

Thank you for the comments and the suggestions of the anonymous referee. We believe that when we apply the necessary corrections in the revised version of the paper we expect to ameliorate the quality of the paper due to all comments made until now. Our responses are provided in detail below.

Major Issue

1. The authors use data only from 2010 to 2014. There is no real justification given for this choice. The only justification is that they want to explore the post Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009) period. It is a rather strange choice and in so many ways goes against the grain of meta-analysis. Why commence from 2010 and not 2009? Why not 2008? Why exclude all the prior evidence? With such a selected sample, the skeptical reader will have no confidence in the estimation and interpretation.

Please see our previous responses No. 1 and No. 3 where we discuss on the motivation of our study in detail. The year 2010 is selected as the next year of the year in which the meta-analysis of Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009) was published.

2. The authors also use regression coefficients in their meta-analysis. Some of these are surely suspect as can be seen clearly from Figure 2; see the estimates with extreme high precision.

Thank you for this comment. The coefficients in our meta-sample do not have the same measurement as there are many alternative dependent variables used in the meta-sample, such as the employment rates, change in employment, relative employment, employment to population ratio, hours worked. Moreover there are several minimum wage variables used e.g. minimum to average wage, level of real minimum wage, dummy for minimum wage existence, minimum wage coverage. This is the reason why some coefficients present extreme high precision as well as creating problems in the interpretation of the true effect. In the revised version of the paper we will use the Partial Correlations to address this issue in our analysis.

3. Table 4, Column 1 reports results using OLS. It is ok to present these for robustness but they should not be used for interpretation. Columns 2 and 6 are labelled robust and the note says “robust regression”. Is this robust regression or robust standard errors? It is strange that the coefficients are identical in OLS and ‘robust’ regressions, which makes me suspect that this is robust standard errors. Please clarify. Is Column 3 and 7 random effects? Please clarify. There is something really strange with the coefficient results. Please check the data and analysis. Perhaps focus only on the elasticity estimates. It is not obvious that anything is gained by also exploring a small sub-set of regression coefficients.

We agree that OLS is a benchmark method and should not be used for interpretation purposes. Columns 2 and 6 report the estimates with robust standard errors. Moreover columns 3 and 7 are Random Effects. We will check the data and the commands in STATA and we will make our analysis again using the Partial Correlations of the meta-sample.

#### Minor Issues

1. In the abstract, the authors state: “This result contradicts the neoclassical theory and gives a Keynesian perspective which suggests that changes in minimum wages are not related with positive or negative employment effects.” I didn’t quite follow what this sentence was trying to say. Moreover, the findings from Doucouliagos and Stanley (2009) are not necessarily at odds with neoclassical theory. Indeed, they are consistent with it if one allows for adjustments to occur elsewhere (e.g. consumer prices or work intensity), if the minimum wage is non-binding or if the primary econometric studies are deficient.

Our intention was to say that the empirical findings of the impact of minimum wages on employment could be contradictory with the statement of the negative impact of minimum wage on employment as the theory presents in the case of a perfectly competitive labor market. We will revise this statement. Indeed, the findings of Doucouliagos and Stanley’s study do not necessarily contradict to the neoclassical model but provides new avenues through which the minimum wage can affect employment. We will take care of this issue and we re-write the “abstract” and the “introduction” part in a revised version as well.

2. *Belman and Wolfson also completed a meta-analysis for the US?*

Belman and Wolfson conducted a meta-analysis using data from 23 international studies since 2000. Their meta-sample generated 439 estimates and the majority of the studies concerned the USA. Generally, they find negative and statistically significant effects of minimum wage which were very small, though. This study is a chapter in their book, *What Does the Minimum Wage Do?* published by The Upjohn Institute (See Wolfson, Paul and Dale Belman (2014) Does Employment Respond to the Minimum Wage? A meta-analysis of recent studies from the New Minimum Wage Research for more details

[http://www2.gre.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0004/824377/Dale-Belman-and-Paul-Wolfson-Does-Employment-Respond-to-the-Minimum-Wage-a-meta-analysis-of-recent-studies-from-the-New-Minimum-Wage-Research.pdf](http://www2.gre.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/824377/Dale-Belman-and-Paul-Wolfson-Does-Employment-Respond-to-the-Minimum-Wage-a-meta-analysis-of-recent-studies-from-the-New-Minimum-Wage-Research.pdf)

3. *Please describe what standard errors you are using in Tables 6 and 7.*

In tables 6 and 7 we use standard errors clustered at the study level only for columns 2 and 6. To ensure the quality of our study we will accommodate heteroscedasticity and within-study dependence for all the specifications in the revised version.

Once again we would like to thank you for your comments and your useful suggestions which will improve the quality of our paper in the revised version.