

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_124229
Title of the Manuscript:	Vision 2030 and Beyond: Intersecting Technology, Policy, and Society for Saudi Arabia's Future
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Choosing Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 as the main subject of the research was an excellent decision. Vision 2030 is not only a national development strategy that has garnered global attention but also, in my view, a topic that demands academic efforts to analyze and interpret its significance from a theoretical perspective. A shortcoming of the manuscript is the insufficient exploration of theoretical frameworks and academic perspectives in relation to Vision 2030. I hope that my comments contribute to enhancing the scholarly value of this manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"The title of the manuscript is appropriate as it includes the research subject and reflects the contents outlined in the manuscript. However, after reviewing it, I believe the core focus is on transforming the economic structure from an oil-dependent economy to a diversified one through a well-established national policy. I suggest considering incorporating this key aspect into the title, such as ' Saudi Arabia Vision 2030 and Beyond: From an Oil-Dependent Economy to a Diversified Economy. The suggested title is purely an example, and I would like to clarify that it is not intended to be a directive for adoption.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a good overall summary of the manuscript. However, I could not find the international comparison mentioned in the abstract within any part of the manuscript. I recommend either incorporating this aspect into the manuscript (preferred) or removing it from the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript reflects its title well. In addition, I would like to make three suggestions as follows. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new section or paragraphs providing an overview of Saudi Arabia's social and economic conditions around 2016 is necessary. In Chapter 2 of the manuscript, Vision 2030 is introduced and discussed immediately after the introduction. However, beyond describing Saudi Arabia as an oil-dependent nation, the manuscript lacks sufficient context about the country. Including details such as the population size, the state of the economy at that time, and the background that led to the development of Vision 2030 would be beneficial. This could be explained either at the start of Chapter 2 or in a separate section. 2. A literature review on relevant theories is necessary. National development strategies like Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 are initiatives undertaken by many countries. In this context, developmental state theory has been extensively developed in academia over time. I recommend including a literature review on developmental state theory and discussing why studying Vision 2030 is significant from an academic perspective within this theoretical framework. Additionally, it would be beneficial to explain how the study of Vision 2030 differs from similar national development policies in other countries, highlighting specific aspects of differentiation. 3. It is recommended that Chapters 3 (Technology as a Catalyst for Transformation) to 6 (Economic Diversification and Sectoral Development) be grouped under a higher-level heading, at a similar level to the Introduction. Alternatively, consideration could be given to making Chapter 2 (Foundational Pillars of Vision 2030) a main section, with Chapters 3 	

Review Form 3

	through 6 as subsections under it. The reason for recommending this restructuring of the manuscript is that Chapters 3 through 6 analyze and present the results of Vision 2030 from the perspective of its four pillars: technology, policy, society and economy. It would be helpful to clearly state this structure in advance, providing a brief explanation before these chapters to inform the reader that the upcoming content will analyze and present the results of Vision 2030 based on these four pillars.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript does not present scientifically groundbreaking discoveries. However, it includes two figures, though it is not immediately clear if they effectively support the author's claims. According to the charts, Saudi Arabia's population growth, investments, and other indicators show a steady upward trend. The author states, 'this plot represents the shift towards a modern, culturally vibrant society, supported by investments and policy reforms under Vision 2030 (page 5).' In my evaluation, the author needs to provide further interpretation and explanation of these graphs. If Vision 2030 has impacted areas like e-health adoption or manufacturing sector output, as the author claims, there should be a noticeable change in trends starting around 2016 or shortly thereafter. For example, the author could interpret the chart (page7) to show infrastructure investment costs doubling within a few years of Vision 2030. Providing more detailed interpretations of the figures, especially explaining changes with 2016 as a turning point, would strengthen the manuscript's claims. This would help the author more clearly and objectively demonstrate the claim that Vision 2030 has significantly impacted Saudi Arabia's economic diversification. Additionally, I recommend investigating and, if relevant, including changes in international indicators that rank or measure competitiveness in terms of technology, economy, policy, and society before and after Saudi Vision 2030. This would offer a clearer understanding of Saudi Arabia's position in these areas compared to other countries and how it has evolved over time.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references in the manuscript are well-organized and sufficient. However, as mentioned in earlier evaluations, national development policies have been widely implemented by many countries, and key theories such as developmental state theory are well-established in this field. Since the manuscript does not incorporate academic research on national development policies or theories like developmental state theory, it leans more towards a technical report or policy document. The conclusion also primarily offers recommendations for the success of Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030, rather than focusing on its academic significance. A more in-depth literature review on theories related to national development policy would enhance the manuscript. This addition would provide valuable insights for policymakers developing future national strategies and contribute meaningful academic analysis regarding Vision 2030. And here is the reference the author can start; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Haggard S. Developmental States. Cambridge University Press.; 2018 2. Amsden, Alice Hoffenberg. 1992. Asia's next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization. Oxford University Press on Demand. 3. Johnson, Chalmers. 1982. Miti and the Japanese Miracle: The growth of Industrial Policy, 1925-1975. Reprint edition. Stanford, Calif: Stafdord University Press. 	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, concise, and well-structured, using appropriate terminology for academic readers. The manuscript demonstrates a strong command of English and presents ideas logically. Overall, it is well-written for its intended academic audience. However, the terminology and phrases used in the manuscript tend to be somewhat abstract. It would benefit from including more concrete information. For example, the manuscript should specify when the Saudi Arabian General Investment Authority (SAGIA) was established, provide details on what the Nitaqat program and Saudi Green Initiative entail, when they began, as well as the scale of budget and personnel involved. While references are cited, the manuscript should incorporate factual evidence or at least minimal substantiation for the information mentioned. More specifically, on page 4, the statement 'the demographic landscape of Saudi Arabia is undergoing significant changes, with a young population that is rapidly urbanizing' lacks supporting statistical data. Similarly, in the case of projects like The Red Sea and Qiddiya mentioned on page 6, the manuscript should specify what these projects are, when and with what budget they were initiated, their current status, and how they have impacted tourism revenue growth, backed by statistical evidence.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sung Jin Park
Department, University & Country	South Korea