

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Kien, P. T., Shmelevqa, E., Quan, B. V., Thuy, L. T. G., Khanh, M. Q., Tinh, T. T., & Trang, N. T. (2026). A comparative study of autonomous university governance models and implications for Vietnam. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026022. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20918>



| Submitted: 05/01/2026
| Revisions required: 12/01/2026
| Approved: 14/02/2026
| Published: 30/03/206

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

REVIEW FORM

Article title: A comparative study of autonomous university governance models and implications in Vietnam

A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION
Sequential and logical sequencing of the content of scientific ideas.
1. Does the article contain original ideas that have not yet been presented on the subject?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Does the introduction make the research topic clear, present the studies that have addressed the problem or similar research and point out the gap that the research covers/justification for the research?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Does the introduction make it clear what the research question is or the hypotheses (if applicable) and are the general and/or specific objectives in line with the research question?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Is the theoretical framework presented in sufficient quantity and quality for the research construct and are the ideas presented in sufficient depth for the study in question?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. Does the theoretical framework presented include classic authors in the field who are still relevant to the discussion, and does it also include work from the last five years?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
13. Do the conclusions present authorial closure without repeating previous parts of the article and pointing out the limitations of the research itself and future research?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Reviewer's comments on the cognitive dimension.
-
B. METHODOLOGICAL DIMENSION
Precise description of the methods and techniques used.
1. Does the title specify the content of the work more generally and the subtitle (if there is one) is a technical title more related to the topic? Another possible approach is when the title refers to the theoretical object and the subtitle to the empirical object.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No

5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
7. If the research involves human beings, have the procedures carried out to comply with research ethics guidelines been described or the approval number of the work by the research ethics committee indicated?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
Reviewer's comments on the methodological dimension.
-
C. AESTHETIC DIMENSION
Writing, form and normalization.
1. Are the rules observed with regard to citations (ABNT 10520 - 2023), references (ABNT 6023 - 2018), presentation of illustrations and tables (title and source)?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the text show correct accentuation and typing of words; nominal and verbal agreement; correct arrangement of words and connection between sentences or paragraphs (cohesion); logical relationship of the ideas presented (coherence); avoid repetition in the text of what is already written in the illustrations and tables?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No
Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension
-
Recommendation
<input type="checkbox"/> Accept <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept with mandatory corrections <input type="checkbox"/> Submit again for evaluation

Submit to another journal

Reject

The reviews will be published without the identity of the reviewer, in accordance with the principles of Open Science. The reviewer must state whether he/she authorizes the publication of the review with his/her identity or authorizes it without his/her identity.

Once the reviewer agrees to the review, the review will be published without their identity. If the reviewer wishes to authorize their identification, please inform it in response to the review request.

Reviewer's opinion/ Comments

- The text presents a very interesting debate on university management methods and autonomy, conducting a comparative study of various countries and universities considering different forms of university administration. While highlighting the positive and negative aspects of these systems, it maintains the idea that it is not possible to simply import one or the other, but it is necessary to study them in order to develop a model appropriate to the context in which it is to be implemented. This topic is of great relevance to the entire university context, which is always under pressure from the various factors presented in the work.

That said, I would like to point out that the text is not complete, as noted below, hence the recommendation that it be resubmitted for evaluation.

- The work does not have a written conclusion.

- The abstract should be no longer than 150 words and should include a presentation of the topic, bibliographic relevance, methodology, presentation of discussions/analyses, and a brief summary of the conclusions.

- I would also like to point out a minor analytical inconsistency, as the tuition-dependent financing method was considered differently in two separate analyses: positive when referring to the University of the United States and not so attractive when considering the University of Thailand. I believe this may be a valid analysis given the different contexts of these universities, but as it was not specified that this difference is based on context, it becomes an inconsistency when the same point is seen as both negative and positive.

List of mandatory corrections

- Write conclusion
- Rewrite the summary according to the specifications in this opinion.

Publication of the opinion, according to Open Science standards

- I authorize publication without the name of the reviewer
- I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer
- I authorize publication with the name of the reviewer, being aware that the journals of Editora Ibero-Americana, it is mandatory to.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação
Review, formatting, standardization, and Translation

