Dear Reviewers,

First of all, I would like to sincerely thank you for taking the time to read my text and for your thoughtful comments. I was glad to see that you found the topic important and that you appreciated my engagement with it.

Your suggestions were very insightful. I have carefully considered all the points raised and have tried to incorporate these to the bets of my abilities into the revised version. Accordingly, the revised article now contains a lot of ‘red’ markings. The 'clean' version, in all corrections have been accepted, is accordingly easier to navigate.

All three of you suggested a clear and unequivocal focus on West Germany and Berlin-Tegel Prison as my central case study. This made perfect sense to me, so I have adjusted the spatial focus and hence also the title.

Beyond that, although your suggestions for revision varied significantly, they seemed reasonable to me, and, as far as the sources allowed, I have sought to implemented them.

**Reviewer 1**

You suggest not only refining the **introduction** in terms of spatial focus, but also rendering the historical context and analytical framework more precise, as well as more clearly addressing the problem areas I engage with. I have rewritten the introduction accordingly and rearranged parts of the text as suggested (for example, introducing West German legislation and reform steps earlier).

In **chapter 2**, I have embedded the longer quotations more strongly in my argument and have contextualized them in greater detail. Thank you for this suggestion.

**Chapter 3** focuses on the perspectives of businesses and the economic arguments for prison labor. Here, I have clarified that my material pertains to employer associations rather than the companies themselves. To highlight the nature of unfree labor more clearly, I have added three corresponding sections. I have also clarified the extent to which “exit options” existed and which industries and companies employed prisoners in Tegel. However, I cannot determine exactly who organized and initiated the contact between companies and prisons or the precise nature of the contracts. The Tegel prison files contain no information on this, and I was unable to identify pertinent corporate archives.

I started **chapter 4** with a new paragraph discussing prison magazines as a (not unproblematic) source. The historical context should now be clearer.

I have thoroughly revised **chapter 5**, as I did with the introduction, and I have strengthened the aspect of the “humanization of labor.” Thanks for pointing me to Gina Fuhrich’s book.

**Reviewer 2**

I have limited the scope of the article to West Germany and omitted the references to England and France. However, I have now incorporated the influence of the U.S. military government in the postwar prison reform and the debates surrounding the *Zuchthaus*. This aspect primarily concerns the Hessian penal system, but I still find it relevant to my analysis.

I would like to explicitly thank you for encouraging a more meaningful engagement with the concept of the “other”. I have drawn on Ralf Dahrendorf’s contemporary concept of the “outsider” and now refer to “outsiders” instead of “others”. Here, too, I have rewritten a passage to clearly reflect this (contemporary) reference.

It is also absolutely correct that prison labor follows a capitalist logic, which I have emphasized more strongly in the text.

Finally, I have taken into account works by Sandra Leukel, Richard Wetzell, and Warren Rosenblum.

**Reviewer 3**

You noted a lack of literature on the penal system in the Federal Republic of Germany. I have included works that address the West German prison reform of the 1960s and 70s from a historical perspective. If I have overlooked anything, I would be grateful for specific recommendations.