Referee #1: To-do:

* Specify whether the CSS data for liquor law violations is arrests or disciplinary actions.
* Wants regressions on both liquor law violations and disciplinary actions for “additional insights” only.

Referee #2 To-do:

* This referee is particularly concerned about whether the results are strong enough to warrant publication in a good journal.
  + Bring up good point that the CI are very large, and therefore, we cannot actually say whether or not these effects are large, since we can only rule out very small effects.
* Referee believes that the question seems a little obvious. Imposing restrictions on events with alcohol will lead to less alcohol. I think this is a stupid comment and I motivated this in the beginning….but maybe need to really push the fact that kids can still just drink whenever they want..as long as they don’t get caught.
* Wants a couple of new wants to improve precision:
  + Weight by total enrollment or undergraduate enrollment (can do both).
  + To interact the treatment variable with the share of students who are in IFC fraternities. This is difficult to do and would muddy the results quite a bit. Lots of missing data. Could interpolate? Doesn’t sound good to me though.

Referee #3 To-do:

* Touch upon the death factor misconstruing the actual effect of the moratorium earlier.
* Clarify what is going on in Appendix Figure C7 in regards to the death/moratorium. Referee #4 had a good suggestion on how to go about this.
  + Create a greater spotlight on this issue, even if it weakens the results.
* To better Table 7, the mean of the dependent variable would be helpful for the reader.
* Wanted some sort of progression over time of the moratorium…similar to what I did before per-Kevin’s request which Heather called “reading tea-leaves”.
  + This is probably the most difficult thing to get at. How can we see how the moratorium progresses over time?
  + They want to know some way to inform the optimal length and whether we would expect any benefit from a permanent ban on alcohol at these events.

Referee #4 To-do:

* Interacting the treatment with the share of IFC fraternities.
* Wants to know whether a death causes an effect absent treatment. Using a 64 average pseudo treatment with the never-treated-but-death group.
* Representativeness of sample in context of Fraternity/Sorority life universe – what is a typical share and what is my share?
  + This is extremely tough to get at…might be some statistics online or maybe the IFC has some? The IFC would never give me their data…or so I think.
* Condense 3.1 and 3.2 by moving some of the material to the appendix.

Order of Business:

First Order:

* Interacting the treatment with the share of IFC fraternities. This was brought up by two referees so it is clearly on peoples mind. As of now, the model assumes the intensity of treatment is the same because I don’t have anything for IFC share.
  + Need to reach out to the final schools to see if I can get any type of data on this. In the current draft, I have data on 33 of 37 universities on this. I think I can hound 4 universities.
    - Tufts (617) 627-3240 or 617-627-2743 or :182
    - Ohio University (740.593.4065): 592
    - Florida International ([305-348-2138](tel:305-348-2138)): 554
    - University of Virginia: 1700
* Weight by total enrollment or undergraduate enrollment—how to do this?
  + Want to check with someone in STATA to make sure I’m doing this correctly.
* Create pseudo treatment with the never-treated-but-death group. Two referees brought up this issue of the effect of a death rather than the effect of a moratorium. Referee #4 had a fantastic idea of giving a 64 day pseudo treatment to these schools.
* Progression of moratorium over time. Hard to do this since moratorium lengths are very different.
* Specify whether the CSS data for liquor law violations is arrests or disciplinary actions.
* Wants regressions on both liquor law violations and disciplinary actions for “additional insights” only.
* Representativeness of sample in context of Fraternity/Sorority life universe – what is a typical share and what is my share?
  + This is extremely tough to get at…might be some statistics online or maybe the IFC has some? The IFC would never give me their data…or so I think.

Second Order:

* To better Table 7, the mean of the dependent variable would be helpful for the reader.
* Condense 3.1 and 3.2 by moving some of the material to the appendix.
* Fix up the Appendix Clery Act Table notes. They were confusing to you.
* Footnote 21 has an error. Please fix.