Referee report on "Two principles for two-person social choice" (SCWE-D-23-00280R1)

Most of the suggested points have been worked on and answered one by one by the authors. In my opinion, the article is ready to be accepted as long as the authors correct a problem in the definition of $[\![q]\!]$. The authors write "Given $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$, let $[\![q]\!] = [0, q] \cap \mathbb{N}$ denote the interval of integers between p and q" (Line 201), but there is no p to consider in such definition. The authors should write something like "Given $q \in \mathbb{R}$, let $[\![q]\!] = [0, q] \cap \mathbb{N}$ denote the interval of integers between 0 and q". I also think that $q \in \mathbb{R}$ is unnecessary, for q seems always to be a positive integer in the paper. Moreover, the now undefined notation $[\![0, q]\!]$ can still be found in several parts of the paper (see, for example, Lines 205, 206, and 673). This should be corrected.

Finally, I am still puzzled by the seemingly random use of "For each $\mathbf{P} \in \mathscr{L}(\mathcal{A})^N$", "$\forall \mathbf{P} \in \mathscr{L}(\mathcal{A})^N$", "For any $\mathbf{P}$", "$\forall \mathbf{P}$", "For all $\mathbf{P} \in \mathscr{L}(\mathcal{A})^N$", but if the editors do not argue against that, I won't either.