

Professor Baumgartner:

The *American Journal of Political Science* writes to report that the requisite reviews of the manuscript, titled "Punctuated Equilibrium In Comparative Perspective" and numbered 33410, have been received. Please read them and this letter carefully. As you do, you will see that the reviewers and I acknowledge that the manuscript is interesting, its intellectual merits and potential impacts are promising, and one or more minor or major revisions may advance it to a publishable article.

More specifically, The reviewers agree that the research question asked – on whether and how institutional systems invoke policy processes that produce output changes in varying degree – is important, and that the research design used – one that relies on punctuated equilibrium, associated hypotheses, and big datasets, to get at distributional variations in comparative perspective – is innovative. All three reviewers are positive, and all three want improvements. These improvements are not convoluted, and they sort into at least three areas. One wants greater theoretical development and precise conceptual definition, particularly as these refer to what punctuated equilibrium theory is, why the Central Limit Theorem may be assumed to capture correctly the distributional form of government outputs, and what “efficiency” and “friction” mean in the context of the investigation under way. A second improvement focuses on analysis, particularly on estimates of kurtosis, on the potential for time series dependencies in the data, and on inferences to be made based on the analysis about efficiency, friction, and punctuated equilibrium. A third improvement involves presentation and writing, that is, some of the text is simple, some is complex, and much is not straightforward. Thus, a better effort to link theory, models, and hypotheses, as well as a stronger justification of the countries used for analysis, and a stronger conclusion that gets at the innovation and importance of the research question asked and the research answer developed would help considerably to improve the organization and the reading of the manuscript. Other comments are made as well. Taken together, these comments and my own reading indicate that the manuscript is near, but not yet at, article status and that a revision is in order to make the case about the strength and uniqueness of its contribution. If you accept this invitation to revise, then please note that the revision and the accompanying memorandum should address the points made in this letter and in the reviews. Note as well that the revision and the memorandum will be sent to one original reviewer. The fuller text of the reviews can be viewed at the links below.

Review #2: <https://www.journalmanager.org/ajps/reviews/33410-2-2025-48317fe5bd974.pdf>

Review #3: <https://www.journalmanager.org/ajps/reviews/33410-3-2524-479611d762873.pdf>

Review #4: <https://www.journalmanager.org/ajps/reviews/33410-4-567-46a91834a8978.pdf>

Accordingly, *AJPS* offers you an opportunity to revise and resubmit the manuscript. You should decide carefully about whether it is worthwhile to revise and resubmit the manuscript to the peer-review process based on the following:

- The offer to revise and resubmit is exceedingly rare; a manuscript must be judged initially as having a >80% probability of success. However, the offer also is not a guarantee of acceptance for publication.
- At least one and possibly all original reviewers may be recontacted and a new reviewer may be selected.
- If you do decide to revise and resubmit, then the revised manuscript must be resubmitted within the next six months unless you specifically request an extension of time from the editor.
- The revised manuscript must not exceed 40 double-spaced pages in length with all text as well as references being double-spaced in 12-point type. All figures and tables, if included, may be smaller-point type but printed on separate pages.
- The revised manuscript must be resubmitted online at Guidelines for Manuscripts at www.ajps.org. At the time of resubmission, you should send:
 - an anonymous (pdf) version of the manuscript; and
 - an anonymous (pdf) memorandum of response to the reviewers' comments. The response should not exceed 4 single-spaced pages inserted at the top of the anonymous version of the manuscript.

If you have any questions about the above, then please contact me at your earliest convenience. In thanking you for considering *AJPS* as an appropriate journal of publication of your work, I remain,

Sincerely,

Marianne C. Stewart, Editor,

The American Journal of Political Science,

School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences,

The University of Texas at Dallas,

Box 830688,

Richardson, Texas, U.S.A. 75083

Email: ajps@utdallas.edu

Telephone: (972) 883-4595

Website: www.ajps.org