

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127677
Title of the Manuscript:	PROJECT MANAGER COMPETENCY ON PROJECT SUCCESS IN THE CONCEPT OF SCOPING REVIEW: CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PERSPECTIVE OF PT. MMS GRUP
Type of the Article	Academic

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>

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is academically significant for the scientific community because it examines the relationship between project manager competency and project success, which is a critical aspect of effective project management in the construction industry. By synthesizing existing literature through a scoping review, it laid a solid foundation for future studies to address the related issues. The findings contribute to the understanding of key competencies that influence project outcomes, offering valuable insights for both academia and industry.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but it could be more concise. One suggested topic could be: Project Manager Competency and Its Impact on Project Success: A Scoping Review from the Perspective of PT. MMS Group's Construction Projects	

Review Form 3

<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>Yes, but more effort needs to be taken to improve its quality. Comments: This abstract provides an overview of a scoping review that investigates the influence of project manager competency on construction project success. However, it has some strengths and areas for improvement. Its strengths include a clear purpose (focusing on mapping existing studies in this specific area), a well-structured methodology, a carefully-chosen time span coverage (2015-2014), a clear conclusion indicating most studies support the influence of project manager competency on project success. It is also obvious that there are areas for improvement. For instance, the claim attributed to Sonelma and Sucita (2022) challenges the consensus but is presented without elaboration. Furthermore, despite the fact that "most studies acknowledge" the competency-success relationship, there is no quantitative summary or categorization of findings (e.g., percentages, types of competencies studied). This weakens the persuasiveness of the conclusion. No research gaps have been clearly mentioned. The research question is not presented. There are also a few minor grammar issues. For example, the phrase "as has been claimed by Sonelma and Sucita (2022) that the project manager's competence does not affect the success of a construction project" is poorly constructed. It would benefit from proper spacing, clearer attribution, and rephrasing for better readability. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a summary of the key competencies studied and how they are linked to project success. • Include an explicit discussion of gaps in the literature and recommendations for future research. • Address the dissenting claim by Sonelma and Sucita (2022) in greater depth to provide a balanced perspective. • Ensure proper proofreading to improve readability and grammatical correctness. Overall, while the abstract establishes a clear foundation for the scoping review, refining its details and addressing its gaps will strengthen its contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, but it must strictly follow the latest APA style.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, it is. But the author needs to take greater effort to improve its quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Specific comments have been provided following each section of the manuscript. Please see the manuscript for my detailed comments.</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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jinyue Wang</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators, China</p>