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**Comments:**

Very nice work! Some (relatively small) comments:

1/ The introduction is a bit to “editorial” (e.g., “born the brunt of this exclusion”). Econ paper intros tend to be pretty dry. I would just stick to emphasizing your contribution (that you can so clearly observe the financial cost).

2/ It took me a moment to understand that the Hong Kong Harbourmaster Reports gives numbers for everyone leaving, not just those going to Canada. Initially I thought you were just using it as a second source to confirm the CR data. I might just make that clearer from the start.

3/ The summary stats table is confusing! You are missing the number of observations. Some of the means don’t make a lot of sense (e.g., percent literature 798.8?).

4/ For the most part I really liked Figure 2. But maybe drop the horizontal mean lines? It makes it seem as though you are doing an RD? It took me a while to understand what the lines were. To my eye, it does seem like the height jumps up every time there is a new fee, which is cool!

5/ Would it be possible to re-do the figure for the subset of observations who are laborers (so that physical health/strength/height are an especially good proxy for ability to earn)?

6/ I didn’t think you should speculate so much in the Conculsion (e.g., first full sentence on p. 24).