

Review of: "Ancient Houses in Ben Tre City: A Multifaceted Approach to Preserve Artistic Architectural Heritage and Boost Local Tourism"

Rachel Chan Suet Kay¹

¹ Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article addresses a very important topic, that of preserving cultural heritage in the advent of development in cities, which adds aesthetic value to cities as well as being capable of supporting tourism initiatives, in tandem with SDG 11, Sustainable Cities and Communities, and UN-Habitat's goals.

The premise of the paper focuses on an interesting case study.

However, I believe that the article would benefit from being more polished in the sense of:

1. Complete sentences (for example, where paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 end with ellipses [...], suggesting there is more to the sentences)
2. While the researchers of this case study have made a notable effort, it is not necessary to mention the exact progress report status update such as "Research groups in Ben Tre have sent two research articles in Vietnamese and English to two national and international academic forums, which have attracted the attention and discussion of domestic and foreign scholars."
3. It also appears that many factual statements are made without sufficient citations from academic literature or other resources.
4. The article's paragraphs resemble point forms. The flow is somewhat non sequitur but more like a list.
5. Sections 1 and 2 could be better off collapsed together into one succinct Introduction section. Issues could then be raised under the following section such as a Problem Statement section. This is preferable to having a title such as "2. About the Old House in the Center of Ben Tre City That Is About to Be Demolished."
6. Section " 3.2. From experts on public opinion: The French public office building if demolished" – My query is, is this supposed to be the findings from the research? Or part of the literature review? This is then followed by the "author's opinion." Again, this article would benefit from following the IMRAD sequence, even if loosely.
7. The entire Discussion section is too short.

These are my opinions on how the paper could be significantly improved in terms of narrative, argumentative quality, and



readability.