Changes to Paper Based on Referee Comments

Introduction:

* From Editor: (Seems like up to me) – importance of the question and implications could be emphasized more strongly
  + It is not clear how large fraternities parties impact student behavior and thus overall crime (similar to how lindo says not known about how big division 1 things affect crime—goes on to say that there are a few students that quantify the causal effects on students’ experiences)
  + Do university policies work?
    - Smoke-free policies
    - Ban the box policies
    - College cost reduction and access act
  + Chaloupka and Wechlser find that availability of alcoholic beverage are among the most important determinants of drinking and binge drinking among college students.
  + Lindo Alcohol and student performance
    - Finds that gaining access to alcohol affects student achienement
  + The effectiveness of university policies:
    - Affirmative action bans
      * Peter Hinrich - finds that fewer underrepresented minorities become graduates of selective colleges
      * raise
    - Needs-based financial aid policy on college acesss increased graduation rates among low-income students.
* Might want to change the last paragraph given the new analysis that is coming up.
* I think that I can add in the brain development effects in the paragraph which reads “Last, this paper adds to the literature relating to the effects of alcohol on college-aged individuals which include health effects, such as increases in mortality, emergency room visits, and adolescent brain development, and behavior effects such as… ”. Moreover, I think I can add in “Second, this paper contributes to an emerging body of economic work relating to the effectiveness of both university policy, and more specifically, fraternity policy. On one hand, university policies such as academic probation and financial aid have been found to be effective in improving GPA and recruiting students respectively. On the other hand, there are two studies as of this writing that analyze the effects of deferring fraternity recruitment from freshman to sophomore year that find improved academic performance, although no long-term salary premium . Notably, none of these policy evaluations focus on university crime.”
  + Academic probation = find that discourages some students from returning ot school while improving GPAs of those who do. (LINDO)
  + Financial aid – makes students more willing to go to college (Dynarski)
  + Brain development (The biological psychiatry) for memories and decision making (silvervi)

Background:

* There are no edits to be made in this section 😊

Data:

* Referee #4: Said 3.1 (Sample Construction) and 3.2 (Matching) could be condensed. My stance is that this is rather hard to do. Maybe Toshio/Anna could help?
* Referee #4: Wants to know the representativeness of the sample in regards to colleges with Fraternity/Sorority Life. In 3.3 (Descriptive Statistics) I can add a sentence after my explanation of IFC fraternities representing a small fraction of the total enrollment. I can then go on to say that despite their small numbers, these schools are representative of universities with a high amount of Fraternity/Sorority Life Culture.
  + From here, I can reference the new figure.

Empirical Strategy:

* Referee #3: wants to spotlight the death effect more. Perhaps in my assumptions I should write that an assumption is that the effect is from the fraternity itself and not from the triggering event. I can reference the analysis that will be done later on in the paper, and perhaps give another subsection or paragraph that goes more into depth on the triggering of a death.

Results:

* Referee #2: add in a column (or columns—not sure which) with the weights by total enrollment. Your defense here can be that it doesn’t help the standard errors much, and increases the point estimates somewhat. Given that you want to stay conservative and make sure that your results don’t rely on weighting, I am going to stay with the non-weighted estimation given that the results are similar.
* Referee #1: Edit the last paragraph of 5.2 to make sure you specify whether these are discipline or arrests or a weighted average of each.
* Referee #3: Edit in 5.3 (or create a new section 5.4) to include the “treatment passing” analysis. Furthermore, you should look into the triggering event for each of these quantiles that you place each one into.

Heterogeneity:

* Referee #2/#4: place in a new model that utilizes the variation in IFC share. Show that as IFC share gets bigger, the effect gets larger as well. This will result in a new table.
* Referee #3/#4: In 6.2, add in the pseudo-treatment

Discussion:

Conclusion:

* Referee #2: Careful with “large effects” not entirely sure if these are large effects due to the large Cis.

Tables/Figures:

* Referee #3: Table 7, put in the mean of the dependent variable.
* Table 3: Error in Specification Note.
* Table 5: Error in Note: Do not write out 9.
* Referee #3: Figure C7 is not clear enough. Specify the