

**Paper: “A Systematic Review of Green Recovery Model for Forest and Farm Producer Organizations in Vietnam Post-Natural Disasters”**

**Submitted: 03 November 2024**

**Accepted: 15 April 2025**

**Published: 30 April 2025**

Corresponding Author: Hong Hai Pham

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n12p33

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Xrysa Kapartziani

National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

Reviewer 2: Nebnoma Romaric Tiendrebeogo

Nazi Boni University, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Yes

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes, need minor revision

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The article provides a well-organized and methodologically robust framework on green recovery, with clear relevance to current environmental policy and sustainable development discourse. I recommend acceptance with minor correction. Can you check the wording with AI detection software?

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Generally reflects the content of the article, but can be optimized to better highlight certain key aspects. The title mentions a "theoretical framework", but the article focuses on a systematic analysis of the literature. More precise wording would better reflect the methodology used. The title is somewhat long and could be simplified while retaining the essential information.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The summary is clear, structured, and well-informed (Clarity of purpose and methodology, well-articulated results, practical application). However, it could be slightly improved in terms of conciseness and precision: It is dense and could be summarised to get straight to the point. For example, the detailed explanation of databases or specific studies could be shortened.

Future prospects and limitations of the study are often more appropriate in the conclusion of the article, where they can be developed in more detail. In the abstract, limit yourself to the practical perspective and the five pillars of the green recovery model. In the conclusion, go into more detail about the avenues of research, specifying which aspects require further investigation.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Overall, good.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Well structured and clearly describes the systematic literature review process. It follows a rigorous approach and spells out the analysis stages. It could be further improved to enhance the clarity, precision, and methodological consistency of the review. I would suggest justify why only 40 articles were selected: is this a threshold determined by data saturation or a compromise between quality and feasibility? Was there a timeframe (e.g., articles published between 2010 and 2024) to ensure temporal relevance?

How were the analytical categories constructed: was it an inductive approach (emergence of themes) or a deductive approach (based on a pre-established framework)?

How did you deal with discrepancies between the results of the studies, if any?

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Overall, good.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Your conclusion is clear and well-structured, highlighting the pillars of the green recovery model. It would be made more effective by prioritising the recommendations according to a sequential framework (short, medium, and long term) and by strengthening the argument on the role of government in regulation and financial incentives. It would also be useful to acknowledge the potential constraints (cost of green technologies, limited access to infrastructure) and to open the discussion on research perspectives, in particular, the evaluation of the impact of the green recovery model on climate resilience and social justice. Finally, simplifying certain long sentences and reducing repetition will improve the clarity and overall impact of the text.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Overall, good.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The term "green recovery" is mentioned at the beginning of the paper, but it's not defined until the research review; it would benefit from a more precise definition (a short one) at the outset to avoid any ambiguity.

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

yes

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes, the Abstract includes the objectives, methods, and results, but a few adjustments in structure and phrasing will make these elements more clear, concise, and academically aligned. (ie Right now, the conclusion blends into the final recommendation. Instead, close with a clear implication or next step.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes, overall your article is well-written and coherent, but there are a few minor grammatical errors and stylistic inconsistencies that should be corrected before submission to a journal. These are not major, but addressing them will greatly enhance clarity, flow, and professionalism. ( i.e The destruction caused by Typhoon Yagi (Typhoon No. 3) serves as a prime example..."

Improved: "Typhoon Yagi (Typhoon No. 3) serves as a prominent example of the escalating impact of climate-related disasters..."

("Prime example" is slightly informal in academic writing.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, the study methods in your paper are clearly explained, especially given that your work is based on a systematic literature review. However, there are a few areas where clarity, detail, and academic presentation could be enhanced to meet the expectations of peer-reviewed journals (i.e In Phase 3, you say documents were "analyzed in detail and categorized," but how exactly?

Did you use thematic coding, content analysis, or matrix mapping?

Were categories predefined or emergent?

Justify Sample Size You selected 40 articles—which seems reasonable—but a sentence justifying this number (e.g., saturation reached, thematic diversity achieved, etc.) would be helpful.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of your paper is generally clear, coherent, and well-organized, but it does contain some minor grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and stylistic issues that should be corrected to meet the standards of academic publication.

These are not major or structural problems, but polishing them will greatly enhance clarity, professionalism, and readability.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

To make the conclusion more concise, impactful, and academically polished, consider the following refinements:

1. Avoid Repetition

Some points are repeated from earlier sections almost verbatim (e.g., reuse of by-products, green technology, eco-certification). In a conclusion, restate ideas more succinctly rather than revisiting full explanations.

Example:

"FFPOs can reuse by-products in production to create added value and minimize resource waste..."

→ Instead:

“Encouraging FFPOs to adopt circular practices will enhance both environmental sustainability and economic value creation.”

## 2. Group Similar Recommendations

You can streamline by grouping recommendations under themes:

Policy and Financial Support

Technological Adoption

Community and Market Integration

This helps avoid a list-like format and creates logical flow.

