

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_97875</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INVESTIGATING THE EFFECTS OF POOR MATERIALS MANAGEMENT (PMM) ON BUILDING CONSTRUCTION PROJECT SITES AND ESTABLISHING ELEMENTS OF GOOD PRACTICE IN FCT, ABUJA</b>
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript intends to give the outline on the practices adopted in the construction site so as to manage materials.</p> <p>2. Effect of poor materials management on materials waste is better understood for a reader, if correlated with the results mentioned in the tables.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, they are in line</p> <p>5. Measures for effectiveness on construction materials on sites, the respective mean values derived should have been substantiated with discussion for the drawn values.</p> <p>6. Some references, e.g., in line 52, the citation is not mentioned appropriately (student, 2011), there are no recent literature support, 2016 being the latest shown, references are not sufficient and written as required.</p> <p>The graphical representation is not clear, it's a jpeg file which is not visible, the results drawn from a model are not discussed below individual graphs. What does the respondents who show poor professional experience convey and in the section 2.1 the influence of extreme temperature is not discussed i.e., impact of variation on materials.</p> <p>Census data is used in the section 2.2, which year's data it was ? what is the instrument used ?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The flow is satisfactory while the discussion would have been more technical rather than superficial mention of numbers.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Acceptable with necessary refinement</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Asha G
Department, University & Country	SJBIT, India