

Reviewer-2

The manuscript is important for the political science and comparative politics community. It addresses a well-established research question—how winning or losing elections affects satisfaction with democracy—but adds a novel dimension by focusing on party institutionalization as a conditioning factor. This provides valuable insights into why the winner–loser gap varies across contexts, especially in presidential systems in the Americas. The findings are relevant to both scholars of democracy and policymakers concerned with democratic legitimacy.

The current title, “Party Institutionalization and the Effect of Winning and Losing on Satisfaction with Democracy”, is clear and descriptive. It accurately reflects the scope of the article. The reviewer provides an alternative title “When Winning Matters: Party Institutionalization and Democratic Satisfaction in the Americas”. But it is up to the Author’s discretion.

Introduction: Well-framed, with a clear research gap identified. It situates the study within existing literature and outlines the main hypothesis logically. Literature Review: Comprehensive and well-cited. Demonstrates awareness of classic and recent debates. A minor suggestion is to streamline overlapping explanations of winners vs. losers across sections. Research Design: Well explained, with clear justification for focusing on presidential systems. The operationalization of key variables (CSES for satisfaction, V-Dem for institutionalization) is appropriate and transparent. Including robustness checks or clarifying limitations (e.g., absence of some demographic controls) is commendable. Results: Presented clearly with both regression tables and figures. Interpretation is solid and ties back to the hypothesis. However, the tables are dense; highlighting key findings visually in the discussion would improve accessibility. Conclusion: Strong in summarizing contributions and pointing to future research. It effectively shows the broader implications for democratic theory and practice. Could be slightly more concise to maintain impact. Bibliography & Appendix: Well-organized, comprehensive, and appropriate for a study of this scope.

The references are highly relevant, appropriate and up to date, including very recent works. They cover the core literature on satisfaction with democracy, the winner–loser gap, and party institutionalization. Classic foundational works (e.g., Lijphart 1999; Anderson 2005; Anderson & Guillory 1997) are included, as well as methodological references (Brambor et al. 2006; Friedrich 1982).

Specific Comments:

This manuscript makes a valuable and original contribution to the literature on democratic satisfaction by examining how party institutionalization conditions the

winner-loser gap. The theoretical argument is well-developed, the empirical design is solid, and the analysis is based on high-quality cross-national data (CSES and V-Dem). The findings are both plausible and significant, shedding new light on why the impact of electoral outcomes on democratic satisfaction varies across contexts. The paper is clearly within the scope of the journal and will be of interest to a wide readership in comparative politics, democratization studies, and political behavior.