Thank you very much for your positive and thoughtful review. If you and other readers find this response satisfactory, we will be happy to add it into the paper's conclusion or as a footnote.

This paper focuses on the Shapley Value normalized as the SSPI. We do not attempt to evaluate our empirical results relative to other power indices for three central reasons. First, addressing an axiomatically derived power index allowed us to design an experiment tailored to those axioms. Second, the Shapley value has particularly widespread applications, making it a good beginning. Third, we felt that addressing this one index involved enough complications in design and analysis that we should keep comparative analysis separate.

That said, our search of vote profiles did not reveal profiles with 1) measurable differences contrasting the SSPI with the Banzhaf (1965)-Penrose (1946) power index "BPPI" and 2) unambiguous compliance with the Shapley axioms. Only two of the power-identical profile sets in this paper yield any difference between SSPI and BPPI. For the *r* set, the largest player has 36.67 percent of the power with SSPI, contrasting with 36.21% with the BPPI. For w_1 , SSPI yields 40.00% and PBPI yields 39.29. Readers who wish to apply these results to the BPPI and accept this experiment's design as appropriate for BPPI, may interpret these results as supporting the BPPI equally as to the SSPI.

Those who accept this experiment as relevant to other indices will find our results contrasting strongly with indices which identify substantially more power with large players, e.g. Johnston (1978), or substantially less power with large players, e.g. Deegan and Packel (1978).

Thank you,

Chris Geller