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Reviewer's report:

The paper makes use of an innovative database that consists of merged register data to analyze the impact of family background and the neighborhood on education outcomes, health outcomes, teenage pregnancy, and a measure of labor market success of adolescents in a Canadian province. Although I think the presented results are relevant and contribute to the existing literature on the influence of family background on children’s success, I think the presentation and discussion of the results should be improved before publication. My main suggestion for revision is that the authors specify more clearly the motivation of the paper and exactly point out their actual research question.

Major compulsory revisions:

Title:

1. In my view the title of the paper is misleading: the term “well-being” lets the reader expect an analysis of a measure of well-being. Instead, you analyze education outcomes, health outcomes, a measure for teenage pregnancy, and a measure of labor market success (income assistance). These are all important determinants of individual (or subjective) well-being but you have no concrete measure of well-being (an example of which would be a life satisfaction question in a survey).

Background:

2. At the moment, the paper is mainly motivated from a technical, data driven point of view. I would suggest a complete revision of this part of the paper. You should give a clear motivation of what your exact research question is. In the recent version of the paper it is not clear if you are interested in estimating the influence of the family; the neighborhood; or both or if you are interested in estimating the effect of the family along your stratified samples. In either case you should give a motivation with respect to content and not with respect to data availability. Of course improved data availability is an important point and a valid asset of the paper and should also be discussed here, but should not be the primary motivation of the paper.

3. It would also be good to have a motivation of the choice of your outcomes based on a theoretical discussion why you expect these to be influenced by the family or the neighborhood. You should also give a few references after your point a) “importance in the literature” in the text.
Methods:

4. Your definition of the LA achievement index incorporates also missing values. You mention that you ran a regression that excludes observations with missing education information. But you do not state if the results are robust to this exclusion. You should include these results in the paper.

5. Discuss more in detail the family background variables you use to adjust your neighbor correlations. These should only vary on the family level. Discuss the implications for your results if you carry on using individual level variables (for example birth order or mother’s marital status at birth).

Results:

6. Give an interpretation of the estimated sibling and neighborhood correlations: for example “a sibling correlation can be interpreted as the percentage share of the variance (inequality) in educational achievement that can be attributed to factors shared by siblings.” Discuss these results more in detail.

7. Place your results in existing (economic and sociological) literature on sibling correlations. Discuss potential channels of family and neighborhood influence.

8. Motivate stratifications.

Conclusions:

9. Rewrite conclusions section to explicit answer the research question that you choose in the introduction. Also discuss policy relevance of your results.

Minor essential revisions:

Methods:

10. For readers not familiar with Canada it would be good to add a sentence about where in Canada the Manitoba province is located.

11. It would be good to clarify the part describing the attrition rate in your sample. You end up with 75 % of all children from the full birth cohort. You should give an overview on the basic characteristics of the children you loose from the original cohort.

12. Add an explaining footnote / comment to figure 1 and 2.

13. It would be good to run a sensitivity analysis using all siblings from a family and place a comment if the results remain robust to that, like you have it in the text for your neighborhood definition.

Results:

14. Table 7: Discuss in more detail which sibling determines the number of moves of one family.

Miscellaneous:
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