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"?

*OK, this has been changed.*

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 fact, our results suggest most of the difference can be explained by aggregation. I refer to the WIDER working paper, where we contrast poverty lines and estimates using six domains and one domain (the latter being close to what the official estimates assume). We find that our estimates using one domain are even lower than the official ones. We adapted the paragraph, which now reads:*

*The poverty headcounts we obtain using six spatial domains are much higher than the official ones. While part of the divergence may be explained by various differences between approaches (eg. official estimates scale household consumption expenditure by adult equivalent units, while we use per capita expenditures; we use a much more recent dataset underlying the poverty line estimates, etc.), spatial disaggregation seems to make the largest difference. In Van Campenhout et al (2014), we compare poverty lines and poverty estimates based on the 2012/13 data, contrasting figures generated using one and six spatial domains. We find that our method using one spatial domain actually leads to a lower poverty estimate than the official one, while allowing for spatial disaggregation leads to substantially higher estimates of poverty[[1]](#footnote-1). The reductions in poverty over time also seems more modest than the official ones, with an overall reduction in poverty between 2005/06 and 2012/13 of about one quarter, echoing concerns raised by Daniels and Minot (2015), who argue that the original 1993 poverty lines may have increased too little to keep pace with inflation. We also see that the largest reduction the number of people living below the poverty line happened between 2011/12 and 2012/13.*

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

*You are right. There are only about 65 households that report bad seed quality as a shock in the last 5 year. I added a warning in the text.*

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?

*OK, I deleted the explanation of the methods in the conclusion and made the part on the dynamics more focused and shorter.*

In the Tables, 3 and 4 report row percentages, but are there a sufficient number of observations in all rows?

*Yes, for instance in table 4 I removed some of the categories that had insufficient observations (eg other).*

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?

*I adapted the titles to make it clearer we refer to characteristics in the baseline (2005/06 UNPS) and also changed the note.*

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.

*This has all been taken care of in the respective figures.*

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.

1. *Technically, this can be explained by the fact that poverty lines are based on the consumption patterns of the poorest households (eg. the poorest 50 percent). If poverty lines are constructed at higher aggregate levels, such as the national level, all the poor are lumped together and the poverty line is calculated on the basis of the poorest of the poor in society at large, leading to a single low poverty line. If allowed for some degree of spatial disaggregation, these poor are likely to be distributed over spatial domains, generally leading to higher poverty lines.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)