Response to referees 1 & 2

First, I would like to thank the two referees for careful reading and very useful remarks, which have occasioned substantial improvement in style and content of the paper. I have incorporated their comments in the new version of the paper as follows.

Referee report 1. I have provided an explicit bound on the size of perturbation. In addition, I have provided a bound which could be easier to use in applications (Remark after Theorem).

Referee report 2.

Remark (1): In the new version, following referee report 1, I explicitly work out an upper bound for distance of preferences. This implies that I do no longer need to refer to compactness of the ε -slice (or, correctly, to its closure).

Remark (2): I revised only the proof of statement (iv) of Lemma 3 (in the new version, statement (v) of Lemma 3) keeping the statement as it was in the first version. This because I believe that referee's remark was due to a cryptic proof of this statement in the previous version. Actually, that proof did not make explicit that λ in the statement is not the same as λ * in the proof. I hope that the new proof makes it clear the difference between λ in the statement and λ * in the proof.

Remark (3): I have incorporated the referee's remark in the new version.

*** * ***

In addition to revising the paper along referees' remarks, I have revised the paper also from the stylistic point of view, in order to hopefully minimize "funky" grammar & spelling.