

Summary of Committee Comments and Corresponding Responses/Actions Taken PhD Thesis: Majid Talab Alfelfel — Doctoral Defense Held 22/07/2026		
No.	Comment / Feedback	Response / Action Taken
1	Overall thesis length is excessive (approximately 305 pages) and the writing style reads more like a technical report than an academic doctoral thesis.	Length-reduction and academic-tone revision undertaken. Textbook-style explanations of basic research concepts removed and replaced with citations; over-explanatory descriptions of diagrams/arrows removed in favor of direct prose. The number of papers become 122 pages.
2	Chapter 1 contained literature review content, research hypotheses, and variable definitions that belong in later chapters.	Chapter 1 restructured to contain only the Research Problem, Research Questions, Research Importance, Research Objectives, and Chapter Summary. The literature review was moved to Chapter 2; research hypotheses were moved to Chapter 3; variable definitions were moved to Chapters 2 and 3.
3	Avoid over-explaining basic/textbook research concepts (e.g., defining what an independent variable, dependent variable, or mediator is; explaining what diagram arrows represent). If a definition is needed, cite a textbook reference instead.	Textbook-style definitions of the dependent variable, the mediating variable, and reliability/validity were replaced with concise statements citing Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Hayes (2018), and Tavakol and Dennick (2011). The description of conceptual-model "arrows" was replaced with a direct prose description of the three hypothesized relationships.
4	For sources with three or more authors, the first citation anywhere in the thesis should list all author names in full, using "et al." only from the second citation onward.	Noted that this reflects APA 6th-edition convention, while the thesis follows APA 7th edition ("et al." from the first citation for 3+ authors). Note; Flagged for supervisor confirmation before applying a thesis-wide citation sweep.
5	Reference-management software (e.g., Mendeley, EndNote) should be used; AI-generated references must be rigorously verified, as AI tools can fabricate citations.	Every citation identified during this review was cross-verified against the original source document or a targeted, source-confirmed search before correction; no citation was accepted on unverified AI-generated authority. Adoption of dedicated reference-management software recommended for future work.
6	The Research Gap section should not name individual authors. It should instead classify the gap by recognized type(s) and be presented as a single, clearly headed section at the end of Chapter 2.	The three Gap subsections in Chapter 2 were rewritten as anonymized synthesis prose with no individual author names. A new "Classification of the Research Gap" section was added immediately after, applying Miles' (2017) seven-type taxonomy of research gaps to classify the three identified gaps as a Population Gap, a Methodological Gap, and a Practical-Knowledge Conflict Gap.
7	The literature review reveals the study's variables and conclusions too early, removing the reader's sense of discovery.	Variable references throughout Chapters 1 and 2 were reframed as factors "identified through the literature review and the researcher's professional experience... while other influencing conditions may exist," rather than presented as an already-established, exhaustive list.
8	Software output (e.g., statistical package screenshots) should not be embedded in the thesis as raw images.	The G*Power sample-size calculation output and images were moved to Appendix B.
9	Concurred that the thesis over-explains basic research concepts and diagram mechanics rather than writing at doctoral level.	Addressed jointly with the related comment from Dr. Mostafa Abu El-Saud above. The number of papers become 122 pages.

10	Requested a clearer rationale for why the six specific independent variables were selected, and whether the selection was literature-based, theory-based, or practice-based.	Expanded rationale added to Chapter 2, explicitly naming three converging sources used to select the study's variables: frequency and prominence in the reviewed literature, alignment with the study's theoretical frameworks, and the researcher's professional observations in Saudi design and consultancy firms.
11	Asked which theoretical framework most directly informed the proposed conceptual model.	Confirmed and documented in the Theoretical Integration section: the Integrated AI Project Management Framework serves as the primary theoretical anchor, given its direct connection to the mediating variable and all seven outcome variables.
12	Requested that the relationship between the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the study's proposed Integrated AI Project Management Framework be explained.	A new subsection, "Relationship to the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)," was added to Chapter 2, comparing TAM to the study's framework and providing three specific reasons for adopting the Integrated Framework instead. New citation added: Davis (1989).
13	Requested a clearer explanation of how the quantitative and qualitative components of the study were integrated (mixed-methods design).	Confirmed already documented in Chapter 3's "Research Design and Statistical Processing" and "Mixed-Method Integration and Triangulation Strategy" sections; the verbal defense explanation was consistent with the written methodology.
14	Asked why Cost of AI Implementation and Ethical Considerations showed weaker or non-significant statistical effects despite being emphasized in the literature.	Explicit written discussion added to Chapter 4 (Results 7 and 8) and the corresponding Chapter 5 recommendations, explaining that these factors function primarily as adoption-stage barriers rather than independent direct drivers of project outcomes, supported by citations to Bughin et al. (2018) and Alshaikhi and Khayyat (2021).
15	Multiple reference-list entries required correction for author misattribution, misspelling, or incomplete author information.	Corrected using verified source documents, including a previously misattributed source. Dissertation title and year corrected, and duplicate reference-list entries removed.
16	Several redundant or duplicated passages were identified across Chapters 1, 3, and 4, including a duplicated methodology paragraph, a duplicated hypothesis-support interpretation, and an informal first-person note left alongside a formal restatement of the same content.	All identified duplicated passages were removed or consolidated.