

Review of: "The residential Property price Impact of Luas Investments"

Marko Kryvobokov¹

¹ Centre D'Etudes En Habitat Durable

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments

The paper estimates a hedonic model of residential property prices to measure the price impact of developments of the light-rail network in Dublin. A significant positive impact of the opening of new stations is found with a difference-in-differences test.

A practical importance of this modelling is well described. It's not only a measure of higher property prices. The infrastructure is regarded as a substitute for car travel that may lower road congestion and associated air and noise pollution. Also, 25 billion € of Government investment plan for Dublin transport infrastructure is mentioned.

The paper is clearly structured and well written (except some points). It's a good example of a practical application of existing methods (semiparametric hedonic model, geographical weighting of prices, difference-in-differences test). The result seems to be comparable with other studies (though paper needs more details about the results of other papers). An interesting element is the variable Building Energy Rating found significant and (probably) not highly correlated with the building age in the hedonic price model.

In the Conclusions, it would be good to add a quantified comparison of the result (the price impact) with the previous studies, especially in Ireland (Mayor et al., 2012, ...).

The only statement I have a doubt is the claim that "An innovation of the paper is its application of a walking-time variable [...] using the Google Distance Matrix API". Today, many studies use different measures of walking time. Moreover, it's a Google product. So, I would not consider this element as an innovation of the paper.

In the paper, we see often "I estimate", "my model", etc. An impersonal form would be preferable in a research paper.

In the paper, there are several comparisons with previous studies (published many years ago), written as if the current paper had been published earlier. For example (page 4), McMillen and McDonald (2004) is mentioned. Then, "As in my model, they use...". But their paper was published in 2004. It's rather: in your model, as in McMillen and McDonald (2004), you use...

The same on the page 4 about Anglin and Gencay (1996): "Their paper differs from my study...". No, it's your study which differs from their paper.

Detailed comments and questions

- For a non-Irish reader, a bit more explications are needed. Luas – is it an abbreviation or a full name of a transport company? Also, “Daft Inc..” – what is it? By the way, why two points after Daft Inc (page 4)?
- Page 1, second paragraph: the last two sentences with the tests’ results should be a part of Conclusion, not Introduction.
- The Introduction is very practical. Only the practical aspects of the Dublin light-rail development are discussed. The place of the paper in the existing literature is unclear before the reading of the Section 2. The only theoretical discussion (with the only reference) is in the penultimate paragraph of the Introduction.
- Data: why two data sources are used? Again, explain a bit more the Irish context.
- Page 2, tautology: “Commonly included variables include...”.
- Page 4: in Anglin and Gencay (1996), there are two authors. “Anglin et al.” is not appropriate.
- Table 1: min price=5400 €. Atypical property or atypical sale?
- Table 2: Low min prices (<6000 €) are present in each geographical category. The max price in SW is absent.
- Table 2: the title should be moved to the next page (where the table is situated).
- The same for the three tables in the Appendix.
- Page 8: Does the description of Figure 2 in the text correspond to the graph? Also: “During my sample” looks strange.
- Page 9, the second paragraph: The results are in fact shown in Figures A1-A3 (not A2-A4).
- Page 9, the second paragraph: In the Appendix, there is no figure for a quarterly trend for a number of bedrooms.

Table 3, notes under the table: The first version of the model is not geospatial.