

Review of: "Economics Rationality in the World of Amartya Sen"

Robert Feleppa¹

¹ Wichita State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The reviewer wrote additional comments in the MS Word attached in the Supplementary data section of the present review.

- The paper seems interesting, but the writing, especially in its first eight pages is awkward and hard to follow. I have taken the trouble to do some extensive copy editing using the strike-through function in Word and red highlighting. I am not sure that my revisions fully capture the author's intended meaning in places.
- Beginning with the section entitled "Reconnecting Economy And Rationality" on page 8, the writing becomes more lucid. Unfortunately, at this point the footnotes and references, which are problematic throughout the paper, present serious obstacles to my efforts to give the paper a fair reviewing. The reference of nearly every footnote is unclear or wrong. The author cites three books by Sen and some interviews and I suspect most of the "Ibid." references are to Sen's Collective Choice and Social Welfare or his On Ethics and Economics. But specific pages are rarely given and there is extensive misuse of the "Ibid." reference label.
- The argument seems to move along somewhat smoothly after page 8, but the reference/citation problems prevent me from checking the context of quotes or look for possible mis-readings or for important changes in Sen's thought in later works. On Ethics and Economics was written in 1987; the version of Collective Choice and Social Welfare seems to be the 1970 version and not the Expanded Edition of 2017. And, although mentioned in the paper's introduction and included in the Bibliography, the 2009 The Idea of Justice does not seem to be cited. So I worry that we are not considering Sen's more recent thinking on these issues.
- At several points the author cites class notes. This sort of reference seems inappropriate to me, as readers have no way of checking the source. Perhaps the author can give credit for input and assistance to the professor teaching the class.
- I also have some substantial worries in the marginal notes about such things as the relevance of the author's sortie into definitions of child abuse on pages 4ff., the discussion of sympathy on page 8, and the critique of circularity on pages 8-9.
- Taking into account the extensive problems with the footnotes and bibliography, the best I can rate the paper is a 3.