

14/1/16

Dear Professor Thies,

We were very pleased to receive your email conditionally accepting our paper "Signaling By Signature: The Weight of International Opinion and Ratification of Treaties by Domestic Veto Players" for publication in PSRM. As you requested, we will respond to the points that reviewer 2 made.

First reviewer 2 asks us to check whether our results are robust to controlling for the number of initial signatories,  $n_{i\_sign}$ , and its interaction with our main independent variable. In the table below we report results for inclusion of these variables where we operationalize the sum of knowledge of initial signatories using  $patent_{i\_sign}$ . As can be seen in the table below, our results in relation to  $patent_{i\_sign}$  are robust. While  $n_{i\_sign}$  is significant in model 2, as its coefficient is less than 1 the chances of ratification go down with the number of initial signatories, conditional on other factors. The additional variables are not significant in the multiplicative specification in model 3. We obtained similar results for other operationalizations of the sum of knowledge of initial signatories. While we appreciate reviewer 2's point, we remain unconvinced that there is a theoretical basis for it. We would be happy to report the results in the table below in the online appendix if you think it is advisable, but in the version of the paper we are uploading in footnote 19 we just draw attention to the fact that we have carried out checks.

Reviewer 2 remains unconvinced by our illustrative example of the Aarhus Treaty. We agree with him/her that our account of this case does not exactly correspond to the logic of the model, since our argument is that the late signing of Germany drew the attention of the Länder to the earlier signing of other countries. We also agree that we are unable to show evidence for the "smoking gun" of vetoes being persuaded by the weight of international opinion. In the light of this we have ultimately decided to delete the case study from the version we are resubmitting. In the conclusion on p. 25 we do draw attention to the possibility of carrying out qualitative research to trace the causal mechanism we propose. If you think the paper would be better for retaining the Aarhus case, we have prepared another version retaining the case study, and we can upload it on your advice.

As required, we have prepared replication files and checked that they give rise to the results we report in the paper. We have deposited these on the Harvard Dataverse site for PSRM. We understand that you will also carry out checks on these.

We would like to thank you and your reviewers for a stimulating and timely review process.

Regards,

Hugh Ward (on behalf of the co-authors)

	Model 1	Model with no. of countries' signatures	Model with interaction N_L_SIGN*PATENT_L_SIGN
	exp(coef) (p)	exp(coef) (p)	exp(coef) (p)
<b>Pooled expertise</b>			
PATENT_L_SIGN	<b>1.369</b> <b>(0.000***)</b>	<b>1.413</b> <b>(0.000***)</b>	<b>1.386</b> <b>(0.000***)</b>
N_L_SIGN		0.998 (0.024*)	0.997 (0.054)
N_L_SIGN*PATENT_L_SIGN			1.000 (0.341)
<b>Controls</b>			
FIRST_SIGN	4.659 (0.000***)	4.968 (0.000***)	5.024 (0.000***)
IO_MEMBERSHIP	1.005 (0.116)	1.004 (0.13)	1.004 (0.124)
THRESHOLD	1.005 (0.001***)	1.006 (0.000***)	1.006 (0.000***)
LAGPERCREGION	1.019 (0.000***)	1.019 (0.000***)	1.019 (0.000***)
OPEN	0.963 (0.402)	0.965 (0.427)	0.964 (0.417)
RGDPL	1.158 (0.234)	1.153 (0.252)	1.149 (0.263)
RGDPLSQ	0.922 (0.452)	0.925 (0.469)	0.927 (0.487)
LNSO2PC	1.095 (0.000***)	1.094 (0.000***)	1.094 (0.000***)
MEANPC	1.116 (0.000***)	1.115 (0.000***)	1.115 (0.000***)
GDPL	0.959 (0.031*)	0.959 (0.033*)	0.959 (0.034*)
LRT (p)	6002 (0)	6011 (0)	6013 (0)
Wald test (p)	4373 (0)	4382 (0)	4394 (0)
Robust (score) logrank test (p)	141.1 (0)	143.9 (0)	144.4 (0)
No. Observations	205384	205384	205384
No. Events	3002	3002	3002
No. States	157	157	157
Period	1972-2000	1972-2000	1972-2000

**Table 1:** Cox proportional hazards regression models for treaty ratification.

Notes: Each cell entry [exp(coef)] is the exponential of the coefficient which is the hazard ratio (HR). The likelihood ratio test assumes independence of observations within a cluster (country); the Wald and robust score tests do not. \*\*\* $p|z| < .001$ , \*\* $p|z| < .01$ , \* $p|z| < .05$ .