

Reviewer-1

The research paper demonstrates a strong foundation in content, proposing a clear and novel hypothesis, employing appropriate data and methods, and delivering interpretable results. The theoretical framework is robust, and the conclusion is thoughtful, offering valuable directions for future research.

“Party Institutionalization and the Effect of Winning and Losing an Election on Satisfaction with Democracy.”

The abstract could be improved in the following ways: Clarify the Hypothesis: Briefly state the expected relationship between party institutionalization and the winner-loser gap. How does party institutionalization influence the psychological or evaluative processes of voters?

Add Methodological Detail: A brief mention of the data or analytical strategy would add credibility. Define Key Concepts: Provide a short explanation of what is meant by party institutionalization which would help anchor the reader. Highlight Broader Implications: Consider linking the findings to broader democratic outcomes or policy relevance.

From a writing style perspective, the paper is generally clear, precise, and academically appropriate. However, it could benefit from refining certain transitions and reducing minor redundancies. Regarding writing mechanics, the paper is largely sound in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Some conceptual groundwork, such as the basic winner/loser effect and the characteristics of highly/weakly institutionalized parties, is introduced in the "Introduction" and then reiterated with similar phrasing and examples in the subsequent "Satisfaction with Democracy" and "Party Institutionalization and Satisfaction with Democracy" sections. While some reiteration can aid clarity, it occasionally borders on redundancy.

The introduction's roadmap uses somewhat formulaic phrasing like "Then I discuss...". While functional, varying the sentence structure could significantly improve the flow. The paper refers to "Figure 1: Bar Chart of Satisfaction with Democracy", and "Figures 2-3" in the results section, but the figures themselves are not included in the paper. This is a serious omission on the author's part.

The paper follows a logical and conventional academic structure, progressing from an introduction and literature review through data and methods, results, and conclusion. This structure enhances readability and comprehension.

The paper demonstrates extensive engagement with existing literature, with numerous in-text citations supporting arguments and contextualizing the research. A comprehensive bibliography is also provided with recent literature (2020 – 2024). Footnotes 2 and 3,

which contain detailed statistical comparisons of voter turnout and vote share percentages between CSES data and actual figures, interrupt the main text's flow. This detailed numerical information, especially with the awkward notation, would be more effectively presented in an appendix table, with a concise summary in the main text or a single, streamlined footnote.