Response to Reviewers for MS 2021-314-R2, "Patterns of Panethnic Intermarriage in the United States, 1980-2018."

I thank the reviewer for their careful reading of my paper, and I am happy to address the few remaining points they raise. I show the reviewer's comments in italics and my responses below.

The author states: "I feel that the reviewer is really engaging in an argument more with Harris and Ono than my paper. The reviewer is technically correct that what Harris and Ono describe is not necessarily a bias."

The author has and continues to characterize his/her paper as addressing a "bias" (which the author admits now it is not). My point is that the uneven spatial distribution of racial groups is an "explanation" while the author had called his/her study a "descriptive" study. I'm not sure why the author seems reluctant to give credit to Choi, for example. Rightly or wrong, left unsaid this leaves the impression that addressing "local marriage markets" is somehow novel or new or an unusual feature of his/her paper.

I have substantially revised my discussion of this issue on pg. 9 in the paragraph beginning "All of the studies cited above use log-linear models…" to remove any language such as "underestimation" that might imply a bias. I have also included the Choi and Tienda reference in a discussion of why local marriage market characteristics are important to consider.

The manuscript discusses this issue in the context of prior work on panethnic intermarriage. The current manuscript makes no claim that my attention to this issue is novel in comparison to that prior work, and certainly not to the larger field of studies on intermarriage. I discuss in that same paragraph how two of the previous articles on the topic recognized and attempted to address the issue. I do make a claim that the mode I usel handles the issue better than this prior work on panethnic intermarriage and I believe that claim is well founded.

The author rightly points out that the Diversity measure, which he/she calls the Blau index, has many different names. The problem, in my opinion, is that the author now switches from "Blau" to "Simpson" without comment in the paper.

In an interdisciplinary field like demography, the Blau index is not a particularly common name, hence my previous comment. I think readers clearly would benefit from the author's acknowledgement of this fact, and perhaps from a citation to the Simpson index or even a reference to a forthcoming useful paper in Annual Review of Sociology (2020) (https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-soc-030420-015435) or the Census Bureau's recent analyses of 2020 census data

(https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2021/08/measuring-racial-ethnic-diversity-2020-census.html). I'm not wedded to the naming of the Simpson Index, only that the author should be clear about the measure to avoid any confusion.

I agree with the reviewer that there is a lot of terminological confusion around this measure. To highlight this point, the Choi and Tienda article that the reviewer asked me to consider including above refers to this same index as the "Herfindahl index."

Per the reviewer's suggestion, I have now added a reference to the original Simpson article from 1949 on this topic when introducing the measure on pg. 7. I have also included a footnote (footnote 2 on pg. 8) in this area that says: "This index is known by a variety of names including the Simpson diversity index, the Gini-Simpson index, the Blau index, and the Herfindahl index."

Aside from the footnote, I consistently refer to this index as the "Simpson diversity index" throughout the manuscript. There are no references to the "Blau index" outside of the footnote.

The author states: "The reviewer seems to put a lot of weight on the Census for determining what is a race. This is odd given that the Census Bureau was trying to remove the split question format from Census 2020 and move to a single race question which included a Latino category."

There is nothing at all "odd" here, as most of Demography's readers would agree. The Census Bureau and other federal agencies have had a very clear classification of race and ethnicity based on OMB DIRECTIVE NO. 15 (Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting). Asians ARE a racial category using OMB's definition, yet the author says in the response letter that my characterization "is not completely accurate." Why, according to the author? Because the Census Bureau illustrates particular racial categories bylisting national origin groups (e.g., Chinese). A national origin group, however, is NOT a racial category.See https://wonder.cdc.gov/wonder/help/populations/bridged-race/Directive15.html

I fear that this disagreement has gone far afield of anything directly related to the manuscript. This specific comment offers no actionable suggestions on changes to the manuscript. To track back to the source, the original comment by the reviewer to the round 1 revision that led to this back and forth was as follows:

"*In the end, the authors claim that Asians are being racialized at a faster rate than Hispanics. This is true by definition. In the Census, Asians are a racial category. Latinos are not.*"

I believe that the disconnect between the reviewer and myself is that I understand racialization to be a social process reflecting everyday experiences of categorization and classification, while the reviewer seems to understand racialization to be a synonym for officially canonized races according to the Census and OMB. To help clarify how I am using this term and avoid similar confusion among other *Demography* readers, I have changed my discussion of racialization on both pg. 5 in the background section to read "On the other hand, racialization of Asians as a singular group in everyday life tends to be stronger than for Latinos, who have an enduring

history of racial ambiguity in the US." Similarly, I have changed my discussion of the same topic on pg. 22 in the conclusions to read: "Specifically, Asian ethnic groups (and in particular East/Southeast Asians) are more likely than Latino ethnic groups to be racialized as the same in everyday life due to more phenotype similarity and a broad panethnic "model minority" stereotype." In both cases, I provide several references to the extensive literature on the racialization of Asians and Latinos.