Title page

I don’t like the old title, but I don’t like this one either. Also, this should probably be labeled a research note depending upon how long the doublespaced version (without the appendix would be) . The appendix should almost certainly be submitted as a separate document since it would become an online appendix. And word count should be without the appendix.

I suggest the new title be:

<Examining Eight Plausible Alternatives to the Present Electoral College: None will Prevent Divergence Between Popular Vote and Electoral College Outcome.>

ABSTRACT: Change sentence to read:

<This typology allows us to classify four major variants of“reform” to the present Electoral College in a parsimonious fashion. Within these major variants there are also further subvariants so that we consider eight possible alternative rules.> **JONATHAN, IS THIS RIGHT?**

ABSTRACT : Change sentence to read: < Many of the proposals we consider have been proposed by well known figures, with some actually debated in Congress They include the proposals we view as most likely to be taken seriously>.

AReporter once asked legendary singer/actor Maurice Chevalier: “Mr. Chevalier, ho

w does

it feel to have reached the ripe old age of 70.” Without hesitation, Chevalier responded

to the reporter: “Old age isn’t so bad when you consider the alternative!”

p. 1 Jonathan I had forgotten that there were quotes from Trump opening up the paper, so I would like to move the Chevalier quote later in the text. I would now put it at the beginning of the first paragraph in the discussion section. That paragraph would now tart with

AReporter once asked legendary singer/actsor Maurice Chevalier: “Mr. Chevalier, ho

w does

it feel to have reached the ripe old age of 70.” Without hesitation, Chevalier responded

to the reporter: “Old age isn’t so bad when you consider the alternative!” ,The point of the present essay has been to consider the plausible alternatives to the present Electoral College and, judging by reversal likelihood, there is little to recommend change.

p. 3

and it’s far from clear to what constituency a reformer would be trying to

persuade. and it’s far from clear to what constituency a reformer would be trying to persuade.

Delete the redundant <to>

p. 4 for consistency, in the sentence below change nine to eight.

While we recognize that there are many dimensions along which the Electoral College and proposed

alternatives to it could be evaluated, both in normative and empirical terms, here we evaluate nine key

p. 4

You wrote

(see e.g., Longley & Braun (1972); Hardaway (1994); Grofman & Feld (2005);

Polsby et al. (2012); Koza et al. (2013); cf. Barth´el´emy, Martin & Piggins (2014), whom we consider **among** the

most thoughtful and detailed empirical analysis most closely resembling this paper’s analysis).

check spelling of <Bathelemy>

add the word <among>

change whom to <which>

change analysis to <analyses>

DISCUSSION

Using election results from the period 1868 to 2016, we have constructed a total of fourteen counterfactual …

Jonathan shouldn’t it be **eight**??!!

DISCUSSION

Change the last paragraph of the discussion section to read

<The EC is not perfect, a fact of which the framers were perfectly aware , But all plausible alternatives, except for the the popular vote or something which is its equivalent, such as the proposed compact rule, do not cure the main problem of inversions. Moreover, many have new and severe problems of their own. For example, changes that would eliminate winner-take-all and move to district unit rules would almost definitely lead to political maneuvering and even more extreme gerrymandering (as would increasing the size of the House). And, in an age of hyperpolarization, with the potential for a close national outcome, the direct popular vote creates problems with respect to a proliferation of election challenges.. All in all, it is in our opinion that making changes to the

system of electing the president should be looked at with a high degree of skepticism.>

Table 1

\* 31.25% of elections we have data for, compared to the 10.5% of the 38 elections in this studies for the actual EC.

I found this endnote confusing It should read something like

<The number of inversion is 31.25% of the FILL IN NUMBER OF elections for which we have district level data, In comparison, in the full set of 38 elections there are FILL IN NUMBER OF inversions (FILL IN percentage) .>