COMMENTS

I think that the justification of the paper based on the aggregate productivity developments of the Brazilian economy should be reframed in this way: this paper investigates whether the evolution of productivity in the exporting sector display a different dynamics with respect to the aggregate performance of the economy.

To the LBE explanations I would add the complementarity between exporting and investing in innovation (Lileeva-Trefler, 2010).

In table 4, I would consider other definitions of exporter (a year by year comparison; a more stringent definition of exporter based on the entire history of the firm or on its export share) to see if the results of stochastic dominance change for industries 23-30-32-33.

I am not sure how standard errors are computed. The STATA routine nnmacth that you mention is not designed for propensity score matching (PSM). The relevant paper is Abadie and Imbens (2012, Matching on the estimated propensity score) which establishes a closed form expression for standard errors in the case of PSM, and the STATA command teffects psmatch is based on their work.

I think that the authors should show the quality of matching and should try to implement different matching strategies to test the robustness of the results. For example, given the sectorial heterogeneity detected, they could estimate industry specific propensity scores and/or match only firms belonging to the same industry. It would be reassuring also to show that employing a different number of neighbors or implementing kernel matching leave the results unaltered.