Thank you very much for your positive feedback and your additional comments! We hope that we are able to meet your expectations with the revised version of our paper. In the following we would like to point out in a few sentences how we addressed each of your points.

Is the theoretical perspective outlined satisfactorily in the article? Are there any gaps in the theoretical framework that you would like to point out in particular, and are there any additional theoretical perspectives or relevant research you would suggest that would improve the article?

Reviewer B: Very satisfactorily

Reviewer A: Very unsatisfactorily. There is a descriptive and insufficient discussion of "market orientation theory". However, it does not convince as a theory being used for this specific article.

Reply: I revised the literature review. I rewrote the entire section and provided more context on the background of market orientation theory.

Is the method outlined satisfactorily?

Reviewer B: I wouldn't mind more detail on the method. Perhaps the author should even bracket out a separate section for this.

Reviewer A: Unsatisfactorily.

Reply: I revised the method section and provided more details about the case study approach.

Do you have any suggestions for the author(s) that would improve the analysis, discussion, conclusion?

Reviewer A: The analysis lacks depth and clarity. The results should to be analyzed in a higher level of abstraction, thus shortening existing work and expanding such ambitions. It is not clear what the main contributions to the field are. The discussion and analysis does not come out well enough.

Reply: I tried to focus on the four cases in the results section and discuss these results on a more abstract level in the discussion. The contribution to market orientation theory and innovation is part of the conclusion of the study.

Do you have specific suggestions to the author(s) regarding elements in the manuscript that would be helpfully expanded on, shortened, or removed?

Reviewer B: I'd ask the author to supplement the current analysis with a stronger comparison \*between cases\*. In other words, rather than looking at 4 cases and analyzing only what they say about entrepreneurial market orientation in general, the author might supplement this by looking at how the cases are similar and different amongst themselves. In many ways I think this is a more interesting question.

Reply: In this study, I wanted to focus on processes of market orientation in general rather than compare two or more specific cases. However, I incorporated a table in the discussion section which summarizes the approach of every case as well as the changes over time and the current stage.

Thank you again for the great feedback. We hope that you are pleased with the revised version of the paper.