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Summary

Relevance: 16m working-age adults provide informal care important implications for labor market decisions

Need to account for selection into care-provider role

Existing literature failed to produce definitive answers

Paper evaluates labor market consequences for female caregivers who co-reside with a disabled care recipient

Paper uses PSID to estimate impact of caregiving on labor market decisions at both intensive and extensive margins

Novelty: analysis of longer-term consequences of caregiving
Comments and Suggestions: Part 1

It would be helpful to develop at least a sketch of a theoretical model explaining how the decisions are made.

Clarify whether the paper provides estimates of causal effects or only of associations.

Sample construction: clarify how many (potential) observations are dropped when each exclusion is applied.

Explore some more the potential weakness of co-residence indicator as a proxy for caregiving.
Comments and Suggestions: Part 2

• Statistical and econometric issues:
  • In Table 1, do you account for dependence of observations (i.e., those from the same woman) when computing statistics to compare characteristics between the groups?
  • Provide a clearer explanation for what $\delta_i$’s in Eq. (1) represent and how controlling for them helps to account for endogeneity of $core_{si}$
  • Is the categorical nature of $LFP_{it}$ addressed via econometric modeling? Or are you simply estimating a linear probability model?
  • Do you account for the probability mass at zero when estimating the model for $hours_{it}$?

• Minor issues:
  • Use either “I,” or “we” consistently
  • No need to introduce the term ‘PSID “gene”’: your descriptive explanation for who these women are is good enough
  • What is the purpose of Tables 6–8? Are they simply “extended” versions of Tables 3–5?
  • Why is there no $\delta_i$ in Eq. (2)? Is this a typo or intentional omission?