This is a fascinating article on how national identity narratives can shape policy debates and outcomes. As I’ve noted in the comments, most of the reviewers' concerns have been addressed by the author. I am assuming that you have addressed Reviewer 1's notes on Israel’s policies (comment #7), but please note that I did not evaluate whether you included the suggested references.

The main unresolved issue is Reviewer 1’s concern about a lack of support for the findings (comment #6). I have two suggestions on how you might address this:

* Consider introducing each case with a summary of the sources you consulted – perhaps even include the number of such sources consulted in various categories? Add anything on how you identified ‘popular intellectuals’ (as per Baud and Rutten).

* In addition, as you present your findings, you might make reference to – or organize the presentation of your findings by – the four causal factors or the four analytic steps that you take in accordance with the causal process tracing method.

Finally, a general issue. Your use of multiple terms for the same concepts may be confusing to readers. It would help if you took extra care in introducing these concepts and then continually use the same terminology throughout the text. For example:

* You use many terms for national ideologies, including: public philosophy; nationalism (civic or ethnic); national ideology; national identity narrative; prevalent idea; indigenous particularistic identity

* You use various terms for those who contribute most to public discourse and to the framing of national ideology (to use one of your terms, above), including: popular intellectuals, political actors, activists, agents.

Good Luck!