

# Review of “Did Pokémon Go Affect the 2016 US Presidential Election? A Demo Political Science Publication”

Aurea Juniper<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nuvema School of Public Policy, Unova University

May 17, 2018

I really like the focus of the paper, and I think it makes a valuable contribution to the literature. Indeed, the literature review is the most comprehensive documentation of the politics of Pokémon literature to date. However, I think the authors really need to be upfront about the fact that their design identifies a *local* average treatment effect (LATE) of increase Pokémon Go activity, not the average treatment effect (ATE) or even the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT). Who are the “compliers” in this design? Since a large majority of the shiny Pokémon releases on Election Day were flying-type Pokémon, this design really only tells us how flying-type Pokémon fans respond to increased Pokémon Go activity. Since the majority of Pokémon Go players are probably indifferent to flying types, I’m not sure this paper can speak to the more general phenomenon of Pokémon Go’s role in American Politics.