Point to point responses to the reviewers’ notes

**To the Editor**

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for working with my paper. I am also very thankful that you have selected such wonderful reviewers. All of them have their very instructive points, and I did my best to address all their suggestions. As a result, I am sure that this revised paper has a much more developed and robust theoretical contribution to the existing literature. You can see the revisions highlighted in the main text of the revised paper.

Turning now to your specific comments:

* I developed the theoretical part in a great extent. I also provided a description in which I situated the world-system of knowledge production in the world-system in a wider sense.
* I also made explicit what the Bourdieusian perspective can provide to world systemic research. Moreover, I delineated the main features of a three dimensional model by which both the horizontal dimension of central-peripheral hegemony (in a geographical sense) and the vertical dimension of social stratification (that also has a center-periphery structure) could be handled. With this I could also the problems of the phenomenon of periphery-within-the-core.
* I also discussed (briefly) the contribution of both world polity theory and decolonialization theories as possible perspectives by which cultural hegemonies could be described.
* By emphasizing the fact that besides horizontal (geographical) inequality, there is a vertical (social) inequality with center-periphery structure, the separation between nations (countries) and institutions could be easily made. In our case, I emphasized that the differences between elite and low class institutions (mass education) could be a result of an institutional stratification without closer geopolitical significance (a la Bourdieu).
* Finally, I made a brief historical description on the global state of communication studies and argued why I chose this specific discipline for further analysis. However, since most of my reviewers wanted me to develop the theoretical parts and cut off the empirical presentations, the significance of these rather empirical parts slightly declined.
* In order to satisfy the rightful concerns of my distinguished reviewers I had to make the paper longer than 10.000 words. With respect to the author guide of Journal of World-System Research I would like to ask for your kind permission to accept this extended length.

Again, thank you for your valuable and professional work with my paper. Please find my point-to-point responses to the reviewers.

**To reviewer A**

Dear colleague,

thank you very much for your time, and I am also very thankful for your positive feedback. Your comments were extraordinarily useful and I hope that I could develop a much better paper by addressing your queries. Please find my point-to-point answers below. You can see the revisions highlighted in the main text of the revised paper.

* You were absolutely right in suggesting that the use of the expression “soft power” could be misleading in this context. I’ve changed it to more adequate terms when I talk about knowledge production, intellectual imperialism or stratification. Based on your comment, I used the ideas of Mignolo and Santos to situate the program in a broader context, thank you very much for the suggestion.
* I made explicit what the Bourdieusian perspective can provide to world systemic research. Moreover, I delineated the main features of a three dimensional model by which both the horizontal dimension of central-peripheral hegemony (in a geographical sense) and the vertical dimension of social stratification (that also has a center-periphery structure) could be handled. With this I could also the problems of the phenomenon of periphery-within-the-core.
* Based on your query, I made explicit how individual capital became institutional or collective capital.
* I also made some brief historical and theoretical frame for the question of measuring academic capital in terms of publication output and citation.
* By applying the Bourdieusian ideas on institutional stratification, now the paper discusses the periphery-within-the center situations and the center-within-periphery situations as well.
* Since most of my reviewers wanted me to cut off a great part of empirical analysis and concentrate on theory building instead, I significantly shortened the data-analytical parts, so some of your minor comments regarding the nature of data and measuring correlations became resolved. However, I indicated in the text that I used the SSCI Web of Science list for analysis.
* Finally, I made a brief historical description on the global state of communication studies and argued why I chose this specific discipline for further analysis. However, as it has been already mentioned, most of my reviewers wanted me to develop the theoretical parts and cut off the empirical presentations, so the significance of these rather empirical parts slightly declined. notwithstanding, I used the literature you suggested for referring to comparative research in different disciplines in and beyond social sciences, thank you very much for the suggestions.

I would like to thank again for your professional work with my paper.

**To reviewer B**

Dear colleague,

thank you very much for your work on my paper. Your comments were extraordinarily useful and I hope that I could develop a much better paper by addressing your queries. Please find my point-to-point answers below. You can see the revisions highlighted in the main text of the revised paper.

* I made explicit what the Bourdieusian perspective can provide to world systemic research. Moreover, I delineated the main features of a three dimensional model by which both the horizontal dimension of central-peripheral hegemony (in a geographical sense) and the vertical dimension of social stratification (that also has a center-periphery structure) could be handled. With this I could also the problems of the phenomenon of periphery-within-the-core.
* Based on your advice I made the theoretical part more robust while cutting off a considerable part of the data presentation.
* I discussed the core-periphery relations within the center as you suggested, and I also discussed the opposite (core-periphery relations within the periphery)
* You were absolutely right in suggesting that the use of the expression “soft power” could be misleading in this context. I’ve changed it to more adequate terms when I talk about knowledge production, intellectual imperialism or stratification.
* I made the distinctions between countries and institutions more precisely, thank you for the suggestion.
* I referred to the literature of world polity to situate my research in a broader context, thank you for this comment, too.
* I briefly discussed the hegemonies in knowledge production; but since it has a very extensive literature (including those dealing with the role of academic English or with the geopolitics of academic writing) the best to be done here is only a brief description and a rich reference to the works dealing with these processes.

Thank you again for your valuable comments that helped me to develop my ideas in a great extent.

**To reviewer C**

Dear colleague,

thank you very much for your work on my paper. Your comments were extraordinarily useful and I hope that I could develop a much better paper by addressing your queries. Your comments gave a new light to my own work as a social scientist; for this, I am also very thankful. Please find my point-to-point answers below. You can see the revisions highlighted in the main text of the revised paper.

* It’s easier to respond for your minor comments. Thank you for your suggestion, I read and used the works you proposed and they were very useful! You were also right in suggesting that the very sharp distinction between soft and hard sciences (in terms of their ideological saturatedness) was too harsh. Indeed, I made some academic hedges on this assertion by saying that the soft sciences are subjected to these biases in a greater extent than the hard sciences.
* Your major concerns were harder to answer, in spite of the fact that they were very heart stirring to me. This is why my answer here will be a little bit unprofessional. As a scholar from the periphery I am used to the fact that my critical arguments was considered subjective by my (mostly Western) reviewers. So in the course of time I fell out of the habit of reflecting my personal point of view or other personal aspects like my suggestions for change when proposing my articles to Western periodicals. It is one of the most typical dichotomy between Western and peripheral scholars that, while the former gives the theory and the perspective, the latter serves as a “good student” in terms of saying the lesson of Western knowledge, Western methodology and Western perspective. Of course, when you became a professor with a prestigious Western affiliation, then you will have the right to speak on your perspective immediately. Consider, for example – and I indicated it in the revised version, thank you for the inspiration – that almost all of the celebrated theorists of decolonialism were educated or affiliated at some elite institutions of the center.
* Notwithstanding, inspired by your comments, I added a part called “What should be done and why anything should be done at all?” to the end of revised version. In the worst case, it will be easy to cut it off if reviewers would find it too subjective or personal.

Thank you again for your different voice, it was a pleasure to read your comments: they helped me to concentrate again on some very interesting aspects of my work.