

The author(s) have made efforts in revising their manuscript. It has improved. However I am still not convinced about/by the main message of this paper. In my view, the problem of the paper boils down to the question whether one should publish a paper saying roughly and more or less implicitly that the Mexican case is actually not appropriate for this kind of method. The answer to my question whether and how the PR component and strategic coordination between parties and voters at different levels have an impact on the correct identification of partisan bias actually relies on referring to another referee's recommendation to frame the paper as a purely methodical one. This implies that the authors mechanistically apply that method to the district level (as they explicitly and frankly wrote in the first submission).

The second point, why I am still skeptical is the missing theoretical foundation of this application (which in is directly linked to my first point).

Nevertheless, the authors draw far-reaching conclusions from their analysis:

„Our application reveals how the plurality component of Mexico's mixed electoral system gives persistent advantage to some parties in recent congressional elections. Relative to the PAN, there is evidence of small, but systematic partisan bias in favor of the PRI in the votes-to-seats conversion, and of a larger, if more volatile, bias favorable to the PRD throughout the period“

In my view these are not covered by the underlying processes. We know from recent developments in electoral-research in the last 10 years that there are multidirectional interferences between tiers of electoral systems, and there are interdependencies between different components of electoral systems shaping parties' strategies.

Given these insufficiencies which I consider essential I have to reject the paper.