

Review of: "An experience of global higher education and university autonomy in Viet Nam: A case study of Ton Duc Thang University in Ho Chi Minh City"

Emilia Rahnemay Kohlman Rabbani¹

¹ Universidade de Pernambuco

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors

Your work presents a theme that is interesting and relevant for the academic community. The account of these experiences in Vietnam aroused our curiosity and this contributed to the fluidity of the reading. Below we point out some suggestions could improve the current version and contribute to the exchange of knowledge and the strengthening of the scientific community.

Below are our suggestions.

1. The objectives and methodology could be better structured. This also would reflect in the discussion and results sections of the paper. Starting with an abstract that does not present clearly the objective and methodology and conclusions (the main results are presented). The same occurs in the development of the body of the paper, making the logical sequencing of a scientific production difficult. Nothing prevents the text from being better organized and the objectives and methodologies from being well-defined, which will be a very important step in improving the paper.
2. Despite having read the paper with a certain fluidity due to the curiosity aroused by its title, at some points the text suffered from failure in its organization of thought, that is, the story was not told in a linear fashion. This becomes clear in chapter 2, where the characterization of the case study is mixed with testimonials (it would be useful to know what kind of questionnaire was used, with how many people were surveyed, when it was applied, if it was approved by the Ethical Committee...). The authors suddenly introduce "In a survey, a staff summarized the experience as followed" without the methodological approach used to gather the information presented in the article.
3. We agree with the other reviewer's suggestion regarding the arrangement of the data in Table 1, which could be presented also in percentages. Our suggestion is to keep the information and add the percentage for each item in parentheses for example.
4. Regarding the text itself, we suggest that the paper be reviewed by a native English speaker.

In general, we suggest the authors better define the objectives and better describe the methodology used to collect the information and make the surveys, so the writing can be more consistent and well-founded text, because these two

elements facilitate the structuring of the entire methodological approach.

In short, you have gathered a great material, and has explored an important theme for the academic universe. I hope this is helpful and I look forward to reading the new version.

Emilia Kohlman Rabbani, Ph.D. and Full Professor at UPE and Maria Cristina Alves de Lima, master student at UPE