Peer Review Response

The first suggestion for the paper was in reference to my first sentence:

"It can but will have terrible results. I suggest not such a definitive statement."

I can certainly understand the problem a reader might have with such a statement. For that reason, I changed my first sentence to be more realistic and accurate.

The second suggestion was actually made in two of the reviews, and it was in reference to my introduction paragraph. The first one read as follows:

"Good intro, but you need a overview of your paper and results"

Below is the second suggestion for my introduction (with a spelling correction):

"This sentence is your thesis statement because it informs readers what the point of this paper will be. Therefore, I highly suggest moving this sentence or a version of it to your Introduction where readers will see it at the beginning and know what this paper is about instead of being confused through the first two sections of what this paper is."

I believe they were referring to a sentence later on where I bluntly described my purpose for the paper. I understand that being direct from the very beginning can be practical, but often leaves little room for dynamics and intrigue. That is why I had not originally been obvious about my purpose for the paper in my first paragraph. After all, if you forewarn someone about what you are trying to persuade them to believe in your coming arguments, they will have more time to build up counter arguments. Still, since it was

mentioned twice, I added some more direct purpose statements at the end of my introduction.

There was a comment about one of the last sentences in my Problem Description paragraph, and I am still confused about it:

"Does this imply using only the highest variables or using the highest variable together to predict tax change?"

Honestly, I cannot understand what this question is asking, so it was hard to correct that sentence. Still, I edited the sentence and split it up to make it clearer. Hopefully, whatever the problem may have been is fixed now. My new sentences are as follows:

> "However, we can consider each significant variable and determine which ones have the highest correlation with tax change. We can then predict, with substantial accuracy, how a state will alter its taxes."

The next comment addresses my explanation of the error measurements on the third page:

"The normal reader would not understand these numbers. I think an explanation of what is high or low is needed in the paper."

I am, in fact, aware that the normal reader would not understand these numbers. For this reason, I had already explained in my initial draft what these numbers represent, how they work, and why they are important. I did not mention them without a thorough explanation, and I made the explanation as simple as I could. I had already specifically

explained why I cannot give an example of a high or low error measurement, since they are only viewed in comparison with the errors of competing models. That being said, I added an extra sentence to assist in that clarification.

There was a comment criticizing my grammar for one sentence:

"This sentence is a run-on. I would advise making it three separate sentences or adding conjunctions to make it a compound sentence and thereby grammatically correct."

I am a grammar nerd, so I was hypersensitive to this comment. However, upon reading my sentence over and over again, I could not find a single defense for this criticism. This is my sentence: "The BIC was 15568, the In-Sample R.M.S. Error was 383, and the Out-of-Sample was 438." I would argue that my commas make the three error measurements a list of items, and my use of "and" is a conjunction. The sentence is actually very short. I am highly confused and slightly upset that this sentence was accused of being grammatically incorrect. I cannot think of a way that it could be made shorter, and I have two other sentences just like it in the paper that are somehow not a problem. For this reason, I did not change it at all.

The next comment was helpful because it was in reference to what I fully intended to edit but did not get the chance to prior to submitting. It was referring to my explanation of my second model:

"Don't tell readers that you don't have a reason to include a variable. It discredits the validity of your argument if variables are chosen at random with no

reason to why they were chosen. You include a reason for choosing this variable namely, "an increase in population is an increase in the number of citizens in that state." Use that reason and delete the part saying you don't know why you chose this variable."

I was not saying that I had chosen the Population variable without reason; I was simply explaining that it's something anyone could notice. An idea does not have to be revolutionary to be helpful. I did not say or imply (to my knowledge) that I "don't know why" I chose the variable; I know exactly why, and the reason was simple. I explained that. However, apparently it can be misinterpreted, so I removed that sentence.

Throughout the rest of my paper, I edited the parts that I already had planned on fixing. I also made a few slight word changes scattered in response to comments made in the peer reviews. Overall, I feel that my paper is much clearer now, and I hope it is easy and enjoyable to read.