Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for providing your reviews for our article. We have given your suggestions due consideration and have revised and hopefully improved our article to ensure it is ready for publication. Please find a detailed list of your comments, and our changes made to address your suggestions.

Your insights are much appreciated, and will be happy to address any further questions or comments you may have regarding our research paper.

Regards,

The Authors

Anirban Sarkar

Dr Aron Perenyi

Response of reviewer's comments

Reviewer (A, C and D) comments	Response
Reviewer A (INTRODUCTION)	
A/1-1: "Introduction is on high level"	Thank you.
A/1-II: "Formal aspects of figures should be solved - names and sources must be below the figure"	Format adjusted, as suggested.
A/1-III: "Objective of the article should be more specific"	The following sentence is added to Introduction (see page 2) to specify the objective of the article – "This is done mainly to identify the role of intermediaries and the key themes that affects the reliance of the intermediaries in the process of internationalisation".
Reviewer A (LITERATURE REVIEW)	
A/2: "Literature review contents many relevant literature sources connected with topic and has logical system. In this review many other research results are identified. Sources are cited precisely."	Thank you.
Reviewer A (METHODOLOGY)	
A/3-I: "Objective of the article is clearly written but should be more specific and extended to more areas"	Thank you. As per response to A/1-III, further clarification to the research objective has been added on page 2.
A/3-II: "Research procedure is accurate, methods used in the article are relevant, but the main problem is low number of respondents included into interview".	We acknowledge the shortcoming of the research in terms of the quantitative response number. This is recognised as a limitation of the project on page 23. We would like to note however, that the extent of the data for the qualitative methodology used in this research (as noted and explanation expanded on page 13) is to be assessed not based on the number of responses, but the depth of information extracted from the respondents, and the authority of the respondents over the subject matter. This is elaborated further on page 13, with new references provided to support the rationale of methods choice. The respondents in this case have reputable and high credentials and have authority in their fields, by means of decades of experience. Hence, their response is considered of high quality and dependable. It is also mentioned in 'Limitations' that more interviews are required to identify the saturation point of the themes. This is also mentioned as part of further research.
A/3-III: "Therefore I suggest to use questionnaire to reach much more respondents for having relevant	A qualitative method was argued to be appropriate, therefore the authors are not in a position to pursue a quantitative, questionnaire/survey based method.

results, conclusions, and generalization. It could help to quantify this research and use statistical methods. And interview can be used as a supporting method".	Please refer to the response for A/3-II.
Reviewer A (RESULTS AND FINDINGS)	
A/4-I: "Part of analysis is on average level but the synthesis is quite poor and contents mostly the answers of the respondents and nothing more".	The analysis and therefore the synthesis has been augmented by discussing the responses at the sub-theme level, therefore better explaining the observations and linking them more strongly to the research questions. The discussion and conclusion sections now make specific reference to the sub-themes, in presenting the results.
A/4-II: "Interpretation of the research analysis is correct but in my opinion is that 4 respondents are not enough for the scientific article".	Thank you and refer to response of A/3-II.
Reviewer A (DISCUSSION)	
A/5: "All research questions of the article are commented well but discussion is quite poor".	Detailed conclusion is added to the identified sub-themes of the discussion to augment explanations.
Reviewer A (CONCLUSION)	
A/6: "Conclusion is on average level and contents the main parts such a general summary, practical and theoretical implications, and research limitations. But all these parts should be extended to meet higher level".	Conclusions have been augmented with sub-themes. This may improve the depth of conclusions made.
Reviewer A (CONTRUBUTION TO THE FIELD AND DEPTH OF RESEARCH)	
A/7-I: "I highly appreciate research problem, research questions, and relationship between research questions and interview questions displayed in tables".	Thank you.
A/7-II: "But I see contribution to the field only in theoretical implications because 4 respondents seems to me pretty small number for scientific research and article".	As argued by the authors, a qualitative method was chosen to address the research problem. Please refer to response of A/3-II.
Reviewer C (INTRODUCTION)	
C/1: "It includes the objective of the article".	Thank you.
Reviewer C (LITERATURE REVIEW)	

