

Peer Review

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

Stefano Zamagni¹

1. University of Bologna, Italy

The main problem with the article is that, being a review article of the literature on the concept of utility, it does not review enough. For example, authors like M. Pantaleoni and above all V. Pareto (and many others) are not even quoted, in spite of their major contributions to the subject. The authors do not mention the distinction between cardinal and ordinal utility. Yet the equations they write in the paper postulate cardinality. But what about the metric to be adopted? Edgeworth coined the term "hedonimeter" in this regard – not quoted.

Second, the AA. do not seem to realise that the neoclassical theory of utility was created to contrast the labour theory of value by Smith and Ricardo. That was the real intuition, not the one suggested in the paper. This point has to be elucidated.

Third, the paper misinterprets the Aristotelian concept of happiness, putting him in the company of the pre-Socratic school of thought. A mistake also made by Kahneman, who was a very good psychologist, but a modest philosopher.

Finally, the AA. take for granted the conflation of choice and consent: if an agent chooses outcome A versus B, this implies that the agent consents to A. Which is not true at all! This point is relevant for the discussion of PU.

Best regards

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.