

Dear ISQ editor,

I am honored to submit my article, "Naming, Shaming, and Boycotting: The Rising Power of Peer-to-Peer Transnational Advocacy Networks," for publication in *International Studies Quarterly*. ISQ has a rich history of conceptual engagement with transnational advocacy networks (TANs) and public diplomacy (Carpenter 2007; Wajner 2019; Hall et al. 2020; Cheng et al. 2021). This manuscript aims to add a unique contribution to the existing literature on TANs and public diplomacy, through its case study and methods.

To reduce the gap between IR theory and diplomatic practice, my case study considers Israel and a peer-to-peer network civic actor, the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. Connecting two fields of study, "Transnational Advocacy Networks (TANs)" and "Public Diplomacy," the article examines the flexibility and digital capabilities of the BDS movement to enact "peer-to-peer networks." A necessary update to existing literature on peer-to-peer networks and public diplomacy, the article considers radical changes in social media and digital networks, and the role TANs play in facilitating citizen involvement in public diplomacy. Through the lens of boycotting, the article discusses the power of TANs in granting agency to individuals across the globe. Not limited to "naming and shaming," BDS uses digital tools to call on millions of digital peers from different nations to promote Palestine by boycotting Israel.

The manuscript has undergone a multitude of revisions from its previous form, titled "Challenging States: Boycott Diplomacy of P2P Networks." These revisions aimed to address ISQ feedback and strengthen the theoretical argument. These criticisms may be grouped within three main areas for improvement:

- 1) Reviewers critiqued the manuscript's connection between boycotting and Nye's concept of soft power, as the discussion of soft power both distracted from the article's TAN and public diplomacy focus. Additionally, the soft power discussion had theoretical inconsistencies.
- 2) Reviewers outlined the theoretical weakness of the manuscript's argumentation, particularly its weakness in outlining the manuscript's unique contribution to the field.
- 3) Reviewers suggested adding the dimension of agency and individual empowerment to the manuscript's argumentation, an individual empowerment which has arisen in the digital age.

The revised and updated manuscript removes the lengthy discussions of soft power and renews its focus on TANs and public diplomacy, both as it relates to the BDS movement and the state of Israel's attempts to establish its own multidimensional TAN. The manuscript underlines its unique contribution in outlining the empowerment and agency of individuals working as global digital peers in a worldwide boycott. By studying the power of social media and other new digital technologies, the manuscript shows its unique contribution to the field as a necessary update to old ways of thinking about public diplomacy and TANs. These empowered peers, as non-state actors and civilians, can then bypass existing official government bodies in their digital advocacy. Lumbering state bureaucracies cannot keep up with digital peers in their information sharing across the globe, undermining the legitimacy of traditional state actors.

I hope you will deem the revised article to be relevant to the readers of *International Studies Quarterly*.

With kind regards,  
Dr. Shay Attias