First of all, we would like to thank the referee for his/her valuable comments and the time that he/she has spent for commenting on our paper.

Regarding the comments, we will try to answer for each of them as following:

The theoretical model the authors have in mind does not become clear. Why and how should corruption in the home country exactly lead to different behavior and what exactly is that behavior?

The authors seem to equate apprehension and criminal activity. This is simply not true. There is tons of empirical evidence, particularly for the US, showing (racial) discrimination in law enforcement and the justice system. It is totally unclear that more apprehensions mean more violations of the law. It is an additional step to argue that these (assumed) violations of the law have to do with corruption. I don't believe that this is true for 99% of these cases. If the authors only want to link home country corruption to crime, they have to rewrite the article. Here we come back to the missing clearly spelled out theoretical model.

Regarding this comment, it is clear that people in corrupt countries are more frequently involved in corrupt acts like bribery, fraud, embezzlement, favoritism, etc, because of common practice of these corrupt acts in the society. Based on these facts, we believe that if a person lives in a corrupt environment, he/she would be willing to behave corruptly (if a person has bad nature) or would be forced to behave corruptly (a person sometimes forced to behave corruptly, though he/she does not want to do so) due to existing conditions. Moreover, we believe that first type of people (with bad nature) might be willing or trying to practice home gained corrupt experience while residing abroad, however, we do not claim that second type of people (honest) might be willing or trying practice corrupt behavior because of the probability that apprehended immigrants as a proxy variable for corrupt actions like bribery, fraud, theft, etc. We mentioned in the paper that some illegal practices has nothing to do with corruption and we mentioned that we used apprehension level data in general without specifying types or causes for apprehension because of not availability of this type of data. Moreover, we mentioned that we could have more precise results if we could obtain specific data by type of apprehension that is related to corruption.

We have not had any intention of equating apprehension and crime activity in our research, we specifically chose apprehension data because any person, who was arrested whether he/she committed or suspected in practicing any crime or violation, goes through apprehension process, if an immigrant was found to be guilty, he/she would be responsible for the acts, otherwise, he/she would be released. In both cases, whether an immigrant found to be guilty or not, he/she goes through the apprehension process and this fact is registered in the data. Once again, we would like to note that we used an apprehension data as a proxy variable for corrupt behavior because of the probability of immigrants being apprehended due to committing corrupt practices. Moreover, we do not argue that more apprehension cause more violation of law, the purpose of our research is not based on this issue. We have witnessed (especially in the case of the US immigration) many times that the apprehension level has increased not only because of violations but also due to law enforcement (Stricter control of Mexican border or 9/11 are good examples).

Are the authors really suggesting that the immigrants to the US are a representative or at least a comparable sample of the population of their home countries? Immigrants from corrupt countries might simply be more likely to be refugees or fleeing from poverty and discrimination than immigrants say from OECD countries. It is not surprising that they might be more likely to violate laws (or at least be apprehended), but that does not imply that people from these countries generally are. This criticism would also be in line with some of the results for the control variables.

Regarding this comments, we would ask readers to refer to data source of Migration Policy Institute (MPI) the number of Foreign-Born Population (FBP) by country of origin, which specifies the total number of immigrants by their country of origin. Moreover, the data for the number of Apprehended Foreign-Born Population (AFBP) by Country of Origin, which was obtained from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) also specifies the number of apprehended immigrants by their country of origin. According to MPI, the term foreign born refers to people residing in the United States who were not United States citizens at birth. The foreign-born population includes naturalized citizens, lawful permanent residents (LPRs), certain legal non-immigrants (e.g., persons on student or work visas), those admitted under refugee or asylee status, and persons illegally residing in the United States. Thus, our FBR data comprises total number of immigrants including refugees and other immigrants who are in search of better life. It is true that refugees and asylum seekers are less likely to be involved in violating law (at least) due to fear of being deported to their home country where their lives are going to be in danger, however, it does not mean that they are totally free of committing corrupt actions (and being apprehended as a result). In our paper, we noted that we reduced our sample to 104 countries by excluding extreme countries (Mexico, Honduras, and Guatemala) in terms of apprehension level due to the outlier problems in our regression analysis. It was the first reason behind dropping these countries from our sample. The second reason to avoid these countries' data in our sample was due to great number of illegal border crossings from these countries, which ended up with apprehension. For example, in 2011, Mexico's Corruption index was 2.97 and the number of apprehended Mexicans were 489547 people, while Moldova with a similar corruption index 2.88, had only 142 people apprehended in the US. If we calculate the ratio difference between these two countries, we find that Mexicans were apprehended 3448 times more than Moldavians.

