

Review of: "From General Equilibrium to Algorithmic Equilibrium"

Sura Mahmood Abdullah¹

¹ University of Technology - Iraq

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

While the essay "From General Equilibrium to Algorithmic Equilibrium" presents an intriguing perspective on economic equilibrium, there are some points that readers may consider, such as:

Lack of Empirical Support:

The essay primarily relies on theoretical constructs and introduces Algorithmic Equilibrium without providing concrete empirical examples or evidence of its application in real-world economic scenarios. Empirical support could strengthen the validity and applicability of the proposed framework.

Assumptions and Simplifications:

The essay may make certain assumptions or simplifications about human cognitive processes, decision-making, and the applicability of Algorithmic Equilibrium without addressing potential limitations or critiques of these assumptions.

Limited Discussion on Practical Implementation:

While the essay introduces a novel concept, it may not delve deeply into the practical implications or implementation challenges of adopting Algorithmic Equilibrium in economic modeling or policy-making.

Lack of Comparison with Existing Models:

The essay does not extensively compare the proposed Algorithmic Equilibrium with existing equilibrium models in economics. A more comprehensive comparison could help readers better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the new framework.

Generalization of Equilibrium:

The essay generalizes the concept of equilibrium to accommodate Algorithmic Equilibrium, but it may not sufficiently address potential criticisms or counterarguments related to the uniqueness and specificity of different equilibrium models.

It's important to note that the perceived points are subjective, and different readers may have varying perspectives on the significance of these points. Additionally, the limitations mentioned here do not necessarily invalidate the essay's contributions but highlight areas where further clarification or development could enhance the overall strength of the argument.

