

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 4.07.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF MONITORING TECHNIQUES ON PROJECT PERFORMANCE OF KENYAN STATE CORPORATIONS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27.07.2017, 0727/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Title is promising, but the content do not fully reflect the title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Abstract reflects the issue.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Sometimes a sentence starts with a small letter, two or three words are not separated	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Study methods are explained too much clearly. It seems sometimes that the paper is about methods	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The body of the paper should be divided for Introduction, Literature Review, Research and Data, Result and Conclusions. There are too many points. The Table 4 is without comments in the text, This table title should be different as well, since there are statements related to the monitoring technics, not the monitoring techniques in themselves	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The problem is that the goal and hypothesis is not problematic. Monitoring must influence the performance, the question is – is it a positive or negative influence, and it depends on the performance measure that is not specified in the presented research.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>The references are poor. Authors should analyze more papers related to the project management.</i> <i>Suggestions</i> Al-Jibouri, S. H. (2003). Monitoring systems and their effectiveness for project cost control in construction. <i>International Journal of Project Management</i> , 21(2), 145-154. Crawford, P., & Bryce, P. (2003). Project monitoring and evaluation: a method for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. <i>International journal of project management</i> , 21(5), 363-373. Fleming, Q. W., & Koppelman, J. M. (2016, December). Earned value project management. Project Management Institute. Dvir, D., Raz, T., & Shenhar, A. J. (2003). An empirical analysis of the relationship between project planning and project success. <i>International journal of project management</i> , 21(2), 89-95. Wholey, J. S., & Hatry, H. P. (1992). The case for performance monitoring. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 604-610. Turner, R., Zolin, R., & Remington, K. (2009). Monitoring the performance of complex projects from multiple perspectives over multiple time frames. In <i>Proceedings of the 9th International Research Network of Project Management Conference</i> . IRNOP.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the Literature Project Management Institute (PMI) Project Management Body of Knowledge should be mentioned as a basic methodology with precise definitions of project management stages: initiation, planning, executing, monitoring and closing while managing: scope, time, costs, resources, communication, risk, quality and procurement with techniques that are specified. It is difficult to write about project management without PMI standards.

What program was used for the statistical analysis?

I do not understand the statement : Monitoring techniques have a positive and significant influence on the project performance. What do authors mean by project performance? It is obvious that monitoring as a task must influence the performance of something that monitoring is a part of.

There is another statement: Additionally, monitoring techniques are instrumental in enhancing project success. What is project success?

If the hypothesis is going to be verified than both monitoring and project performance should be clearly defined.

In what way do the findings presented in the paper can influence the market?

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: