

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_120949
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Analysis of Traditional versus Agile Project Management Methodologies on IT Project Outcomes
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>
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.	The manuscript makes substantial contribution to the body of knowledge on agile project management approaches. There is evidence of good background information on current trends on agile project management. The findings as presented clearly bring out the gist of the paper.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but a bit too long. There is need to re-organise it so that the flow of information is sequenced as it is in the article	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	There is a good attempt to bring out the statement of the problem. The presentation of findings and subsequent analysis and interpretation is adequate hence making the manuscript technically sound. The article is flowing logically	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is need to check on tenses especially in the methodology section to reflect a report	
Optional/General comments	The author introduces a blended approach in the discussion section against the clear findings that the agile technique is better	

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:	Robert Kati
Department, University & Country	Kibabii University, Kenya