

Comments on the Proposed Revision of: Guilt Aversion and Redistributive Politics: A Moral Intuitionist Approach

Gilles Le Garrec

26-02-2014

General Comment

I appreciate the fact that the author, before undertaking the revision, has asked the opinion of the two referees about the changes he wishes to implement. I found reasonable both the direction of the revision and the main structure of the new version of the paper that the author proposes.

However, I think that some of the proposed revisions do not fit with what I asked for. The author can find below my replies about each of his answers to my specific comments: I refer to section 3 (Specific answer to referee 2) of his "Proposed revision" document. Furthermore, in that document he does not mention anything about the long list of typos characterizing the previous version of the paper: I hope that he would go into a deep proofreading before posting the next version.

Specific Comments

1. This would be fine to me.
2. I do not think that changing "voting behavior" into "median voter theory" and updating Campante (2010) would be enough. If the author has not in mind to provide a deeper discussion (and additional references) of voting behavior or median voter theory, I insist in suggesting him to avoid presenting the paper (also) as a modelling of "the voting behavior over redistribution". I do not see, even in the proposed revision of the paper, such a contribution.
3. In line with the previous comment, I think that the author is understating my critique about the fact that voting over redistribution is presented as a central issue of the paper, while instead all theoretical results in the paper (Propositions 1, 2, 3) are only "preparatory" to voting behavior. Even in the proposed revision of the paper, I do not see a clear solution to this problem. I hope that the revised version would not show this incoherence between declared goals and actual contribution of the paper.
4. This would be fine to me.
5. OK, I see, and I agree with the author's view.

6. I agree with the author that "skin conductance" is very intuitive. But other terms, as "*anterior insula*", are not. Hence, I encourage him to carefully check if the paper contains such technical terms that do not belong to the economics field and, for each of them, to provide definitions, references and, wherever possible, intuitive explanations to the reader.
7. I hope that in the revised version of the paper the author would be able to clarify this important point.
8. This would be fine to me.
9. I am glad that the author agrees with me about the fact that guilt aversion *à la* Charness and Dufwenberg (2006) is not suitable in the theoretical context he analyzes. However, in the new version of the paper I would also like him to clarify the confound between what he calls "guilt" and what he calls "fairness" (inequity aversion) *à la* Fehr and Schmidt (1999). What I mean is that this comment is more general than what the author claims: it is not just about removing a reference.
10. This would be fine to me.