**Colonial Rule and Economic Freedom – Public Choice**

**Louis**

1. **Organize Literature Review in three subitems**

* Geographical Determinants
* Incentives for Extractive vs. Inclusive institutions
* Human Capital of colonizers

1. **Run a regression of EFW colonized on HIEL Colonizer at independence**
2. **Respond to fixed effects**
3. **Cluster standard errors at the colonizer level**
   1. Appendix: Conley standard errors for spatial autocorrelation
4. **Controls for:**
   1. legal origins,
   2. Prevalence of European Settlers (this might be controlling for a channel)
   3. Ruggedness
   4. Urbanization rate in 1500 (already have, I think)
5. **Sensitivity Analysis** 
   1. See [Appendix C](a.%09https:/louisrouanet.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Rouanet_Tallec_Long_Live_Republic.pdf)
6. **Regress EFW in decade t+1, t+2, t+3 etc, on HIEL colonizer**
   1. Test for persistence
7. **Minor comments**
   1. See example on how to summarize righting on Louis’ comment
   2. Cite Justin’s paper on civil law in Louisiana
   3. Map of colonizers and colonizer
   4. Raw Correlation Plot between EFW colonizer and HIEL colonizer
   5. Change Section 4.4 to “Categories of EFW”
   6. Revise section 5 for conciseness

**Reviewer #1**

1. **Conceptualize Economic Freedom**
2. Include a definition of economic freedom from EFW
3. How does it differ from “quality” of institutions?
4. Control for these alternative measures to highlight what distinguishes economic freedom
   1. That would be controlling for post-treatment variables
5. **What’s the author’s argument?** 
   1. Better explain the rationale of economic freedom
   2. What is the relationship between the two mechanisms (length and economic freedom)
   3. Include some institutional analysis with some case studies
6. **Is the author making a causal claim?** 
   1. Even if is only correlational, the controls should be included altogether
   2. Include colonizer fixed effects, and run with HIEL of colonizer at the beginning of colonization
7. **Other comments**
   1. Tie the literature review to the argument.
   2. What’s the contribution relative to AJR and La Porta literature?
      1. Relative to AJR, we are looking at the institutions of the *colonizer*, and its robust to the inclusion of settler mortality. So my findings suggest that even controlling for “type” of colonization, freer colonizers implemented freer colonies.
      2. Relative to La Porta, economic freedom encompasses a wider set of institutions than simply legal origins. Look at two colonizers with the same legal origins, but varying EFW.
   3. **Population weighted regressions**
   4. **Instead of Change in EFW (Table B5), test persistence as pointed out by Louis**

**Reviewer #2**

1. **Cross-correlation robust-standard errors.**
   1. Cluster at colonizer level
   2. Conley for spatial correlation
2. **Control for settler mortality and pre-colonial population density (p. 11)**
   1. Already done it, just make it clearer in the text
3. **Include all covariates (or at least the significant ones) at the same time**
4. **Minor comments:** 
   1. Page 2, line 46. There is a typo. It should be written as "I show that countries colonized by European"
   2. On the third paragraph on page 5, the author should also make reference to the type of government implemented by the British Empire: indirect rule in those colonies not settled massively as the Neoeuropes. In India there was a mix of direct and indirect rule
   3. Page 9, line 39. It should be written as "However, 21 colonies, for which EFW data are not available, were dropped".
   4. Page 11, lines 46 and 47: The sentence "Estimations without the Americas (4) and "Neo-Europes" (Australia, Canada, and New Zealand)" is unfinished. I imagine the author meant to say that such regressions provide also unchanged results.
   5. Page 18, lines 36-37. The author argues that "Thus, large population densities are indicative of areas more susceptible to settlement and with greater labor force, both of which could be desirable by colonizers." This is not totally correct. Strictly speaking, according to the endowment view of Acemoglu and coauthors, higher precolonial density is an unfavorable endowment that did not promote mass settlement, rather the opposite. In his 2002 QJE paper, precolonial population density (population density in 1500) is used as an alternative endowment variable to potential settler mortality employed in his 2001 AER paper. **R:** *I meant to say that they were more susceptible for larger [native] population* *settlements*, *not settlement by colonizers. Indeed, European settlement was smaller in areas with larger population densities. See also Easterly and Levine (2016).*
   6. Page 19, line 39. It should be written as "similar magnitudes to those of Table 4".
   7. More generally, revise the writing and posible typos throughout the paper.