

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

Victor A. Huerta-Francisco

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I thank the authors for sending the manuscript. Below, I review the study based on the "CASP Checklist: 10 questions to help you make sense of Qualitative research."

The aim of the research is unclear, in part because the aim is repeated at least four times in the introduction section. It is repeated a number of gaps in the literature, which it is unclear whether they intend to address each one or why they are mentioned.

In the aim section, list four aims, which it seems to me are partially addressed the barriers and challenges of virtual communication. It does not seem that you've examined communication; it shows a lack of theoretical background like what you mean by "communication" and "effective communication". The work lacks theoretical support, as it does not define key concepts such as "effective communication," "virtual project teams," among others. Referring to the phenomenon of virtual communication, you should refer to the field of "Internet studies"; however, there's no reference to the field of study in any section of the manuscript.

The qualitative research paradigm seems adequate for this work; however, it does not provide a theoretical background that defines what is understood by qualitative research.

In the section on study participants, the term "sample" is used. In qualitative research, participants are not considered a "sample," as in the quantitative paradigm. People who joined the study are participants. Also, ¿how many participants were there in the research? The authors do not specify. It is mentioned by the authors that narrative analysis was used, but ¿based on which author did they do it?

From the information provided in the methodological section, it is not possible to know if the design was adequate and supports the study. There is a lack of information for the reader.

Likewise, it is not indicated which technique was used to select the participants, although the social actors included are mentioned. It is necessary to be more precise.

The data collection techniques mentioned include interviews, but ¿what type of interviews were used?, ¿were interviews audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis? In addition, no quotes from the participants are recovered in the results section, which makes me wonder ¿what was the purpose of the interviews if you don't recover them?

Considering the relationship between the researcher and the participants is a debate of the qualitative paradigm. To

consider the figure of the researcher within a social space in which research is conducted, but at the same time, you been observed by social actors. This work shows poor reflexivity on the role of the researcher in the field of study.

Some ethical considerations are mentioned, but in this study, specifically, what ethical considerations were followed? This is something authors do not specify.

The information collected by the authors is shown with not much rigor, coherence, and clarity to the reader. Parts of sections are repeated several times, such as the aims, which become disjointed. Similarly, the problem statement is not developed.

The findings can be considered partial and unconnected with reality, due to the lack of epistemic, methodological, and theoretical support. I recommend the authors to reformulate the problem statement. The work seems to me like it could be focused on cultural differences and work in virtual teams.

Authors make statements that lack support throughout the manuscript. Every time authors make a statement, it should be supported with empirical evidence (citations). I recommend caution to the authors because if the original ideas of other authors are not cited, you may be practicing plagiarism.

The authors' findings and conclusions lack empirical, theoretical, and epistemic support. Therefore, the findings may be considered partial and unconnected with reality. I recommend the rejection of the article.

I enlist some references for the authors for their consideration in the empirical and theoretical support:

<https://doi.org/10.1163/156916207X234293> ; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2022.09.135> ;

<https://doi.org/10.1162/dmal.9780262562324.123> ; <https://doi.org/0.2196/jmir.1030>