

OPINION A

How to reference this paper:

Yen, N. H. (2026). Teaching student's lifestyle, emphasizing Ho Chi Minh's thoughts to increase social responsibility. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp1), e026030. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp1.20940>



| Submitted: 05/01/2026

| Revisions required: 22/01/2026

| Approved: 10/02/2026

| Published: 30/03/2026

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

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

REVIEW FORM

Article title: Teaching student's lifestyle, emphasizing Ho Chi Minh's Thoughts to increase social responsibility

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?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
2. Is the topic important to the context in which it is inserted?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ 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?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ 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?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
5. Is the theoretical framework relevant to the topic and in line with the objectives set?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ 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?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ 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?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
8. Are the results consistent with the aim of the research, the theoretical framework and the methodology?

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
9. Is the data calculated correctly and do the results show that there is no fabrication or falsification of data?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
10. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the theoretical framework?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
11. Do the discussions correlate coherently with the results presented?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
12. Do the conclusions provide an answer to the research question and objectives?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ 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?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ 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.
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
2. Does the abstract present the objective, methodology, results and conclusions in a way that is coherent with the work?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
3. Is the choice of keywords in line with the content of the article and the field?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No
4. Is the objective clearly written?
☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

5. Is the methodology detailed, characterized and does it explain how data will be collected (if applicable) and analyzed?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No
6. Is the methodology coherent with the theory and consistent with the results?
☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ 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?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ 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)?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ 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?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
3. Are the illustrations (graphs, charts, images, figures, maps) and tables of adequate size and legibility for reading?
☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☒ No
Reviewer's comments on the aesthetic dimension
-
Recommendation
☐ Accept ☒ Accept with mandatory corrections ☐ 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 paper addresses a very interesting topic and offers a current perspective, combining classical studies with issues that affect life today, thus appropriately comparing what was written in the past with various new challenges that did not yet exist, which leads to a very interesting analysis to be developed. However, the article has some serious problems that need to be resolved before it can be recommended for publication. I reiterate that it is an interesting topic with great potential, but the text needs to be better developed so that the reader can fully understand what has been worked on.
- The text mentions, using an extensive bibliography on different lifestyles, something that was still in line with the proposal of the work, dozens of lifestyles, but it is not specified which of these will be worked on or even how these ideas will be cross-referenced with the proposals that will be presented. Some of these concepts can be seen later in the questions asked to obtain data, but there is still no indication of why they were selected or why so many were mentioned and not used.
- In data analysis, as presented, it is impossible to validate what is being presented in many cases, as only a fraction of the data is provided without the total values being known. In some cases, the data presented even contradicts what has been written, invalidating the analysis (for example, in the excerpt: "The market mechanism has a positive impact on students' lifestyle: 34% agreed, 9% disagreed, the data shows that the majority of students perceive the impact of the market mechanism from a negative perspective," this is the only information provided on this point; there is no mention of what type of measurements were used, no mention of 67% of the data, and based on

what was presented, what is stated by the authors is directly opposite to what is shown in the data presented).

- The work also has significant writing issues that make it quite difficult to read and understand. I believe these are translation issues, but it needs a very detailed review and proofreading to avoid confusion when presented.

List of mandatory corrections

-

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

