature concerning the EU-candidate state relations. This kind of a very general statement makes a reader ask, “Why do we even need this study?” and “What is particularly new about this research?” all along the way. The author(s) fail to address these questions and repeatedly make vague and highly predictable statements without the element of justification and lack of a new fact as an addition to the literature. For example, one can easily predict the suggested phases without following the parliamentary discourse. A bit of knowledge on the EU-Turkey history after the new millennium is sufficient to classify those phases.  
  
~~Moreover, making observations such as “First, the most dominant actors in the Turkish parliamentary discourse are the AKP and CHP, followed by the MHP and the Kurdish party family for the period under observation. This pattern reflects parties’ political relevance in the Turkish political system.” (p.7) is needless since these are the only four parties that can form a group inside parliament. The author(s) has to question both the contributions and the necessity of such a study.~~   
  
~~Why putting a time limitation? It might be obvious to start the timeline from 2004, but why 2017 for a complete stop? What is the ultimate reason and justification to stop gathering data for the last four years? This unclear time limitation makes the entire research somehow outdated and ambiguous.  
  
    Perhaps the most challenging part of the work is the methodology. The author(s) propose a coding model through political claims analysis. However, the author(s) again fails to provide sufficient information about how they conducted this model. Coding is a sophisticated method with many additional elements. For a better understanding, the author(s) need to clarify these points: (a) the number of speeches or discourses they have recorded, (b) the number of plenary sessions they have analysed, (c) the dispersion of these records to political parties (how many belongs to AKP, CHP and the others), (d) exactly how they determined whether a speech or a statement is positive or negative (positioning of a party). As a dataset, using parliamentary debates is understandable; however, to justify this, the author(s) has to go beyond statements such as “parliamentary debates are arenas of ordinary politics”. Anyone familiar with Turkish politics knows that parliament can be as volatile and unpredictable as an election rally. Lastly, why not including the EU-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee sessions in this? This committee’s sole purpose is to debate the EU membership problems, and the committee recorded nearly 25 sessions between 2004-2018. Their recorded statements might be beneficial for this kind of research.   
  
    The last mapping chapter seems to be the critical part that connects empirical findings and conceptual framework. Although there are some slim explanations, the whole part seems more like a broad historical background. The author(s) has to be more informative about showing the fluctuations in party positions amid bilateral relations. To be more specific, how AKP/CHP/MHP/HDP used utilitarian/normative frames/sub-frames and on what particular occasions?, how these variables take place in their debates? This part has to be much more organised and clear with more direct reference to proposed figures and graphs.   
  
    Last but not least, excluding the most salient issues of the last five years, namely the Eastern Mediterranean and migration deal, seems a considerable weakness that might question the validity of the entire empirical analysis.  
  
    The article also needs a language check.   
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
    Reviewer: 2  
  
    Comments to the Author  
    This paper aims to analyze a dataset on Turkish parliamentary debates by focusing on their party positions and frames between 2004 – 2017. This is done by looking at discourses/framing of the parties on Turkey’s EU membership process. The paper and its dataset outline and present the shifts and trends in the Turkish parliament between 2004 and 2017. However, it is not very original to conclude/present a shift in the discourse of AKP, CHP, MHP, and HDP. The paper would be more interesting and methodologically stronger if there were an in-depth analysis and a presentation of evidence/examples from parties’ discourses/framing to understand these shifts and trends (within and between the parties). And what is presented in concluding remarks would be more meaningful if they were clearly linked with the data presented in the text. It is not clear why the author(s) chose to name the period 2006-2012 “enthusiasm” and 2013-2017 “accession fatigue”. Are these labels based on one party’s discourse, or can they be generalized to the whole parliament? Overall, I found the article methodologically problematic. It seems that the author(s) forgot to include Figures 1 and 2 in the paper. References to “the Kurdish party family” requires more explanation. The reader may not know/understand why the author(s) referring to three political parties and call them a family. Referring to the HDP with only ethnic reference may not be the correct identification of the party. The author(s) refer to Gezi events, the EP report, increasing criticism, changing to presidential system when talking about the shift in discourses during “accession fatigue” phase but how do we know about this? What are the reasons for differences and shifts in discourses between the political parties? The author(s) should link these events/potential reasons with speeches/discourses/frames and present it to the reader.   
  
    I recommend rejection of the paper.~~