

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_104923
Title of the Manuscript:	The Performance of Open-Ended Funds in Vietnam
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><i>1. The topic of open funds is of interest to the scientific community, but, in my opinion, referring only to those from Vietnam limits public interest to the research findings.</i></p> <p><i>2. The title is suitable, taking into consideration the structure of the manuscript.</i></p> <p><i>3. I find the abstract comprehensive, even if it is quite brief.</i></p> <p><i>4. The subsections are appropriate for the topic of the paper.</i></p> <p><i>5. In my opinion the manuscript is scientifically correct, the research model is appropriate and the descriptive analysis is well conducted.</i></p> <p><i>6. I consider the references sufficient, but not quite recent.</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><i>Yes, The English used t is suitable for scholarly communications.</i> <i>However, in the last paragraph of the Introduction, "in terms in methos" should be "in terms of method".</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria - Daniela Bondoc
Department, University & Country	The National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, Pitești University Centre, Romania