Reply to the second referee report (Jens Christopher Andvig)

I would like to thank the referee for the very helpful evaluation and comments. Two quick comments on some remarks that have been stated in the referee report:

1) The paper is intended to provide a broad literature overview with main focus on a multidisciplinary discussion. The goal is to bring these fields together, as this had not been done so far for the case of corruption. Naturally, this work (with the intention to be a journal article) is not, and cannot be, exhaustive in every respect, as every field taken by itself has a lot to say about the underlying topic and could (and does) easily fill books. A more fine-tuned setting of priorities in the literature discussion might do the trick.

2) Conventional behavioral/psychological approaches rarely address the issue of corruption directly. Rather, well-known tools are taken and adapted to explain and predict corrupt behavior. In order to acknowledge the importance of these extremely content-rich fields, some specific aspects were taken and highlighted as being decisive drivers for seemingly non-rational behavior in the context of corruption (in particular the issue of self-control). Again, a more fine-tuned setting of priorities in the literature discussion might do the trick.

The comments on a more exhaustive discussion of several aspects (e.g. the criminological part) are well taken. A revised version of this paper will deal with resolving the mentioned obscurities and getting rid of what has been called trivialities.