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**Comments**

This is a very nice piece of work which I really enjoyed reading. In addition to being very well written and structured it seems to contain some non-trivial original work? Your idea of combining Hotelling's game with the classical voter model is bordering on publishable work if you could get a clearer quantitative understanding of how the model behaves under a range of parameter regimes. You have done an excellent job of setting yourself a clear question of relevance to social science and going on to synthesise different ideas from the mathematics and social science literature into something which spans the interface. I think the general thrust of your essay nevertheless remains comprehensible to the target audience even if some of the details may not be. My overall impression is that this is an excellent piece of work which might be worth developing further if you were interested.

**Ways to Improve**

I think you need to include a few more details about the simulations, parameter values etc in order to make the work reproducible. For example, in the captions of figures 2 and 3, you do not state how many agents there are.

The continuous opinion model in which an agent adopts the arithmetic mean of the opinion variables of themselves and their neighbour is closely related to the dynamics of the Deffuant Model, another well-known idealised model in the opinion dynamics literature. You would need to discuss this model in a future draft of this work. In the Deffuant model both agents adopt the mean opinion value after an interaction which I don't think is the case for the model which you propose.

A minor technical point: I didn't understand what you meant by assuming a symmetric opinion distribution on the interval [0,1]! “Symmetric” usually means P(-x) = P(x)

Comprehension: 85

Analysis: 95

Critique: 95

Presentation: 85

**Agreed Mark**

90

**Marking Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade A = 90-100%** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| Use of exhaustive range of sources, including willingness to access original primary sources and where relevant evidence of archival work. | Superlative answer to question approaching level necessary for professional academic publication. Demonstrates masterful facility with use of methodologies and theories and applies these in innovative ways to gain new analytical insights. | Highly original personal perspective on the problems in the question. Ability to innovate theoretically, and to overturn existing scholarly assumptions, and to contribute authoritatively to current high-level academic debates. Offering new interpretations of empirical evidence. | Superb structure, progression and pace. Prose and style appropriate for professional publication. Faultless referencing and bibliography as expected in professional publication. |
| **Grade A = 80-89%** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| Use of comprehensive range of relevant sources, worthy of noting for reference purposes. | Outstanding answer to question approaching level equivalent to preparation for doctoral work. Demonstrates impressive facility with use of methodologies and theories and applies these consistently to gain additional analytical insights. | Original personal perspective on the problems in the question. Ability to challenge existing scholarly assumptions. | Excellent structure, progression and pace. Prose and style near equivalent to doctoral level work. Excellent referencing and bibliography. |
| **Grade A = 70-79%** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| Use of wide range of relevant sources, well understood and fully appreciated. | Excellent answer to question. Locates suitable concepts and makes comprehensive assessment of issues involved. Understands the relevant theories and applies them to answering the question. | Distinctive personal perspective on the problems in the question. Ability to set sources and viewpoints in context and evaluate contributions. Methodological awareness and theoretical appreciation. | Well structured and planned. Clear, articulate style (with good spelling, grammar and syntax). Proper referencing and bibliography. Confident presentation and appropriate length. |
| **Grade B = 60-69%** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| Good understanding of main sources, well summarised and used in a relevant way. | Competent answers to the question bringing out useful points and substantiating them. Use of theoretical models in a relevant way to answer the question. Presentation of arguments and intelligent comments relevant to the question. | Appreciation of main issues and ability to make appropriate critical points. Sensible commentary on evidence and materials used. | Competent structure. Clear presentation (including good spelling, grammar and syntax). Proper referencing and bibliography. Control of length. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade C = 50-59% MA Pass Mark=50** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| Fair understanding of the literature and a fair range of source material consulted. | Limited use and understanding of theoretical models. Presentation of arguments and intelligent comment relevant to the question. | Sensible commentary on evidence and materials used. | Coherent presentation. Satisfactory spelling, grammar and syntax. Satisfactory referencing and bibliography. |
| **Grade D = 40-49% Fail** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| Few relevant sources used. Poor understanding. | Lack of an analytic approach. Purely descriptive account. Often the question has been ignored or badly misunderstood. | Irrelevant comments. Lack of critical or appreciative framework. | Unstructured presentation, lack of coherence, page referencing, etc. |
| **Fail = 0-29% Fail** | | | |
| **Comprehension** | **Analysis** | **Critique** | **Presentation** |
| The work shows little or no understanding of the subject under discussion. Attempts to use literature are either non-existent or irrelevant. The subject is not understood. | Unconnected points or observations dominate the text. There is no analytic structure. The question/title has not been addressed. | Critical awareness is absent. Argument relies on incoherent and/or contradictory observations. | Incoherent sentences. A general absence of structure. Absence of references, page numbers, abstract, etc. |