REPLY TO REVIEWERS

All the reviewer comments are reflected below, highlighted in yellow, with the author’s response to the comments and explanation of revisions given with no highlight and in italics.

In the revisions the author has undertaken major empirical and narrative revisions in response to the reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer C:

This paper considers the predictors of expected well-being among refugees and asylum seekers in Johannesburg, using data from the 2006 FMSP survey. The findings highlight several potentially important determinant of expected well-being, such as employment status and relative income. There are some comments and issues worth raising on the paper in its current form.

I found it quite unnecessary that throughout the paper expected well-being is written as ‘expected well-being’. Are these inverted commas really necessary throughout the paper?

*I amended this and removed all the inverted commas throughout the paper.*

In the third paragraph of section 1, it is mentioned that expected well-being should be considered within the context of asylum seekers and refugees. While it may seem obvious, the author should consider being more explicit earlier on in the paper about defining what exactly is meant by “expected well-being”.

*The author added a more explicit definition of expected well-being on p2.*

It would here also be useful to know why the study is being conducted in Johannesburg; this is partly because that is where the survey was conducted, but it would also be important to know why the Johannesburg context is important, apart from the fact that most migrants choose to go to Johannesburg.

*The author added more detail on the selection of Johannesburg as the city of interest, see p2.*

At times, the literature review read more like a listing of various studies

* often without much detail – rather than a critical engagement with the

research and integration of the various viewpoints and findings.

*The author rewrote the literature section to address the above mentioned recommendations of the reviewer see p.4-7*

In addition, in paragraph 5 of section 2 it is argued that analysis of migration data should also focus on gender differences. But if that is so important, why is that not also done in this paper more explicitly?

*This section was removed from the literature review as it pertains to the migration decision which differs between men and women. Thus this is not relevant to the current study in which the factors that influence the expected well-being of forced migrants are investigated. Furthermore the results of the analysis in the current paper show that gender is not statistically significant in explaining the expected well-being of forced migrants – thus the author believes that additional analyses on gender in this paper might not be appropriate. However it can be a topic for future research.*

The author notes (section 3 first paragraph) that the data set is not representative of the South African migrant population and also not of the Johannesburg migrant population. Why not? Please explain why this is so, and also what the potential implications of this would be for the generalisability of the results.

*The author has added more information on this issue. See p.8.*

Section 4.3, paragraph 2, line 7-8: The sentence should read :The interaction variable was included as an independent variable…". Moreover, the motivation for including the interaction term is not entirely convincing. Apart from the fact that education and employment are “closely related” in the literature, how does that all link with expected well-being?

*The author explained this in more detail, see p.14.*

In table 3, “age” is not included even though the table supposedly summarises the model's explanatory variables.

*The author rectified the omission, see table 3, p16.*

In the same table, the information for relative income seems incomplete or faulty, and although there are apparently three categories for relative income, table 4 and the final sentence of section 5's paragraph 6 implies there are only two categories.

*This was rectified see table 3 on p16.*

Still in Table 3, education is listed as “years of education”, but in Table 1 the levels of education were reported. Table 5 suggests that the maximum years of education is 5 years, which surely is not realistic?

*“Education level” was reported in Table 1 as it summarises the education variable according to the obtained level of education. Years of education and not the level of education was used as the control variable in the estimated model and table 3 was amended to reflect the years of education.*

Given that the employment coefficients were so large in table 4, probably a lot more can be said about that than what is currently the case.

*The author expanded on this section see p21.*

In addition, it is stated (section 5 paragraph 15) that refugees and asylum seekers “seem to find employment against all odds”. Is that really the case?

*This section was amended see p21. Furthermore table 1 and the description of table 1 were expanded on to also include figures on casual (temporary) employment. The added information gives a better indication of the total number of forced migrants in the sample that is employed across any sector of the economy (see p9 and p10).*

In the sample, 57% are employed and later (section 5 paragraph 19) it is argued that respondents “struggle to find employment in a country with very high unemployment rates”.

*This section was amended, see p21-22.*

In general, the author should carefully read the papers as there are quite a number of grammatical and spelling errors, as well as other minor formatting errors.

*The author read through the paper and amended grammatical, formatting and language errors. The author furthermore send the paper for editing by a professional editor.*
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------------------------------------------------------

**Reviewer D:** Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. I structured my review according to the guidelines received.

1. **General comments: (Any comments of a general nature including language,**

**readability, references used or technical aspects)**

The technical aspects of the article require some revision. This applies specifically to the referencing technique. In some cases all three authors of a paper is listed and in other cases it is seemingly not.

*The author listed all the names of the authors the first time reference was made to a specific research paper and thereafter only used the first authors name plus et al.*

The author(s) must ensure that consistency line with the technique of journal is achieved. The use of et al is also not handled consistently.

