Referee Comments on JOPE-D-24-00822 "The Effect of Racial and Ethnic Attitudes on Asian Identity in the U.S"

Overall, I like the idea. I feel that some of the robustness checks are a little confusing. Here are my thoughts on this paper and how it could be improved.

(1) In this interesting paper, the author leverages data on parental and grand-parental country of origin to objectively identify Asian racial identity, and compares this to the child's self-reported identity. Part of this comparison might capture a choice to identify, but with an average age of 8.4 years for the overall sample [ranging from 7.7 years (Third Generation), 8.3 years (Second Generation), and 10.9 years (First Generation)] there is quite a bit of scope for measurement error. Since the self-reporting is filtered through the parent, mention and expand on this critical point early in the manuscript (I would say at the beginning of Data section).

(2) Figure 5 showing the relationship between self-reported identity and bias are quite difficult to read. Reporting these results as figures instead of tables also makes the results difficult to gauge in terms of overall model statistics, sample sizes, etc. I recommend that the actual regression results be included in an appendix with an appropriate footnote. Regarding the control variables employed in equation 4, I am puzzled about the author excluding linear age and including only quadratic age. What is the logic and rationale? I would strongly advise against leaving out linear age. I'd like to see an intuitive justification for using only quadratic age variable.

(3) The summary of the robustness checks (included in section 6) indicates *3 **percentage*** point increase in likelihood of interracial marriage among Asian men for a standard-deviation increase in bias, but the reported results in table 4 show a ***-0.01*** coefficient. For your quick reference, I am pasting relevant part of Table 4 (potential transcription error?):

Table 4: Relationship Between Bias and Interracial Marriages

	(1) Interracial	Asian Men (2) Interracial	Asian Women (3) Interracial
Bias	0.04***	−0.01	0.03**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)

Though the author reported LPM based results, I'd like to see either the Logit/Probit based results and along with marginal probabilities.

(4) In the results for migration, what is the explanation for a higher measure of bias in the current region being associated with a higher likelihood of having migrated, or for that matter a greater likelihood of self-reporting Asian identity when the individual moved to a more biased state? It seems to indicate that individuals in the sample are migrating into places with higher bias.

(5) In the robustness check on migration to less-biased states, it was a little confusing why the author chose to take the current bias in the state of current residence minus the birthyear bias in the state of birth. Differences in trends of bias intensity for the birthplace and current residence potentially bias this measure. I would like to see author acknowledge this potential issue.