



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_29823
Title of the Manuscript:	Price Setting Behavior in Vietnam: Evidence from a Survey
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Clarity on some points would be nice: examples.. 1) First paragraph intro talks about flexible prices negating the output effects of monetary policy. This is true if perfectly flexible, however not realistic. It may be better for readers if this is noted as being 'perfectly flexible'. Economists' usage of the term is different from colloquial language. 2) Second paragraph intro. Immediately after the Fabiani et al citation there is an erroneous "1". Not sure what that is there for. Also at the end you discuss transmission mechanism. I think you mean ..of monetary policy. Again, just for clarity 3) Paragraph 4 of the intro. Here you mention time and state dependent pricing rules BUT you don't explain what those are until the third paragraph of section 3. Explain and provide examples here in the intro – helps with storytelling. 4) Section 2: the survey. Your survey data is limited to those firms who have a history of responding. You claim randomly selected, yet they all are glaringly biased due to self-selection.	Changed as suggested "1" indicate the 1st footnote. This is a typo. Changed as suggested Changed as suggested In practice, some firms are never willing to involve in surveys. There is almost no chance to receive complete questionnaires from them. So to save time and resources and to obtain a high rate of response, we did not sent questionnaires to them. Anyway, the proportion of these firms is small. We randomly choose firms after eliminating those with really bad survey record. The degreee of competition is self rated by the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5) In the paragraph prior to section 3 you mention medium and high levels of competition. Explain what this means. 6) First paragraph of section 3 needs some comma reduction. There are simply way too many commas. 7) Sections 4 paragraph 1. The first section could be better arranged. Make it more active for the firm.	respondent. So I changed the word “reported” with “thought” for better meaning. Changed as suggested I do not really get your point. Anyway, I don't think this is a problem.
Optional/General comments		