

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSE_121935
Title of the Manuscript:	An Appraisal of World Bank's Healthcare System Project in Montenegro: International Project Management Perspective
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article examined very well the project objectives, implementation, and outcomes. Author clearly exposed the successes and challenges. Again, the author demonstrates a deep comprehensive of project management concepts and theories, applying them effectively to this study.</p> <p>This article is well-structured and informative with insightful data analysis. Writing was clear and simple with complex concepts simplified and offering insightful lessons for managing complex healthcare projects. It contributions to the field of international project management and healthcare development and the findings will resonate with practitioners and scholars alike.</p> <p>The strength of the article includes; its balanced approach, acknowledging both successes and shortcomings, and providing actionable recommendations for future projects. The author's analysis of stakeholder engagement, leadership, and strategic planning was incredible and commendable. However, I suggest author to possibly include more specific data and statistics to support claims and a further exploration of long-term sustainability and impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "An Appraisal of World Bank's Healthcare System Project in Montenegro: International Project Management Perspective" is clear, descriptive and connects well with the body of the study</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is a good summary of the article; however, the author could improve it by taking notes of the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To consider including a brief statement on the methodology used in the study 2. Specify the key findings and results, rather than just stating that the project had "positive impacts" 3. Author could highlight the main challenges and lessons learned from the project 4 Also author could lay more emphases on the significance and contributions of the study to the field of international project management and healthcare development 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally well-organized and logical. However, it shall need some possible improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author should consider adding as short but insightful introduction to the case study section to provide more context and background information on Montenegro's healthcare system. 2. The results section could be reorganized to more thematic presentation and also separate the presentation of findings from the discussion of implications. 3. Author should consider adding a separate conclusion section to summarize the main findings, implications, and recommendations. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrated scientific correctness through its rigorous analysis of the World Bank's healthcare system project in Montenegro, employing a comprehensive framework that considers multiple factors and stakeholders.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The author's used some established project management concepts and theories, such as stakeholder engagement and strategic planning making the manuscript technical relevant. The Author included relevant data and statistics to support claims and findings which further enhanced the manuscript's scientific robustness. Additionally, the author's consideration of potential challenges and shortfalls demonstrates an intellectual understanding of the project's complexities. Overall, the methodical approach, analysis, and attention to details enhanced manuscript's scientific correctness and technical relevance, making it a valuable contribution to the field of international project management and healthcare development</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references provided are sufficient and cover a range of relevant sources, including academic journals, books, and reports from reputable organizations. However, some references date back to the early 2000s, and author could include some recent sources enhance the manuscript's relevance. Suggestions are as follows:</p> <p>Updated project management frameworks or guidelines from leading organizations (e.g., PMI, WHO) such as: Health Organization (2020). Global Health Expenditure Database. Project Management Institute (2020). A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide). OECD (2020). Healthcare Systems: Efficiency and Policy Settings</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? The language and English quality of the article are generally good, but there are some areas for improvement to make it suitable for scholarly communications:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity: Most of the sentences were clear and concise however few more where wordy which made difficult to follow. Therefore, trying to simplify the language and breaking up long sentences would improve clarity. 2. Precision: Article is more precise though few terms and concepts could be defined more precisely, especially for readers unfamiliar with project management or healthcare development. 3. Consistency: Inconsistent verb tenses, formatting, and punctuation should be corrected for a polished appearance. 4. Academic tone: Though the article had a good structure, it could benefit from a more formal and objective tone, typical of scholarly writing. 5. Grammar and mechanics: Very great grammatic tone but there were some minor spellings, and punctuation should be addressed to maintain credibility. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>I sincerely commend the author's efforts to present a comprehensive analysis of the World Bank's healthcare system project in Montenegro my ensuring the manuscript demonstrates a clear understanding of project management principles and their application in a complex healthcare development context.</p> <p>The author's use of a case study approach provides valuable insights into the project's successes and challenges, offering practical lessons for future initiatives. However, to further enhance the manuscript's impact, a more explicit connections to broader theoretical frameworks and debates in international project management and healthcare development are recommended.</p> <p>Additionally, the author could explore more nuanced discussions around stakeholder engagement, power dynamics, and cultural considerations, which are crucial in international development projects. By addressing these aspects, the manuscript can contribute more significantly to the existing body of knowledge.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-structured. I believe with some revisions, it has the potential to become a valuable resource for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers in the field. I encourage the author to improve the suggested areas.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Matthew Frimpong Antwi
Department, University & Country	from International Telematic University, UNINETTUNO, Italy