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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Reviewer comment. I thank the authors for thoroughly addressing my concerns and comments. I find the added clarification regarding theory and methods very helpful. Supplementary Table 2 (showing ratification dates for countries categorized by income and democratization) is a particularly nice addition. I believe the article is now suitable for publication.

Authors’ response. We are very grateful to the reviewer for their time efforts. Their insights have vastly improved our manuscript!

Reviewer comment. I would only add one point of clarification: I see variation in timing of ratification across countries as an advantage of the analysis the authors have already completed. e.g., the fact that high-income non-democratic countries ratified between 1981-2009 helps rule out the possibility that the observed effects aren't actually due to some discrete regional/worldwide event that happened in the same year as ratification. (This variation in treatment timing doesn't help deal with confounding by conditions that change gradually over time, but it does mean you're not actually picking up effects of something like the dissolution of the Soviet Union.) It is up to the authors whether they want to point this out as an advantage of
their analysis, but I wanted to note it since this review will accompany the article if the article is accepted.

Authors’ response. We appreciate this perspective, which we had not considered. We have added the following sentence to page 17, at the end of the paragraph on confounding.

“…Of note, because our results stood up over a range of ratification years, any potential societal-level confounders are likely to be ones that unfolded over time, rather than sudden societal shocks…”

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Reviewer comment. Marleen Temmerman (Reviewer 2): the authors have addressed my comments and I am satisfied with their response; they have revisited the paper and modified the conclusions. happy to see this paper published

Authors’ Response. Thank you so much for all your comments and guidance!