

Response to Reviews of “Did Pokémon Go Affect the 2016 US Presidential Election? A Demo Political Science Publication”

Misty Williams¹ and Ash Ketchum²

¹Department of Politics, University of California, Alcatraz

²Department of Government, Johto School of Public Administration

August 04, 2018

We would like to thank both of our reviewers for their thoughtful feedback and their constructive ideas for improving and extending our analysis. In our revisions, we have taken Reviewer A’s suggestion to provide more explicit coverage of the first-stage result in our analysis. Likewise, in response to the suggestion to give context to the effect size, we conduct a back-of-the-envelope exercise in which we examine the Electoral College impact of a hypothetical release of shiny Groudon on Election Day.

We likewise have used Reviewer B’s feedback to improve our analyses and writing. We now explicitly discuss who the compliers in our design are, and show what this means for the generality of our results. We disagree with the reviewer, however, on the assertion the high proportion of flying types released on Election Day precludes our analysis from having external validity. As we show in our descriptive statistics, the most common flying type caught on election was Gyarados, which is also part water-type. Indeed, using survey data from the CCES, we show that both (a) most voters view Gyarados as a water type without realizing that it’s also a flying type, and (b) water is the second most popular Pokémon type.

We nonetheless thank the reviewer for raising this constructive criticism, as we believe the descriptive statistics raised in addressing this concern have clarified and strengthened the overall research design.