I think your comments, all of which ask for clarification, are appropriate.  They may feel it appropriate to address your questions in a technical appendix so as to not interrupt the flow of the paper. In my opinion that would be fine and might even be a good idea. **We have discussed and addressed each of Bev’s comments and suggestions for improved wording and clarity in this draft.**

The paper needs a far more layperson-friendly abstract (or perhaps a longer Executive Summary).  If it remains as a short abstract, It can indicate many options were considered but it needs to cut to the chase and briefly describe, including the cost, of the preferred option. An Executive Summary, written for a layperson, would be preferable, I think. **The Summary is now longer, clarifies some of the buzzwords from the earlier Abstract, and focusses on the preferred option.**

Section 2 begins with a more extensive discussion of the state of poverty in Alberta.  The first 3 paragraphs of this section can be replaced with reference to a paper Rita and I have written (and which is under revision) that goes into great detail on this topic and which will be released ahead of this paper. The important points the Simpson and Stevens make in these paragraphs is to the incidence of poverty in Alberta and to the depth of poverty. Using the MBM measure, the incidence of poverty was 8.6% (Table 11-10-0135-01) and the low income gap was 34.4% (Table 11-10-0135-01), both in 2016. (BTW, they suggest measures of the depth of poverty are only available for LIM.  That is not true as this measure is also available for MBM in Table 11-10--135-01). **Done with just a briefer first paragraph on the LICO and why it still must be used for analysis with SPSD/M. We reference the Social Policy Trends page from Wilkins and Kneebone (2018) but cannot find another reference.**

Still in Section 2, they indicate they will be using the LICO measure.  This is awkward since the federal government has chosen to measure progress on poverty using the MBM.  If possible I suggest all calculations involving reference to a poverty line do so with respect to the MBM.  I don't think that should be difficult. **Geographical breakdown in SPSD/M does not permit calculation of the MBM.**

The issue raised in footnote #8 (page 15) needs to be highlighted. If I understand correctly, their proposal is supplement, rather than replace the existing social assistance program. This is important as most GBI advocates envision it replacing SA with a resulting saving in administrative costs. Having raised this issue, we need to be clear whether the guarantee amount they discuss is a top-up on existing amounts received by families receiving social assistance.  For example, on page 30 we're told they are proposed a Guarantee of $12,778 for a family of four and $6,389 for a single person. Are these Guarantees on top of the current SA amounts being received? **We have clarified this throughout the paper. See also our concluding paragraph.**

The conclusion should note that no attempt has been made to identify the benefits associated with a GBI.  See Forget's (<https://utpjournals.press/doi/abs/10.3138/cpp.37.3.283>) discussion of the Manitoba experiment for this. The costs being cited, then, are gross. This, I think, is important to emphasize. **The conclusion already mentions Forget’s research and we think that is sufficient for this paper.**

A final point that I think needs to be noted.  The proposal being considered relies on the current emphasis of providing social assistance via the tax system. GST credits, child benefits, disability tax credits, and working income benefits are all delivered in this way. A problem with this approach is the fact many people in need are not competing tax forms. For example, a report from the UK reports that almost one-third of eligible people do not claim means-tested benefits to which they are entitled (see Finn, Dan & Goodship, Jo. (2014). Take-up of benefits and poverty: an evidence and policy review. JRF/CESI Report. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272786560_Take-up_of_benefits_and_poverty_an_evidence_and_policy_review>).  Any plan for a basic income needs, I think, to recognize this problem and perhaps any such proposal must include a proposal of how to address it.  **We now raise this issue in our concluding paragraph, but the figures for Canada from the 2016 suggest that tax filing rates are much higher in Canada and that a GBI based on the tax system would reach almost all families.**