

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56968

Title: *Governance Mechanisms and Infrastructure Project Success: The Role of Grievance Redress Systems*

Recommendation:
Accept as it is :
Accept after minor revision : Acceptance with Minor Revision Required
Accept after major revision:
Do not accept (<i>Reasons below</i>)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓			
Techn. Quality	✓	✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance				

Reviewer Name: Dr. MURALIDHARA S V

MAJOR Issues (Must Fix Before Acceptance)

1. Framework Diagram (Section 6) The current diagram is a basic text-placeholder. It must be replaced with a professionally designed figure showing all pathways — primary (Land Risk → Consent → GRM → Success) and supporting (Land Risk → GRM; Consent → Success; Land Risk → Success) — with clearly labeled arrows and theoretical anchoring.

2. Formal Research Propositions The paper proposes a framework but states no testable propositions. A minimum of 3–4 formally worded propositions must be added (e.g., "P1: Land acquisition risk negatively influences community consent...") to guide future empirical research.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Cross-Theme Integration (Sections 4.1–4.4) Each thematic section is self-contained and does not reference the others. An integrative closing paragraph must be added at the end of each section explicitly linking it to the adjacent constructs (e.g., how land risk feeds into consent; how consent enables GRM utilisation).

MINOR Issues (Corrections Required Before Resubmission)

4. Inconsistent Citation Spacing Throughout the manuscript, author-name citations are missing spaces around the ampersand — e.g., Ika& Pinto, Turner &Zolin, Antwi& Ley. A global find-and-replace must be applied to standardize all in-text citations.

5. Study Characteristics Table (Section 3.1) Only 5 of the 22 included studies are listed. The authors must either expand the table to cover all 22 studies, or explicitly state in the text why only a representative sample is shown.

6. Evidence Strength Ratings (Section 5 — Integrated Analysis Table) All four constructs are rated "High" or "Very High" with no explanation. The authors must justify these ratings by specifying the basis — such as number of supporting studies, methodological quality, or level of consensus across reviewed literature.

7. Definition of "Developing Countries" The term is used repeatedly throughout the paper but is never defined or operationalised. A brief clarification of the intended geographic and institutional scope is needed, given the wide variation in governance contexts across low- and middle-income countries.

8. Limitations Sub-section Missing (Section 9 — Conclusion) The conclusion contains no acknowledgement of the study's limitations. A short Limitations paragraph must be added addressing the 22-study sample size, potential publication bias, and the predominance of Sub-Saharan African contexts among the included studies.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

This manuscript is recommended for **Minor Revision**. The paper is fundamentally sound, addresses a genuine and important research gap, and makes a meaningful contribution to infrastructure governance and project management theory. The proposed governance pathway framework is coherent, the PRISMA methodology is rigorously applied, and the practical implications are clearly articulated. The identified issues are entirely correctable within a single revision cycle and do not affect the core argument or validity of the study. Upon satisfactory resolution of the nine points listed above — particularly the framework diagram, formal propositions, and cross-theme integration — **the manuscript will be ready for acceptance and publication in IJAR.**