

Dear Dr. Nguyen,

I have now received reports from three reviewers, the original authors, plus two additional comments regarding your manuscript, “Impacts of Rural Road on Household Welfare in Vietnam: Evidence from a Replication Study” (Manuscript Number 1945-1; Discussion Paper Number 2016-40).

Based on the feedback I have received, I am inviting you to submit a revision. While you should endeavour to address all the main points of the reviewers and the original authors, be sure to respond to the points below:

- 1) Item 7 under the “*Guidelines for replicating and replicated authors*” in the journal’s [Replication Guidelines](#) states that “*The replicating researcher must first attempt to exactly reproduce the original findings. If the original results cannot be exactly reproduced, then the replicating researcher is required to contact the original author to reconcile any differences.*” Your replication has some notable differences with the original study. You note that you are not able to produce the same logit result as Van De Walle and Mu (2007) and that has important consequences for the later PSM analysis. A related issue is that you report 85 project and 83 non-project communes on common support, where Mu and Van De Walle (2011) report 94 and 95, respectively. You should make a better effort to match your results to the original study. The comments from the original authors suggest one possibility.
- 2) Several of the reviewers found your robustness checks to be minor and insufficient. They recommend that you focus on matching quality. A good reference here is a blog by Lampach and Morawetz ([see here](#)). The blog mentions their 2016 paper in *Applied Economics*. You should follow the procedure they describe there.
- 3) The strategy of “limiting covariates to those that are statistically significant in the logit regression” is not a good one for several reasons. Better, follow the procedure in Lampach and Morawetz (2016) focussing on match quality and balanced covariates.
- 4) Drop the additional outcomes of credit and migration. As Reviewer 3 notes, it’s not clear why these outcomes should be of interest.
- 5) Try to address the third point from Reviewer 2 (“...is it possible for the author to re-define road access e.g. access by trucks/vans.”)
- 6) Your revision should follow the journal’s title template for replication studies (cf. Item 10 under the “*Guidelines for replicating and replicated authors*” in the [Replication Guidelines](#)).
- 7) As discussed in Item 8 under the “*Guidelines for replicating and replicated authors*” in the [Replication Guidelines](#), the original study’s results and the replicating study’s corresponding estimates should be placed *side-by-side* in a table to facilitate comparison.
- 8) As discussed in Item 12 under the “*Guidelines for replicating and replicated authors*” in the [Replication Guidelines](#), you should provide data and code that would allow another researcher to replicate all the results in your replication study.

A revised version of your manuscript that addresses the instructions above will be reconsidered for publication. If you choose to resubmit a revision, be sure to include a detailed discussion of how you responded to each of the reviewer's comments, the original authors' comments, and my points above.

Please note that submitting a revision of your manuscript does not guarantee eventual acceptance.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to *Economics; The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal*. I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Bob Reed