

# P5-S256-2 Comments

EPSA 2025

**Frederik Hjorth**  
Associate Professor, Ph.D.  
[fghjorth.github.io](https://fghjorth.github.io)



UNIVERSITY OF  
COPENHAGEN

# 1 Eschenwecker & König

## 2 Hermes & Klüver

## 3 Gessler et al.

# General comments

- Compelling case
- Intro is expertly structured
- Great design, rare opportunity for causal inference
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- **Compelling case**
- Intro is expertly structured
- Great design, rare opportunity for causal inference
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- Compelling case
- Intro is expertly structured
- Great design, rare opportunity for causal inference
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- Compelling case
- Intro is expertly structured
- Great design, rare opportunity for causal inference
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- Compelling case
- Intro is expertly structured
- Great design, rare opportunity for causal inference
- Elegant presentations throughout

# Potential improvements

- ❶ Is “challenging the challengers” the right framing here? Consider instead left-authoritarian party entry
- ❷ After intro, structure becomes harder to follow. Why not state “propositions” as actual hypotheses?
- ❸ Give more substantive information about characteristics of BSW candidacy states and municipalities
- ❹ Explain more about methodological details, e.g. “G-computation” (and less about ATE)



# Potential improvements

- 1 Is “challenging the challengers” the right framing here? Consider instead left-authoritarian party entry
- 2 After intro, structure becomes harder to follow. Why not state “propositions” as actual hypotheses?
- 3 Give more substantive information about characteristics of BSW candidacy states and municipalities
- 4 Explain more about methodological details, e.g. “G-computation” (and less about ATE)

# Potential improvements

- 1 Is “challenging the challengers” the right framing here? Consider instead left-authoritarian party entry
- 2 After intro, structure becomes harder to follow. Why not state “propositions” as actual hypotheses?
- 3 Give more substantive information about characteristics of BSW candidacy states and municipalities
- 4 Explain more about methodological details, e.g. “G-computation” (and less about ATE)

# Potential improvements

- 1 Is “challenging the challengers” the right framing here? Consider instead left-authoritarian party entry
- 2 After intro, structure becomes harder to follow. Why not state “propositions” as actual hypotheses?
- 3 Give more substantive information about characteristics of BSW candidacy states and municipalities
- 4 Explain more about methodological details, e.g. “G-computation” (and less about ATE)

# Potential improvements

- 1 Is “challenging the challengers” the right framing here? Consider instead left-authoritarian party entry
- 2 After intro, structure becomes harder to follow. Why not state “propositions” as actual hypotheses?
- 3 Give more substantive information about characteristics of BSW candidacy states and municipalities
- 4 Explain more about methodological details, e.g. “G-computation” (and less about ATE)

1 Eschenwecker & König

2 Hermes & Klüver

3 Gessler et al.

# General comments

- Very clear research design
- Impressive data collection
- Sophisticated estimation approach
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- **Very clear research design**
- Impressive data collection
- Sophisticated estimation approach
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- Very clear research design
- Impressive data collection
- Sophisticated estimation approach
- Elegant presentations throughout



# General comments

- Very clear research design
- Impressive data collection
- Sophisticated estimation approach
- Elegant presentations throughout

# General comments

- Very clear research design
- Impressive data collection
- Sophisticated estimation approach
- Elegant presentations throughout

# Potential improvements

- ① Framed in terms of “taming”, “disciplining” far right—does DV really speak to that?
- ② Motivation: consider clarifying, e.g. “democracies across Europe (...) hope that responsibility will temper their appeal”
- ③ Compare w. costs of governing for mainstream parties (likely strengthens your point!)
- ④ Covariate selection could be more strongly motivated
- ⑤ Show country-level heterogeneity, e.g. jackknife plot

# Potential improvements

- 1 Framed in terms of “taming”, “disciplining” far right—does DV really speak to that?
- 2 Motivation: consider clarifying, e.g. “democracies across Europe (...) hope that responsibility will temper their appeal”
- 3 Compare w. costs of governing for mainstream parties (likely strengthens your point!)
- 4 Covariate selection could be more strongly motivated
- 5 Show country-level heterogeneity, e.g. jackknife plot

# Potential improvements

- 1 Framed in terms of “taming”, “disciplining” far right—does DV really speak to that?
- 2 Motivation: consider clarifying, e.g. “democracies across Europe (...) hope that responsibility will temper their appeal”
- 3 Compare w. costs of governing for mainstream parties (likely strengthens your point!)
- 4 Covariate selection could be more strongly motivated
- 5 Show country-level heterogeneity, e.g. jackknife plot

# Potential improvements

- 1 Framed in terms of “taming”, “disciplining” far right—does DV really speak to that?
- 2 Motivation: consider clarifying, e.g. “democracies across Europe (...) hope that responsibility will temper their appeal”
- 3 Compare w. costs of governing for mainstream parties (likely strengthens your point!)
- 4 Covariate selection could be more strongly motivated
- 5 Show country-level heterogeneity, e.g. jackknife plot

# Potential improvements

- 1 Framed in terms of “taming”, “disciplining” far right—does DV really speak to that?
- 2 Motivation: consider clarifying, e.g. “democracies across Europe (...) hope that responsibility will temper their appeal”
- 3 Compare w. costs of governing for mainstream parties (likely strengthens your point!)
- 4 Covariate selection could be more strongly motivated
- 5 Show country-level heterogeneity, e.g. jackknife plot

## Potential improvements

- 1 Framed in terms of “taming”, “disciplining” far right—does DV really speak to that?
- 2 Motivation: consider clarifying, e.g. “democracies across Europe (...) hope that responsibility will temper their appeal”
- 3 Compare w. costs of governing for mainstream parties (likely strengthens your point!)
- 4 Covariate selection could be more strongly motivated
- 5 Show country-level heterogeneity, e.g. jackknife plot



1 Eschenwecker & König

2 Hermes & Klüver

3 Gessler et al.

# General comments

- Fascinating topic, case excellently matched
- Great to see explicitly explorative work
- Great complementarity in mix of methods

## General comments

- Fascinating topic, case excellently matched
- Great to see explicitly explorative work
- Great complementarity in mix of methods

## General comments

- Fascinating topic, case excellently matched
- Great to see explicitly explorative work
- Great complementarity in mix of methods

## General comments

- Fascinating topic, case excellently matched
- Great to see explicitly explorative work
- Great complementarity in mix of methods

# Potential improvements

- 1 Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS

# Potential improvements

- 1 **Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity**
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS

# Potential improvements

- 1 Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS



# Potential improvements

- 1 Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS

# Potential improvements

- 1 Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS

# Potential improvements

- 1 Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS

## Potential improvements

- 1 Motivation: Be more upfront about case specificity
- 2 Even given explorative nature, a more focused RQ could be helpful
- 3 Conceptually and methodologically, how can we separate cordon from positional distance?
- 4 How does refusal to engage (“conspiracy of silence”) complicate your research design?
- 5 Risk of low recall w. dictionary approach → consider more ambitious strategy, e.g. using LLMs
- 6 “empirical evidence suggests [accommodation] may be ineffective or even harmful” for countervailing evidence see Chou et al. 2021 CPS, Kollberg 2025 PSRM, Hjorth & Larsen 2022 BJPS