

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99552
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining the Welfare System Expenses in Vietnam: Analysis of Total Expenses and Population Trends in 2011-2018
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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. Yes manuscript is important for the scientific community. Social Security expenses play a significant role in the overall development of citizens. 2. Title is upto the mark 3. The abstract needs improvement. Scope, Objectives, limitations and brief conclusion must be part of the conclusion 4. Researchers must clearly specify the Research design and methodology of the research paper. 5. Yes, it is correct 6. Researchers must support important facts with proper references. Suggestion: Besides, quantitative analysis, researchers should also include qualitative inferences for a comprehensive analysis of this study	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language can be improved for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uma Sheokand
Department, University & Country	P P Savani University, India