

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96366
Title of the Manuscript:	Analytical Study on the Rational Challenges Project Engineering Managers Encounter prior to Achieving Sustainability in the UK Construction Industries
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>The subject of the study is current and quite relevant. Similar studies should be encouraged.</b>  2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable</b>  3. <b>the abstract of the article is satisfactory</b>  4. <b>Are subsections of the manuscript appropriate</b>  5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct</b>  6. <b>the references are sufficient, however many are outdated</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>A map, from the world, highlighting the location would help to locate where the study was carried out, especially for readers from other countries.</b> <b>-The methodology should be better detailed.</b>	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Willames de Albuquerque Soares
Department, University & Country	Pernambuco Polytechnic School, University of Pernambuco, Brasil