

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

Susana Silva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade de Coimbra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I read the article **"Ancient Houses in Ben Tre City: A Multifaceted Approach to Preserve Artistic Architectural Heritage and Boost Local Tourism"** with great interest. This subject is current and relevant, given the increasing need to preserve rich cultural heritage, which, in many cases, serves as crucial elements in constructing the memory and identity of territories. Additionally, it is essential to diversify tourist offerings to meet the demands of current trends and contribute to the sustainable development of places.

However, some points need attention:

1. Abstract: The study's purpose and the methodology employed to achieve the proposed objectives are not clearly presented. Also, some of the study's achievements should be summarized in this section.
2. Introduction: The introduction is missing.
3. The study lacks a theoretical background to support its findings. The relevance of the topic warrants a literature review section covering city historical/cultural heritage, programs, and policies for heritage preservation, the role of tourism in heritage preservation, and heritage's contribution to promoting sustainable local tourism. Additionally, consider including cases of good practices regarding historic houses.
4. Point 2: In the statement "The ancient house located in the center of Ben Tre, according to public opinion, is about to be demolished", a scientific article should not be based on an assumption. Authors should verify with relevant authorities whether the houses will be demolished.
5. Point 3.2.: Was an interview conducted? Is this the methodology used? Clarify the research methodology employed in this work. The reference to Nguyen Thi Hau and then Bui Hoai Son is confusing. Who is Bui Hoai Son - another interviewee?
6. Point 4: The discussion section is too short. Expand this section to include a dialogue between previous research and the obtained results.
7. Conclusion section: Summarize the main contributions of this research, explain practical implications, and highlight the main limitations of the study.
8. References: Improve the reference list.
9. Carefully proofread the entire text for translation and formatting issues, including sentence structure, incomplete sentences, and punctuation.

10. The references are not being used correctly in the article.
11. This article requires substantial revision.