Send around to authors. In actual email, write the top 3 or 4 points that we’d like some input so it’s not too cumbersome for our busy friends.

Red items –

1. Price distributions sum to more than 1.
   1. This mnight have to do with the normalisation. Each time we plot a historgram, we present the frequency. Quite often, when we convert to probs, we divide by the overall n of events to get prob dist. A quick look at the figure, the R side sums to 1, therefore it looks like we have the values – we just need to divide by the n events.
   2. On to do list, have Scott check the R code that generates the data
   3. This one isn’t a main group issue.
2. More extensive treatment with implications – add to the group priorty list. Ask Mark Steyvers and Scott for input on this because they’ve done more on group implications stuff.
3. Primary aim focussed on behavioural properties – not a main group priority.
   1. This might be resolved by answering the other comments that ask for greater model implications and discussion.
   2. In your response. Number the comments so that you can reference responses to different responses.
4. Learning: include it in the email body text. Suggest that we remove it.
   1. There’s a limited number of points you want to articulate in the body to the coauthros. Highlight three or four major points. This will be another one. Gopy the gist of the comment, say I’m happy to drop this part from the manuscript.
   2. Ask if we’re all happy to drop it because we haven’t developed a suitable learning theory
5. Different warehouse and money and different computer conditions:
   1. Numbers are different because we didn’t have two computers.
   2. Rachel would remember the exact calculation of the numbers, why we had exactly those. We had to change the numbers, to accommodate the number of competitors.
   3. This can also go out to coauthors – we can admit it would have been a cleaner comparison to have two computers but at the time mwe didn’t know how to write the code to make that kind of automation. It was apractical simplification due to coding limitations.
   4. Make a draft email, take your time, flesh it out and send Ami and email
6. Parameter guessing
   1. That’s a fair point – our results should be seen as a sufficiency proof.
      1. A suffiency proof is a proof that is not always correct but can be in certain instances. Therefore, this kind of proof is sufficient but not necessary. We didn’t quite show that prospect theory is necessarily the correct theory to account for the data but it is at least sufficient to provide an account of the data. It is a weak form of proof.
      2. We show that iterative prospect theory Can account for the data.
      3. We might argue that although sufficiency is a weak form of proof it is nonetheless a form of proof. Essentially, IPT CAN account for the data.
   2. This point can go into the group email – we agree and we need to explain that this is a sufficiency proof.

Next step – share thoughts with co-authors w focus on the tricky bits. Seek their advice.

This two computers vs one is killing us. One thing that comes to mind. Imagine we could set up a simulation where we have two computers. Actually leave it for now, let’s see what advice we get.