

Major points.

- 1) Above all, the paper is not well-crafted. For example variables are not well defined and there is not table for sources of data and descriptive statistics. This is below an acceptable standard.
- 2) Measuring success is not an easy task. Anyway, the author have to improve in this respect. For example, the 'regime change' is not well explained. The authors may want to double-check the 'regime change' category with those produced in well-known datasets use din IR literature (ex. Polity IV; Armingeon et al.; COW). In this case the critical assessment of Hufbauer would be more meaningful. Detecting the bias would be more clear.
- 3) It is not clear how the variable 'cost to target' is defined and computed. The same holds for 'cost to sender'. Too much vagueness. This could be a crucial point.
- 4) The authors include a variable called 'international cooperation' that would capture the intensity of relationship between countries. A reader would be curious to know how it is defined and whether it does capture only diplomatic relations or also cultural relationships.
- 5) The role of 'democracy' is dramatically underestimated.

Minor points

- 1) Why GNP and not GDPs? It is not a trivial difference for small countries.
- 2) The author do not cite Caruso (2003) that analyzes in depth the impact of different types of sanctions on trade.
- 3) In table 4 sign of the coefficient of duration in model 1 is not well-located.
- 4) It is not clear whether GNP ratios and trade linkages are in current or constant terms.
- 5) The last sentence "bias per se is not bad, but we need to know its size and direction" should be removed.