

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_129863
Title of the Manuscript:	China's Belt and Road Initiative: A Strategic Tool for Soft Power Projection
Type of the Article	Review 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article called China's Belt and Road Initiative: A Strategic Tool for Soft Power Projection is really important for people who read the Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies because its about something a lot of readers care about.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title China's Belt and Road Initiative: A Strategic Tool for Soft Power Projection does a great job of showing what the research is about and what it aims to do, without any confusion. It makes the article clear and on point.	
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 gives you a quick snapshot of what the article is about. It tells you the main points, why the article was written, and where its coming from, all in a few short sentences.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Deliberately crafted and skilfully executed, the research methods described in the article showcase a meticulous understanding of the topic. The methodology offers a comprehensive explanation of the procedures and tools employed, ensuring the validity and reliability of the research. Ethical considerations are explicitly acknowledged, indicating the proper adherence to protocols. All in all, the research methods seem sound and appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The article concludes with an extensive reference list that allows readers to validate information, thus bolstering credibility and supporting additional research.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article uses English pretty well. It's written in a way that is easy to understand and clear. I didn't find any big grammar or sentence mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	The articles conclusion showcases the authors synthesis of the content effectively, with accuracy, strong support, and coherence.	

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:	Abhiram Reddy Anireddy
Department, University & Country	United States of America