Comments:

@1: Thank you for your support

@2: We followed up on this in the introduction

@3: has been clarified in the introduction

@4: Thank you for the suggestion, we changed the title and agree with you that it now better covers the content of the article

@5: Zahra states that “Hayek proposes that entrepreneurial opportunities can only be discovered and acted upon at a very local level. The implication is that distant actors generally lack the relevant facts and knowledge essential to identify, frame and evaluate a potential opportunity”(p524). Hayek argued that in a world of imperfect information, an entrepreneur makes the gap between his knowledge and that of others into an entrepreneurial opportunity

Kirzner, who’s idesa served as a model for Zahra’s ‘social constructionist’, did not deny the need for local knowledge, but rather focussed on ‘entrepreneurial alertness’ as the factor that most clearly distinguishes the entrepreneur from a non-entrepreneur. Tang et al (DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.07.001) write that “Kirzner (1979) defined alertness as an individual's ability to identify opportunities which are overlooked by others. In further developing the boundaries of alertness, we argue that an important component of alertness is the aspect of judgment which focuses on evaluating the new changes, shifts, and information and deciding if they would reflect a business opportunity with profit potentials. We define alertness as consisting of three distinct elements: scanning and searching for information, connecting previously-disparate information, and making evaluations on the existence of profitable business opportunities.” Alertness as such, cannot exist without knowledge of the local situation. The argument, instead, is more like: as everybody has or could have the same information, what really distinguishes the entrepreneur is the alertness to see the opportunities embedded in this information. That is why we reed Zarah’s sentence: “opportunities do not necessarily arise from an entrepreneur's specific local knowledge, but rather from their alertness to opportunities which they leverage by developing products,…” not as a negation of the importance of local knowledge, but rather as a comparison on what elements are most important for recognising or developing entrepreneurial opportunities – in line with Kirzner’s argumentation.

Zarah also highlights that Social Constructionists build on social knowledge in her example of the Acumen Fund (an organisation that we, admittedly, would not see as a social entrepreneur, because there is no entrepreneurial risk): She calls the Social Constructionist an “arbitrageur of knowledge” – which, incidentally, is a term coined by Hayek in “The use of knowledge in society” in 1945. Zarah argues that this arbitrageur of knowledge “brings appropriate knowledge, skills and resources from two different locations together to solve a widespread but specific problem. Her organization appreciates and embraces the knowledge of local entrepreneurs to operate within existing local institutions.“(p 526). For these reasons, we do not think that local knowledge is only important to the lowest level of social entrepreneur.

@6: In our original submission, we explained in a footnote why PRIDE only Works with women. Now, we transferred that to the main text (under Research setting) and included some extra lines on the topic.

@7: I saw why you thought it was a bit muddled. I made it more clear now. The only point I did not follow up was the one on including a relational dimension. Although it is extremely important for entrepreneurship (in fact, we thought it important enough for a separate article, which will appear in International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal), the knowledge needed to create, maintain and use networks can still be subdivided in either cognitive (e.g. the know-who) and affective (e.g., for lack of a clearer term, the ‘feel how’: experience social interaction and feel where what positions can be taken up). We did not see how we could include a relational dimension and keep within the word limit and make it clearer. Having said that, it is something we might follow up on. It is an interesting thought to distinguish three types of learning and see how they can be analytically separated.

@8: I adapted this, hopefully to such an extent that it can now bring across the piont we were trying to make.