

"Voters Reward All Incumbents When They Benefit From Industrial Policy"

Thank you for an interesting read and an extremely well-organized code. I do understand that the extant document is pre-results, and that some of my suggestions therefore will be resolved when data and results are in. Given the phase of the project, I have not made any suggestions to change the code, but given my broad thoughts on the project here.

Notes on replication code

The organization of your code was a source of inspiration with the rproject etc. Thanks for the learning. I will take this as a model for future organization.

I had some difficulty loading the "rnatuarearthhires" library.

Notes on substance

I think the title / abstract needs a clearer framing of the contradiction you are testing/trying to solve for. I have two views (which may be wrong) on what is the interest:

1. Voters do not *see* what is going on, and therefore do not reward politicians (a la the Suzanne Mettler story)
2. Voters are partisan and do not reward politicians for things that benefit them (more the Achen & Bartels story)

I read your title and final part of abstract as hinting to #1, whereas your abstract (sentence 2) hints towards #2. I know this is pre-results, and I see your organization of hypotheses and perhaps you will decide on which story you will lean on as results emerge. Although these mechanism are not mutually exclusive per say, I think clarity on the main mechanism you are testing is beneficial.

Further on this, you do not motivate the case much. I have no knowledge of this act. This is something which can be given more pre-results thoughts, and I think the motivation for the case depends on whether you lean towards my stylized #1 or #2. That is, one can discuss

1. Whether this is more visible than comparable policies
2. Whether this is more contentious in a partisan way than other policies

On #2 here, I recall that something special is going on for Republicans. Perhaps this is what could be emphasized? On #1, you could compare the visibility to the policy that was used in the paper you are replicating.

Finally: *"This is true even in counties where the incumbent party indicates voters may have philosophical opposition to industrial policy and other government intervention."* I know we are pre-results and in draft mode etc., but the concluding line in the abstract should speak to debate 1 or 2, or perhaps to the future of industrial policy.

Notes on language

In the abstract, you write "voters might not attribute these benefits to politicians unless their role in securing the investment is clear." I would replace clear with visible. I think clear can both mean something about magnitude (a clear benefit to me) and and visibility (whether I see a benefit). I think you are talking about visibility.

Notes on figures

Figure 1 has stripes on it. I couldn't understand what they meant. I think they express representative vote, but something is wrong with your legend.

Notes on empirical approach

I am assuming that you are using the (somewhat) same empirical approach as in the original paper, but I felt that the transition from argument to empirical strategy could be clearer. I am guessing that the simple DAG is:

(X) Investment in community \rightarrow Retrospective Evaluation (visibility, partisanship) \rightarrow (Y) Incumbent Support.

And what we are trying to solve for is whether investments are being made strategically with 1) incumbent support in mind, 2) evaluation in mind. Again, more motivation for the case and spelling out the assumptions would be helpful for a reader, who is not familiar to the original case.