C/2: "Paper includes a good review of literature in the researched field. Main important authors are included in the paper".	Thank you.
Reviewer C (METHODOLOGY)	
C/3: "Semi structured interviews could be accept, but it would be a better solution, if a questionnary sould be choosen by the author. I advice to the author to use some hypothesis, and find the right answers in the interviews to accept/reject them".	As argued by the authors, a qualitative method was chosen to address the research problem. A particular feature of qualitative/deductive research is that it does not test hypotheses, and make inferences that can be basis of generalisation, but much rather provides a critical evaluation of the subject matter of the research based on deep insights of the respondents. Therefore, the authors do not feel they can comply with this request of the reviewers' Please refer to response of A/3-II.
Reviewer C (RESULTS AND FINDINGS)	
C/4: "The pieces of information used inside the paper comes from reliable sources".	Thank you.
Reviewer C (DISCUSSION)	
C/5: "Acceptable".	Thank you.
Reviewer C (CONCLUSION)	
C/6: "yes, but the reviewer thinks, that the author should use other method too, not just interview".	The interview method was chosen primarily because of the nature of the research problem. The authors also argue, that quantitative methods are not applicable in this particular case, as there are only 43 accredited universities in Australia. Even if a 50% response rate was possible, and for every university representative, another agent could be surveyed, the total number of responses would still be below that of a proper regression analysis and would be impossible to confirm any scales used. It is the researchers' view that scale confirmation requires a minimum of 200 responses (with a minimum of 100 responses per sub-group) and approximately 150 responses for regression and 200-250 responses for structural modelling. Therefore, the qualitative method is not only better suited to the research problem, but a quantitative method is actually not possible to implement with sufficient rigour and power of analysis. Please refer to response of A/3-II.
R C (CONTRUBUTION TO THE FIELD AND DEPTH OF RESEARCH)	
C/7: "Four interviews is not enough, or the author should write in detail the method of the selection of interviewees (for example: process of expert questioning)".	The respondents were selected thoroughly looking at their experience and knowledge in their industry. They were chosen because of their high credentials and their direct involvement in the field so that their response is dependable. Selection of the key informants is described on page 13/14. Additional information is presented to clarify and justify the validity of information gained.

	The process of extracting and processing the information from the key stakeholders is further explained on page 14. Additional explanation is provided to adequately describe how the data was collected and handled.
Reviewer D (INTRODUCTION)	
D/1: "The article is interesting, touching on an important topic".	Thank you
Reviewer D (LITERATURE REVIEW)	
D/2-I: "Paper include a good review of literature".	Thank you.
D/2-II: "I think the data charts could be moved from "Literature review" section to other part of the article or this part could be shortened".	Data charts has been removed as suggested.
Reviewer D (METHODOLOGY)	
D/3: "The research problem is original and the methods are properly used. The analysis is based on only 4 interviews, but the conclusions are very interesting. The author also draws attention to the limitations associated with this".	Thank you.
Reviewer D (RESULTS AND FINDINGS)	
D/4-I: "The interpretation of the data is appropriate and the results are discussed in details".	Thank you.
D/4-II: "I would suggest putting more emphasis on the analysis to what extent the results of research confirm the entrepreneurial orientation of surveyed universities. This could bring the results to the journal's profile".	As suggested further revision is done in the Analysis section. Key improvements include a specific articulation of key points derived from the actual interviews, in order to
Reviewer D (DISCUSSION)	
D/5: "The discussion is combined with results section. This makes it difficult to find a discussion part that relies on comparisons with other authors research".	Detailed conclusion is added to the identified sub-themes of the discussion to augment explanations.
Reviewer D (CONCLUSION)	
D/6: "There are interesting theoretical and practical conclusions. Research limitations and suggestions for future research are well formulated".	Thank you.

Reviewer D (CONTRUBUTION TO THE FIELD AND DEPTH OF RESEARCH)	
D/7: "The paper make a contribution to the research theme. Contribution to science is not very significant, but practical implications are also important".	Thank you.