

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_95727
Title of the Manuscript:	FROM MIDDLE POWER'S THEORY TO REALITY AND PROSPECT OF VIET NAM
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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The topic of this manuscript is interesting and The manuscript is of significance for scientific community. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. The structure of the manuscript is relatively appropriate, but there should be an introduction part at the beginning. 5. Overall the explanation and the argument of the manuscript is reasonable. 6. The references of some parts are not sufficient. E.g. in this paragraph, "In current mid-power research, there are four basic approaches associated with the rise of dominant schools of thought in the field of international relations:" research of different schools of thought are mentioned, but the author didn't give the information of these research papers or authors. 7. There are many minor mistakes in this paper, e.g. (1)which is a increasing demand for research (2) determining middle power; (3) determine the attitudes and roles of countries (4) "strength of the country". they possess an (5) (multipolar, bipolar, or unipolar). in the international relations system) (6) the wave of relocating factories and factories from China to Vietnam after the pandemic. Just mention a few here, many mistakes in this paper need to be corrected carefully.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is relatively suitable for scholarly communications, but a lot of mistakes should be corrected	
Optional/General comments	This paper can be published if the language problems are corrected	

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhang Youwen
Department, University & Country	Zhejiang University of Finance & Economics Dongfang College, China