Review of: "Effective Communication in Virtual Project Teams at Children Mission Africa: A Short Communication"

Holger Timinger

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First of all, I would like to thank the authors for this article. Below you will find my feedback. I hope it provides some thoughts that can help further improve the paper.

The **title** focuses on effective communication, while the "Children's Mission Africa" plays no relevant role in the rest of the article. Therefore, the authors may wish to either adjust the title or add more information about this mission and its connection to effective communication and virtual project teams.

The **abstract** seems to be more of an introduction than a true abstract. I would like to know a little more about the research methodology used and a little more detail about the results.

Throughout the article, there are statements without evidence (i.e., references to qualified literature), see the very first sentence of the introduction. In a scientific communication, I would expect some further references that underline the authors' statements. Since some of these statements also serve to justify the research gap, I would encourage authors to carefully add additional references if the statement is crucial to understanding or justifying the research contribution.

The **review of the literature** is rather short, and no methodology for implementation is presented, i.e., which search terms were used or which databases were taken into account. Furthermore, the literature reviewed is quite old. Considering that the pandemic situation has given a boost to virtual project teams since 2020, I would expect more recent literature in this section.

Personally, I really like the use of **case studies** to gain a comprehensive understanding and apply the research findings to a relevant situation. Perhaps the authors can add a note about which case study approach they used. This also applies to data collection. There are excellent documents on how to perform such tasks. It helps the reader understand your approach when it is related to other (well-established) approaches in science.

In addition, the reader may want to know a little more about how the authors chose the interviewees, where and why observations were made, and what documents were considered.

Since the research methodology is only roughly outlined, it is difficult to conclusively evaluate the available **results**. At first glance, they are not surprising, although they are somewhat superficial given a real case study.

This also applies to the **recommendations**. They lack relevant details required to actually follow them in real projects.

For me, the overall topic is interesting and worth taking a closer look at. However, as it stands, I would encourage authors to add additional details to improve the post and help the reader apply your insights.