

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript has the importance because it is directly related the healthcare condition of the country. Authors put effort to dig out the application and benefits of the project which are directly beneficial for the public. Few articles attract the attention of researchers in this type of article. This will help the future projects during the feasibility and implementation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the manuscript should be like this: A critical analysis and appraisal of the world Bank Project of Healthcare System in Montenegro: An International Project Management Perspective.	
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.	Authors discuss the analytical techniques and secondary data. But they didn't discuss in the abstract from where they get secondary data means source of the data.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is appealing for the upcoming researchers of project management. This manuscript is the president for the implementation of the same nature of projects in order to save the resource. This paper is technically sound because it is an appraisal base paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but older than 2015 should be updated.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Adequate.	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umair Tufail
Department, University & Country	Danish Allied Health Institute, Pakistan