

Research Design Revision Summary

In revising my research design, I prioritized integrating the feedback I received during our meeting while maintaining the four-page limit. The primary objectives were to enhance methodological clarity, address concerns related to endogeneity and parallel trends, and improve the overall structure and coherence of the paper.

In the introduction, I incorporated a discussion acknowledging the potential political endogeneity of minimum wage adoption. To mitigate this bias, I explained the use of state and year fixed effects, state-specific time trends, and controls for concurrent labor policies.

The data and measures section was refined for better clarity and focus. I emphasized the use of ACS 1-year PUMS data and noted that annual data may obscure short-term effects. I also clarified that the 2020 data employs experimental weights due to disruptions caused by COVID-19. The list of variables was streamlined to include only those used in the analysis, with each variable's role in the study clearly defined.

The identification and empirical strategy section received the most substantial revisions. It now follows a structured three-step approach: descriptive analysis, fixed-effects regression, and difference-in-differences estimation. I added a description of how parallel trends will be tested using Bilinski and Hatfield's (2018) framework and included lagged independent variables to account for delayed effects. Additionally, I clarified that $k \neq -1$ denotes the omitted baseline year in the event-study model.

In the expected findings section, I condensed the content and merged the limitations discussion into a concise paragraph that outlines potential issues related to data and timing. The appendix was also streamlined, featuring a reorganized data documentation table that categorizes variables as response, predictor, covariates, and sensitivity or demographic controls. The table now uses a simplified five-column format for improved readability.