Extreme cases should not be excluded without further explanation of why or in what sense they constitute outliers. (What test statistic exactly did identify these countries?) Alternatively, one should maybe show results from robust regression, which are not easily manipulated to produce specific outcomes.

We applied Jarque-Bera test of Normality to check whether our sample data normally distributed or not. The regression results for 104 and 107 samples were very similar, but the coefficient of Jarque-Bera was very different. Excluding three extreme countries (Mexico, Honduras, and Guatemala) significantly improved the normal distribution of our sample. Moreover, we provided additional reasons for exclusion of extreme cases above.

The exact choice of independent variables needs motivation. Why these? Why not others? What were these decisions based on?

In our regression analysis, we applied several explanatory variables based on findings from available literature and our own predictions. We chose these variables because of their close association with apprehension and corruption. "Why not others?"- we do not argue that our sample data is complete to fully explain the reasons for apprehension, there might be number of reasons for apprehension, unfortunately, most of these reasons have not been given/demonstrated as available data.

It is highly questionable to eliminate multicollinearity by transforming (dichotomizing) independent variables. If the transformed variable is part of the data generating process in its original from, the author is misattributing some of its association with the dependent variable to other independent variables. This is at best hiding the multicollinearity problem, but not solving it.

Regarding this comment, we know that multicollinearity is a problem that most of the researchers face with. In the appendix 1 for Description of variables, we noted that transformation of some data into dummy variables was based on sample average rather than trying to target any specific group of countries. We do not think that application of data as dummy variables (based on sample average) could be the intention of hiding multicollinearity.

Are the authors really suggesting to screen immigrants for "immoral attitudes" and base this test on the level of perceived corruption in their home countries??

Since our data for apprehended immigrants does not represent exact number of immigrants who were apprehended due to corrupt actions (bribery, fraud, etc) or CPI data, which represents perceptions of individuals rather than exact reality, we cannot answer to this question either Yes or No. We think that our findings still need to be strengthened by further research, particularly by obtaining related data (at least, the number of apprehended immigrants due to corrupt actions) for further imperial findings. Unfortunately, we were not able to find this type of specific data. Even though, our findings cannot provide enough evidences for implementation in immigration policy, it can serve as a ground for further research, which might strengthen or reject our findings. We believe that if our findings are going to be supported by further findings, then we could suggest screening immigrants based on corruption in their home countries.

I think the authors are not very precise regarding facts. To give just two examples: Economists do not agree that corruption is "one of the main factors" explaining differences in income. See, e.g., Gundlach and Paldam (2009) in Economics Letters.

In our paper, we did not mention that **all** of the economists agree that corruption is one of the main factors that associated with negative economic growth, we note the **majority** of economists.

Furthermore, in the footnote number 2 we noted that corruption sometimes serves as "greasing the wheels" of the economy in particular circumstances.

the data by Alesina et al. is in contrast to what the authors are claiming not collected in 2003 (the year the article was published) but sometimes even decades earlier.

We accept that we made this mistake; we will correct it and try not to make this kind of mistakes again.

The language and style of the manuscript need to be significantly improved, although one can admittedly understand what the authors are saying.

We agree on this comment, since English is not our mother language, maybe we could not choose right wordings in explaining our points. We will try to give our best efforts to improve the language and the structure of the manuscript.

Citations have to be correct. Dimant (2013) is Dimant et al. (2013). Robert W. Fairlie is cited as W.F. Robert...

These mistakes will be corrected.

Links to published articles should not be listed in the references.

The links were listed in the references because of one of the requirements for submission to the journal *"References. The reference list should appear at the end of the text, with hyperlinks to full-text papers on the Web, and should start on a new page. Issue numbers should be provided for all journals cited in the references:"*.

The literature on corruption and growth in the first section of the article is largely outdated.

It is true that the literature is largely outdated, but we do not see any problem citing their findings because their works were mostly supported rather than being rejected.

What is "multi-front regression analysis"?

By saying this expression we mean that we used several regression analysis by applying different sets of data.

Once again, we would like to thank our referee for the comments that would lead us for further improvements.