

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

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article needs some adjustment. Suggested Topic: Effective Project Management Contribution on successful project outcome on Building Sector (define the scope of your review so that it is manageable. The geographical location covered in the study) in India.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The researcher should include the following: 1) The theory 2) The philosophy 3) The study design 4) The target population 4) Sample size 5) Data collection method and analysis 6) The validity of the study 7) The reliability 8) Presentation of the results 9) Findings 10) Conclusion 11) Recommendations The subsections and structure is appropriate but not complete as detailed in item 3 above.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct after a few adjustments to include updated sections.</p> <p>The citations and references are availed. However, some citations are not well formatted to APA format. Any reference more than five years if not theory is not considered current.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Update the abstract. The abstract is supposed to be a short summary that sums up the research. It should summarize the separate sections and outline study's contribution in relation to its conceptual, methodological as well as empirical approaches. It should therefore present all the elements of the study in a highly condensed form including its conclusions/recommendation. Generally okay although unnecessary crowded with statistical values. An abstract requires mere verbal reporting.</p> <p>2. You may use the following structure of the article/Key organization Topic Abstract, 1.0 Introduction, Research problem, Objective of the Study, Scope of the study, Value of the Review</p> <p>2.0 Review of Literature 2.1 Theoretical Review 2.2 Empirical Review 3.0 Methodology - 4.0 Findings/Result 5.0 Conclusion- Summarize your findings. Avoid new arguments 6.0 Recommendations REFERENCES – APA or according to your institution guideline Review the section highlighted in yellow in the main document.</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:	Dorothy Medza Tsuma
Department, University & Country	Management University of Africa, Kenya