

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_119588
Title of the Manuscript:	Leveraging Artificial Intelligence and Strategic Management for Success in Inter/National Projects in US and Beyond
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. While the paper presents various perspectives on AI and social media (SM), it feels more like a blog post rather than a rigorous academic analysis. The author doesn't offer much critical analysis or a strong, original argument. Although it might not be crucial for the scientific community in a strict academic context, it serves well as an educational report for the general audience.</p> <p>2. The title is fitting and effectively summarizes the main idea of the paper.</p> <p>3. The abstract clearly outlines the paper's purpose and conclusions, but it could be more concise. It should directly highlight the key findings and their implications without unnecessary repetition.</p> <p>4. The paper would benefit from a more coherent structure with clear headings and subheadings to guide the reader through the argument. Some sections need better organization to avoid repetition and improve the overall flow.</p> <p>5. The manuscript highlights the significance of AI and SM, but it needs substantial improvements to be scientifically rigorous. It lacks specific analysis and should provide clear steps or guidelines for leveraging AI and SM in project management.</p> <p>6. The references included are sufficient, but their integration into the argument is somewhat weak. The paper needs more critical engagement with the existing literature to strengthen its analysis.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The paper contains several complex sentences that could be simplified to improve readability. There's definitely room for making it easier to understand</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper offers a solid introduction to the role of AI and social media in project success. However, it requires substantial revisions to enhance clarity, structure, and critical analysis.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhuoyue Wang
Department, University & Country	University of California, United States