

Dear Professor Liebowitz,

I have now received reports from two reviewers, an invited reader, plus an anonymous reader regarding your manuscript, “A Replication of Four Quasi-Experiments and Three Facts from ‘The Effect of File Sharing on Record Sales: An Empirical Analysis’ (Journal of Political Economy, 2007)” (Manuscript Number 1990-1; Discussion Paper Number 2016-48).

Based on the feedback I have received, I am inviting you to submit a revision. In general, I find your responses to the reviewers to be adequate. Please be sure to incorporate all the changes that you say you will make in your responses. Your revision should also address the following points.

1) You did not address Point 4 in Reviewer 1’s report (see below). The yellow-highlighted section particularly deserves a response.

*4. Variation in download intensity across genres*

*This experiment has the most promise within the OS paper, and it thus deserves more focus. The underlying assumption is that some genres are more affected by piracy than others. This paper lays out the issues with this “quasi-experiment” clearly. It is difficult to know what OS did, based on the paragraph in their paper, especially concerning the different genres and the measure of piracy intensity.*

*I do appreciate the extensions in this replication – in fact, I also find this replication more convincing than the others. I agree that a per-sale measure of piracy is better than a per-title measure, and dropping the year 1999 is sensible as well. I find this replication convincing.*

*Regarding the economic impact, again, 12% of something small (16.6%) gives us approximately a 2-percent decrease in sales at the mean. Using the “OS corrected” measure of piracy, the estimated decrease due to piracy is only 1.3%, and not statistically significant.*

2) You should address the “Other Comments” from Reviewer 1.

3) There was some concern expressed about your financial disclosure statement. Please revise your statement to provide more detail about the extent of consulting and expert witnessing you may do for the recording industry. This will not effect the decision regarding your manuscript. As you point out elsewhere in your responses, your facts and sources are clearly documented and stand on their own. None of the reviewers suggested that your analysis was biased by your non-academic, professional activities. However, a more detailed disclosure would make it clear that you have nothing to hide about your financial interests.

4) You should provide all data and code in a format that would allow readers of your article to easily reproduce your results. Ideally, your data and code should allow “push button” reproduction, so that hitting the “run” button on your computer program would generate all the results in your paper. The program should be annotated so as to make it easy for the reader to match the output with tables in your paper.

A revised version of your manuscript that addresses the instructions above will be reconsidered for publication. If you choose to resubmit a revision, be sure to include a detailed discussion of how you responded to each of the reviewer’s comments, the original authors’ comments, and my points above.

Please note that submitting a revision of your manuscript does not guarantee eventual acceptance.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to *Economics; The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal*. I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Bob Reed

Co-Editor

*Economics: The Open Access, Open Assessment E-Journal*