

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for his / her valuable comments. Our responses to these six comments are presented below:

1. It is not clear why the t-statistics is used as dependent variable in meta-analysis regressions (see equation (2) and Tables 6 to 7). If the main variable of interest is employment elasticity, which is by construction comparable across different studies, why not use it directly as the dependent variable? It would be also useful to mention in the paper which dependent variables are used in the MRA by Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009).

If we understood well the model you refer that we should estimate is:

$$\text{effect}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SE_i + \sum_{k=1}^k a_k Z_{jk} + v_j \quad (1)$$

The model we use in tables 6 and 7 is the following:

$$t_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (1/SE_i) + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{a_k Z_{jk}}{SE_j} + v_j \quad (2)$$

where  $t$  is the t-statistic of the estimate of the  $i$  study,  $SE$  is the standard error of the estimate,  $Z_k$  are moderator variables, and  $v_j$  is the error term. We could use directly the employment elasticity as the dependent variable as you recommend but we preferred to estimate the weighted version of the model (1). Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009) use the t-statistic as dependent variable as well. In any case, results should be the same (as equation (1) is (2) multiplied by  $SE$ ) but in this case  $\beta_1$  of equation (1) would no longer be the constant term.

2. Next, in case Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009) use employment elasticities and partial correlation coefficient, it would be natural if the authors of this study use the same variables as well, in order to have their results fully comparable with Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009). If the authors prefer to use different dependent variables than Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009), then (i) the reason should be explained and (ii) as robustness check, the authors

should provide regressions results using exactly the same dependent variables as in Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009).

Doucouliagos and Stanley use elasticities which can be interpreted more easily and are widely used in the economic literature. We wished we could do the same but in some studies, the data did not allow us to calculate the related elasticities therefore we split the meta-sample into elasticities and coefficients. Moreover, in our study we use the same dependent variable to conduct the meta-analysis (t-statistic) with D&S. However, in the revised version of the paper we will use the Partial Correlations of the estimates of our meta-sample to make the estimates of our meta-sample comparable.

3. When investigating the effect of minimum wage on employment for the period 2010-2014, which was marked by the strongest recession since the WWII, a question arises as to which extent employment was affected by the crisis. Perhaps the authors could discuss how such developments affected the labor markets and the results of their analysis.

The point you raise is a key aspect and one of the motives in our study. The OECD Employment Outlook (2015) includes a section on the effect of minimum wages on economic issues since the onset of the financial and economic crisis in 2008 stressing the strong interest in the minimum wage after the crisis. In addition it reports all the previous meta-analysis that has been conducted on the employment effect of minimum wages. We welcome your comment and thank you for your suggestion to discuss how such developments affected the labor markets. We will possibly discuss it in the introduction part of the revised version and we are going to see how many of the studies published in the prementioned period use recent and not ancient data from the labor market.

4. To control for the business cycle conditions, the authors use variable UR equal to 1 “if a model includes an unemployment measure as a business cycle indicator” (Table 5). However, regression results (Table 6 and 7) do not contain UR. It is unclear whether this variable is truly insignificant or simply correlated with some other explanatory variables. It would be helpful if the author check for correlation among the explanatory variables.

Thank you for your very useful comment. We will investigate whether it is correlated with other explanatory variable. Multicollinearity in this case could affect the robustness of the analysis. We will take this in consideration in the revised version of the paper.

5. Eventually, the authors could also discuss which variables (elasticities versus coefficient) are more "robust" with respect to the effect of business cycle conditions.

Your suggestion would be very interesting but since we will use Partial Correlations in the revised version it will no longer be applicable.

6. A number of European countries have adopted recession-related policies, for example short-time working scheme (Kurzarbeit) aimed at protecting employment. It would be useful to comment on the effect of such measures on the results.

We welcome your comment and we will be happy to comment on the effect of such measures on the results since these studies are policy oriented and have important policy implications.