Reply to the Referee Report

Report on "Testing the convergence hypothesis for OECD countries: a reappraisal"
This paper reviews the empirical studies based on convergence and shows that several limitations in the literature can be addressed by using quantile regressions, where upper-quantile countries are shown to have faster convergence.

The question/topic of the paper is interesting, but the paper should be improved regarding the
text. My comments are in arbitrary order below.

1• The introduction should be extended and rewritten with more details in order to motivate the reader. In its current format, it looks too technical. We rather need more economic intuition behind this discussion, which can be connected to some of the existing literature based on theory (as you have in the second section). In a related note, writing one sentence per paragraph does not seem to be a good writing style, where important details are (apparently) ignored. Please have a look at other related studies in the literature that have been published; they may provide you a better aspect for the writing style.

We agree with this suggestion. The introduction can be improved by linking theory with stylized facts and previous work on convergence, which are highlighted in section 2. We can rewrite the text avoiding the use of a sentence per paragraph. It is true that is commonly accepted that a paragraph must contain at least three sentences.

2• How is the methodology in Section 3 selected? How is it connected to the discussions in Section 2? More discussion is necessary here.

The goal of using quantitative regression methods is to provide greater richness and accuracy to the results. Unlike most studies, that use conditional expectation of repressors and thus obtain the mean effect of the initial income on the rate of growth or, in other words, on the speed of convergence, this method allows to analyze the effect throughout the full distribution. In addition, its extension to panel data allows you to take advantage of the cross-sectional and time dimension information.

3• The empirical results (3.3) should also be connected to the existing literature regarding
the economic intuition. In its current format, again, the discussion of the results is too technical, without providing any good economic story.

Yes, we can better connect our results with the existing literature on convergence in order to highlight our contribution.

4• If the claim of the paper is that it is a review of existing studies, the coverage is not enough; you should discuss more papers. If the claim is that quantitle regressions are

important, then the text should be revised accordingly. In sum, I don't believe that the paper achieves what is proposes in the abstract.

Our goal in this article is not to write an extensive survey about convergence but, instead, to simply summarize the most important works on convergence. We think that this part of the paper is well done and is enough to focus the state of the matter on convergence.
In addition, we think that there is no new literature on the subject that contributes some novelty on what already indicated in the paper.

5• Overall, the whole paper needs to be rewritten to make the contribution of the paper
connected better to the existing literature.

Yes, we can do it taking into account the suggestions proposed in points 1 and 3.