

Comments on the manuscript MS 1516 entitled 'Field experimental evidence on gender discrimination in hiring: Biased as Heckman and Siegelman predicted?'

I have few comments as I think the paper is well written and the analysis is competent.

I don't think 'predict' is quite right for Heckman and Siegelman's comments though. These comments were more a critique of the audit approach in field experiment testing – that is using actual testers to go in person to make job enquiries or undertake job interviews. As such they argued the researcher could not control for all aspects of the applicant's characteristics that could influence an employer. I don't feel Heckman and Siegelman were predicting the responses would be biased, more the experiment could overestimate discrimination if a tester influenced the employer.

The main comment I have is that details as to the actual experiment are needed given that the focus of the paper is on explaining whether any bias resulted from the experiment that was conducted. When was the study conducted? Where? What were the actual response numbers?

As to the main finding – no significant evidence for the predicted bias – it may be better expressed as 'no under or over estimation of discrimination was evident'.

Expression again in the conclusion - - rather than 'occupied' say 'investigated'; rather than 'gap' write 'critique'.