

Dear Bjorn,

Our apologies for the long delay in getting back to you on your Uganda chapter for the GAPP volume.

Your chapter is comprehensive and a good contribute to the volume. We have a few final comments for you though which are almost all points of detail. Hopefully will not take too much of your time.

On page two should not "the figures itself" be "the figures themselves"?

In the third paragraph of section 4, can you provide a brief explanation about why your poverty figures are much higher? It can't just be the spatial difference in the poverty line or you would expect to see a more spatially differentiated patterns of difference between the official and your estimates.

In section 5.6, how important an issue is bad seed quality really, few people report this.

The concluding section we feel is too long and not focused enough. The paper is a bit long anyway! It does not seem that the repetition of the explanation of the method in the concluding section I(third paragraph) is needed, this has already been said earlier. The discussion of the poverty results is probably needed in the detail provided here; but is it possible to make the discussion of the poverty dynamics results more focused on the key messages?

In the Tables, 3 and 4 report row percentages, but are there a sufficient number of observations in all rows? Also if the statistics relate to characteristics in the baseline can this be said in the title? The note to the tables 3 to 6 is slightly confusing; I assume this refers to the identification of the dynamic poverty groups, while all statistics presented are for the baseline?

Also the titles of the figures could be clearer. For instance in Figure 3 to indicate that household size is (1) and dependency (2) (plus same point about baseline characteristics etc.). In Figure 5 this is presumably average number of days; is it computed only for those that were ill or including those that were not ill as zero? The numbers in Figure 6 refer to proportion of households? And units are needed in figures 2 and 4.

Hopefully these comments will not take you long to take account of. If it were possible to get us a revised draft by next weekend that would fit well with our overall schedule for the book.

With best wishes,
Andy, Channing and Finn

P.S. Your dynamics story is very similar to what Marguerite, Sarah and I had even though we used the national poverty line. We are waiting for official access to the NPS 13/14 wave to finalise our paper (our story would be very different if we have to stop in 11/12, as your paper also shows). An earlier draft of our paper is on the CSAE conference website https://editorialexpress.com/cgi-bin/conference/download.cgi?db_name=CSAE2015&paper_id=899 but as I say we hope to have an update very soon.