

# Review of: "Contrasting Construction and Business Projects: Implications for Project Management Techniques"

Farooq Ali<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Oulu

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The research phenomenon discussed in this article is both interesting and relevant. However, there are several serious shortcomings that need to be addressed. As a reviewer, I will focus on these deficiencies in my review.

## Abstract

I conducted a Scopus search and found 3,373 scientific articles related to your research phenomenon. Among these articles is '**Cross-functional collaboration in the early phases of capital projects: Barriers and contributing factors**' recently published in Project Leadership and Society. Your statement that '*contrasting different kinds of projects has not been found in extant literature, hence there are few references*' is misleading. Additionally, it is unclear which research methodology you employed. It's evident that the paper lacks a review of the literature directly related to the research phenomenon.

The abstract should outline your article's objective, detail your research approach, highlight key findings, and present practical implications. Aim to define each element with two to three sentences.

## 1. Introduction and Purpose

The introduction begins with the statement, '*very little of this paper is based on hard research. Most of it comes from the author's many years of experience covering mainly business and IT projects, but also some construction.*' This statement implies that the paper is primarily rooted in your personal perspective. My concern is how you addressed potential personal bias. In academia, researchers' personal perspectives generally hold no or very little value.

Please be aware that the Introduction serves to validate the importance of the topic and link your work to prior research. It's crucial to structure the Introduction as a logical funnel, starting with broader aspects and gradually progressing to more specific details, paragraph by paragraph. Utilize published literature, such as journal articles and books, preferably recent ones, to support your arguments. The article's objective or purpose should be expressed at the end, addressing the research problem, and presenting related research questions. Additionally, a brief overview of the adopted research methodology to address these questions should follow.

Both the Abstract and Introduction sections exhibit a significant flaw in that they lack information about the research approach and methodology used in this study. Additionally, the entire article lacks a dedicated Methodology section.

An article typically comprises the following sections and components:

1. Title
2. Abstract
3. Introduction
4. Theory/Literature Review
5. Research Method/Process
6. Results
7. Conclusions

Numerous writing guides offer advice on structuring proposed articles. For instance, the widely recognized IMRAD (Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion) structure. While the terminology might vary slightly—such as the integration of the literature review into the Introduction in the IMRAD scheme—the above list presents the literature review as a separate section.

I would rather stop my review here and ask you to consider the above comments, as these will/should probably result in more or less updating the remaining sections!

I hope that these, quite critical (sorry!), remarks are of help to you when revising your manuscript.