

Conference
**6th International Scientific Conference on Project Management in the Baltic Countries
 2017**

SCIENTIFIC REVIEW FORM

<i>TITLE OF PAPER</i>

ITEMS	ASSESSMENT	COMMENTS
Scientific Review		
Does paper contributes to the project management discipline?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Are the specific aims and corresponding hypotheses, problem formulation clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Has an appropriate literature search been performed such that that the rationale for the study has been adequately presented?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Is the question or hypothesis being tested providing important knowledge to the field?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Are there adequate preliminary data in the literature (or from the investigator) to justify the research?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does paper achieves quality of the organization (logical flow) and the quality of the communication (readability, clarity, grammar)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does paper research design, including sampling, data collection and appropriate data analysis (if applicable)?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Are the proposed tests or measurements appropriate to answer the scientific questions?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does quality of conclusions and recommendations (implications and suggestions for further research) complies with paper content?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Does paper have high probability to stimulate (scientific and practical) debate at the conference?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	

Reviewer's overall assessment

Please check one of the following:

- Paper is acceptable for publishing in its present format.
- Paper is acceptable for publishing with minor corrections
- Paper is NOT acceptable for the publishing

Reviewer's other comments/questions

SECTION TWO - REVISED SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

Reviewer's assessment

Please check one of the following:

- All scientific review issues and comments have been satisfactorily resolved.
- Some scientific review issues have **not** been satisfactorily resolved. Author/s must do corrections for disputing the reviewer's recommendations.

Unresolved Issues

General Instructions for Reviewers

Make sure the article you have been asked to review truly matches your expertise

The project coordinator who has approached you may not know your work intimately, and may only be aware of your work in a broader context. Only accept an invitation if you are competent to review the article.

Avoid a potential conflict of interest

A conflict of interest will not necessarily eliminate you from reviewing an article, but full disclosure to the editor will allow them to make an informed decision. For example; if you work in the same department or institute as one of the authors; if you have worked on a paper previously with an author; or you have a professional or financial connection to the article. These should all be listed when responding to the editor's invitation for review.

In comments to the Author

The comments to the author should not include any statements that indicate to the author your judgment as to the acceptability of the paper for publication. These comments should be stated in a constructive and helpful way. The reviewer should discuss the shortcomings and/or strengths of a study. Include in your critique your judgment of 1) originality and scientific importance, 2) adequacy and length of the title, 3) adequacy of the abstract, 4) introduction, rationale and clarity of hypothesis, 5) adequacy of experimental design and methods, 6) quality of data and presentation of results, including figures, 7) appropriateness of the authors' interpretation of their data, 8) length and appropriateness of the discussion, and 9) inclusion of recent and appropriate references. If possible, make specific recommendations for revisions.

Ethical responsibilities during the Review process

1. Confidentiality - The reviewer should maintain confidentiality about the existence and substance of the manuscript. It is inappropriate to share the manuscript or to discuss it in detail with others before publication. There are some exceptions, if approved by the editor. One example is that the reviewer may ask a colleague to collaborate on a review. However, your collaborator on the review should also agree to maintain confidentiality, and the editor should be informed of the participation of this additional person.

2. Reviewer Conduct - Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests. Knowledge of the content of confidential manuscripts should not be used for any other purpose unrelated to the reviewing of the manuscript.

3. Reporting Concerns - The reviewer also has the responsibility of noting any ethical concerns, not limited to but including suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or ethical concerns about the use of animals or humans in the research being reported.



Fifth International Scientific Conference on Project Management in the Baltic
Countries

Project Management Development – Practice and Perspectives