

## Peer Review

# Review of: "Review, Evolution, and Theoretical Implications of the Utility Concept"

Phoebe Koundouri<sup>1</sup>

1. Department of International and European Economics (DIEES), Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece

This is an interesting and ambitious article that seeks to review the utility concept and propose a more comprehensive framework, incorporating material, hedonic, procedural, and communicative dimensions. The attempt to move beyond narrow interpretations of utility as mere preference satisfaction is interesting, but the paper would benefit along the following dimensions.

First, as a review of the literature on utility, the article omits several foundational figures whose work shaped the classical and neoclassical understanding of the concept. There is no discussion of Pareto, Pantaleoni, or Edgeworth, nor any reference to key distinctions such as cardinal versus ordinal utility (the formal representations used in the paper imply cardinality). Likewise, the historical motivation for the development of utility theory, which was to counter the classical labor theory of value, is not acknowledged.

Second, the aim of the paper is somewhat unclear. On one hand, the authors appear to be developing a typology of utility concepts to support normative work in welfare economics. On the other hand, they seem interested in improving behavioral modeling. These are not the same task. For example, the use of preference orderings in the analysis, without clarifying whether they are meant to describe wellbeing or observed choice, raises important questions. If the purpose is welfare analysis, then the paper needs to be clearer about what kind of theory of wellbeing it supports. If it is behavioral, then more attention to revealed preference theory and its relationship to the proposed typology is needed.

Finally, while the paper presents a fourfold classification (material, hedonic, procedural, and communicative), some of these categories are somewhat loosely defined. For instance, the inclusion of

symbolic and cultural value under "hedonic" utility is questionable, especially since these may not generate any hedonic experience in the usual sense.

In short, the paper takes on an important topic and offers interesting results and insights. However, it would benefit from more rigorous historical grounding, clearer conceptual distinctions, and a tighter focus on what kind of contribution it aims to make.

## **Declarations**

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.