

## Reaction Paper Week 8

The Gilardi and Füglistter paper looks at policy diffusion of health-insurance subsidies in Switzerland through a dyadic variant of event-history analysis and provides evidence of the usefulness of this type of analysis. The Bricker and LaCombe paper proposes a new measure of state similarity to predict policy diffusion: perceived state similarity, and finds that this new measure is more effective and sophisticated than the previous default: contiguity.

I will focus mostly on the Bricker and LaCombe article as I find it to be interesting, thoughtful, and well written; however, I did find a few issues with the piece overall. To start with the positives, I found that this article was extremely good at predicting where my issues with the theory would lie. I found myself multiple times disagreeing with a point <sup>1</sup>the top of a paragraph, only for it to be thoroughly explained by the end. For just one example, when introducing the network as directed I was very skeptical, but by the end of page 379, I was completely on board. My only issue with the paper would be with the figures and tables used. For example Table 2 is extremely difficult to read, with little spacing, and no lines to distinguish which numbers correspond to which variables. Then figures such as Figure 2, were pretty unhelpful and difficult to understand as well. Overall I found my gripes with this paper to be quite minimal, and nit picky, as in many ways this paper was extremely useful, interesting, and added to the field greatly<sup>2</sup>!

---

<sup>1</sup> I wrote “this can’t be true” at the top of multiple paragraphs, only for them to be addressed later on

<sup>2</sup> And I am not just saying this because you wrote the paper