

Editorial comments:

1. The sample is rather small
2. Only one year data. We need at least three seasons data to draw statistically valid conclusions

Author's feedback:

On the behalf of the authors, I would like to express our gratitude to the editor board members for intellectual comments. These are the good points that we need to consider for my further research. Based on your comments, we have made some explanations as follows

1. When we conducted the survey, we already considered about the power of rejecting the null hypothesis, the sample size, 199, is enough to use the translog cost function based on the formula proposed by Carmen et al. (2007) and Green (1991) (i.e., $N > 50 + 8m$, where N is the sample size and m is the numbers of variables). Moreover, we surveyed in four districts of An Giang province in order to ensure the representative of the sample. Please the editors consider and accept it. In addition, in many previous research, their sample size was also quite similar, around 200. For instance, the study of Nghia Dai Tran and John F. Yanagida (2015), published in our journal, which is entitled as "Stochastic frontier analysis with price risk: an application to organic tea production in Vietnam" used the data of only 180 farmers in two districts, and applied "one-stage" approach. Another study of S. J. Ibitoye, U. M. Shaibu and B. Omole (2015) used 240 tomato farmers to estimate production function. The other study of S. A. Donkoh, M. Tachega and N. Amowine (2013) about "estimating technical efficiency of tomato production in Northern Ghana", the sample size was only 100 farmers.

The cost functions is used to reflect the behavior of farmers in using inputs with respective to input prices. In the current situation of production, the prices of inputs such as labor, fertilizers and rice seed were almost unchanged during the year for each farmer because the farmer bought their inputs from one input company for many years and paid after they harvested their paddy. As regards seed rice, the majority, 75%, of farmers used family-produced seed, which means that their behavior did not change over crops per year. In addition, regarding to labor, the labor included both family and hired labor, in which family labor price was measured as opportunity cost. As such, the price of family labor did not change over the crops. As calculated (not presented in the paper) the family labor cost accounted for more than 75% of total labor cost, for this reason, it was plausibly to assume that the changes in labor prices were minor. For these reasons, the cost function for average one year of our current study is also statistically valid to make conclusions. Please editorial board members consider and accept this.