## 3. End with a Strong, Scholarly Final Sentence

Your last sentence is a bit general:

"...thereby contributing to the nation's sustainable development."

Consider ending with a more academic reflection, such as:

“As Vietnam navigates an era of increasing environmental uncertainty, this green recovery framework offers a structured path for integrating resilience, equity, and sustainability into rural development policy.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes, your reference list is comprehensive, appropriate, and well-aligned with the content of your paper.

While your sources are strong, adding one or two very recent articles from 2023–2024 (especially in academic journals) can show the reviewer that your research is up-to-date and aligned with the latest discourse.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

## **Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper titled “Theoretical Framework for the Green Recovery Model for Forest and Farm Producer Organizations in Vietnam Post-Natural Disasters: Towards Sustainable Development and Resilience Enhancement” is a timely and relevant contribution to the discourse on sustainable development, especially in the context of climate change and post-disaster recovery. It is well-structured and clearly outlines the rationale, objectives, and implications of a green recovery model tailored to forest and farm producer organizations (FFPOs) in Vietnam. The logical flow from abstract to conclusion is coherent, and the integration of case studies and international experiences is commendable.

However, to enhance the paper’s academic rigor and improve its suitability for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, several areas can be strengthened. Firstly, while the structure is clear, Section 4 (“Results and Discussion”) would greatly benefit from subdivision with specific subheadings such as Natural Resource Management, Global Policy Lessons, Role of FFPOs, Technological Innovation, and Implications for Vietnam. This would not only enhance readability but also underscore the analytical contributions of each section.

The theoretical underpinnings of the green recovery model are solid but require further elaboration. The five pillars—sustainable natural resource management, green economic policy, technological innovation, community participation, and circular economy—are logical and well-justified. However, the paper would be significantly strengthened by visually representing the framework in a figure or conceptual diagram. A table summarizing each pillar, along with associated strategies and international examples, would also clarify the model for readers and improve comprehension.

The paper presents a useful synthesis of the literature, drawing on over 40 high-quality sources. The use of Jesson et al.’s (2011) methodology for the literature review provides a sound basis for secondary research. To meet academic expectations for systematic reviews, the paper should include a summary table of selected studies, showing key details such as author, year, geographical focus, methodology, and relevance to green recovery. Inclusion of a PRISMA flow diagram would further strengthen the transparency and reproducibility of the literature selection process. Furthermore, the paper could benefit from a deeper level of critical engagement with the reviewed literature. Rather than primarily summarizing international case studies and policies, the author is encouraged to analyze contradictions, policy gaps, or challenges highlighted by the literature. For instance, where some studies suggest that green recovery simultaneously achieves both economic revitalization and environmental goals, others may question whether trade-offs exist—this tension should be explored. Clarifying whether the theoretical framework was developed deductively from existing theory or inductively through empirical synthesis would also help position the paper within academic paradigms.

In terms of writing style, the paper maintains a professional tone, but some grammatical refinements and clearer sentence structures would improve readability. Sentences such as “This model not only aims to restore production but also combines sustainable economic development...” can be improved by restructuring: “This model aims not only to restore production but also to integrate sustainable economic development, environmental protection, and resilience.” The paper occasionally

repeats similar phrases (e.g., “This study shows that...” or “According to research by...”), and varying these expressions would enhance flow and maintain reader engagement.

The references are comprehensive and well-chosen, but consistency in in-text citations and bibliographic formatting should be checked carefully. It is advisable to standardize citation style throughout the text (APA, Harvard, etc.) as required by the target journal. Ensure that all cited works appear in the reference list and that no references are included that are not cited in the main text.

To further enhance the academic merit of the paper, it is recommended to include a brief section on limitations of the study. Since the paper is based on secondary data and literature, limitations such as publication bias, the scope of databases searched, or language restrictions could be acknowledged. Additionally, a dedicated Future Research Agenda would be a valuable addition. This could outline the need for empirical validation of the proposed framework, comparative studies across regions, or case studies testing the model's effectiveness in different socio-economic contexts within Vietnam.

Given the focus on Vietnam, the paper should also more explicitly align its proposed model with Vietnam’s national policy frameworks, such as the National Green Growth Strategy or specific post-disaster recovery programs. Although there is mention of Resolution No. 143/NQ-CP, elaborating on how the proposed model can operationalize or complement this policy would strengthen the policy relevance and application of the research.

Moreover, the role of FFPOs is well-articulated, but additional attention to gender, youth, and ethnic minority inclusion within these organizations would address critical dimensions of equity and social resilience. Integrating such intersectional perspectives would enrich the model and align with current sustainability research priorities.

In summary, this paper offers an important conceptual contribution to the field of green recovery and sustainable development. With revisions to clarify structure, enhance theoretical grounding, and strengthen methodological transparency, the paper will be well-positioned for publication in a reputable academic journal. Suggested improvements include: refining the literature review presentation, deepening critical analysis, adding visual elements (tables or models), improving grammar and syntax, addressing limitations, and providing a roadmap for future research. Additionally, highlighting the model’s applicability within Vietnam’s institutional and policy landscape will further elevate the paper’s impact.

-----