*The author addressed this as is explained in the previous comment. However, there is one paper in which more than ten authors are listed in which case the author used et al. from the beginning as the author could not find an example in the SAJEMS author guidelines as to handle a reference which has so many authors.*

A few references do not appear in the reference list. E.g. Tran and Wright 1985; Frey and Stutzer 2000; Partridge 2013. Alternatively the date is inconsistent between text and reference list. The must be checked and corrected.

*The author addressed these shortcomings.*

The referencing technique used is also not applied consistently. This must be addressed.

*The author changed the reference list so that it is consistent.*

The reference list seems to contain a number of references that were seemingly not used in the text.

*The author removed these references.*

The handling of acronyms in the reference list must also be done in a consistent manner as it is not the case currently.

*The author addressed these issues and corrected the referencing as was suggested by the reviewer. The author used acronyms in text and in the reference list. However the author is not sure about the reference requirements by the journal in this regard and followed the standard Harvard method.*

**1.1 Referencing.**

Some specific suggestions

In the third paragraph under data it is stated that: “It has been shown in the literature that men are more likely to emigrate than women.” An appropriate reference or references are needed to support this sweeping statement

*The reference was added to this section, see p.8.*

In the second paragraph under point 4.3 it is stated that: ”The interaction variable was included as a dependent variable.” This cannot be the case econometrically? I believe the author(s) rather mean independent”. This must be corrected.

*This was corrected.*

The author(s) writes in the first person and uses “I” and “we” interchangeably. It is important that consistency is achieved in this regard as well.

*The author corrected this and all reference made to the second person was changed to the first person.*

The reference in the text of Partridge 2013 also includes the fact that the reference is a masters dissertation in brackets. I believe this can be deleted in the text and included in the reference list as part of a well-structured reference.

*The author changed this and added the reference to the reference list.*

1. **Abstract: (Does the abstract reflect the essence of the manuscript?)**

The abstract reflects the content adequately.

1. **Body: (Does layout of the manuscript enable the reader to ‘follow the**

**story line’)**

The paper is well structured with a logical flow.

1. **Originality: (Does the manuscript contain adequate new information to**

**justify it publication in an ISI indexed journal)**

An obvious drawback of the paper is the fact that the data upon which it is based is now almost a decade old. Normally, the issue of the recentness of data will in this case count against publication of the article. I am however fully aware of the difficulty in obtaining survey data of this nature. The lack of data in general informs my view that that paper is still a worthwhile contribution to the literature on the topic.

1. **Relationship to literature: (Does the manuscript demonstrate an adequate**

**understanding of relevant literature? Are appropriate sources cited?)**

In the literature review the reader is often left wondering where and in some cases when the quoted studies were conducted. It will be helpful if this type of information can be included as part of the discussion where appropriate. Examples include Valentina et al 2010. All in all the literature review is well developed and addresses the state of knowledge on the topic.

*The author added information on the where and when of the Valentina et al. 2010 (see p.5) study and also rewrote the whole literature review section to be more informative.*

1. **Research methodology: (Is the manuscript’s argument founded on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Is the research on which the manuscript is based, well designed and are the methods employed appropriate?)**

The research technique employed in the paper is well established. However, the author(s) makes little or no mention of limitations to the research. Issues such as possible endogeneity are left unattended and this cannot remain the case as with any piece of cross sectional research. This must be addressed thoroughly in the revision of the article e.g. through the use of instrumental variables.

*The author amended this section (see p.12 and p17). The author used Instrumental Variable Regressions employing two stage least scores as an estimation technique to control for unobserved heterogeneity. Furthermore the author did post estimation tests for endogeneity and reported the results. The tests did not reveal any endogeneity and OLS was used as the alternative regression technique together with probit estimation.*

1. **Results: (Are the results presented clearly and analysed appropriately,**

**and do the conclusions adequately tie all the elements of manuscript together?)**

Some elements of the discussion of the results can be enhanced by more rigour in the interpretation. Some examples are as follows: The discussion on the type of housing variable. The insignificance of the results I believe can be interrogated further by incorporating the literature that suggest that many migrants in South Africa lives in overcrowded conditions.

*The author elaborated on this result including references to the overcrowded accommodation in which forced migrant reside when they first come to the country (see p.20).*

The same applies to the religion variable. The fact that the type per se did not render significant results does not mean that religion is not important to migrants in terms of expected well-being. This can be the focus of future of future analysis as there is literature that supports this view.

*The author expanded on the statistical non significance of the religious variable, see p19 and also mentioned that it can be included in future studies.*

The discussion on the under employment can also be expanded. There are several examples of underemployment under migrants in South Africa that can be provided as substance for the argument. These include Zimbabwean day labourers in South Africa.

*The author did expand on this section see p. 21.*

The above relate to the so what question that can be asked of any article. The author(s) should endeavour to expand on the policy value and relevance of the research, especially in the light of the recent spate of xenophobic violence in South Africa.

1. **Recommendation:**

I believe the article can make a useful contribution to the literature on this topic if the issues highlighted are sufficiently addressed. I would support publication with major revisions.
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