

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_111074
Title of the Manuscript:	How Effective Project Management Contributes to Project Success: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Very needed _ for development service health</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Comprehensive, but the method does not yet show the strategy used so the truth is not yet strong</p> <p>Yes, already appropriate</p> <p>yes, but needs a little improvement</p> <p>The number of references used is 54 but they do not use applications and there are 43 which are references from the last 10 years. so that it becomes a good reference</p> <p>The article is well structured but the emphasis on the use of references used has not been mentioned in the methodology. In discussions, discussions should be compared by comparing opinions from outside the references used so that the results are more accurate when the researcher concludes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, enough for readers to understand</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. abstract in detail</p> <p>2. The background is not yet clear as to why this research needs to be carried out</p> <p>3. The methodology seeks to verify the supporting theory</p> <p>4. The depth of the results and discussion in the discussion is not yet visible in comparing the results with other research so that conclusions can be reached</p> <p>5. conclusion, the conclusion is too broad and is more suitable for discussion so that the conclusion cannot be seen either practically or theoretically</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Agus Mursidi
Department, University & Country	University PGRI Banyuwangi, Indonesia