

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96409
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigative and Model on the Challenges Project Engineering Managers towards Achieving Sustainability in the UK Construction Industries
Type of the Article	Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. 7. Results And conclusions (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1-It's important for all parties of construction management industry. The study dealt with an important topic in all countries, not only in the United Kingdom. It showed the challenges facing the application of sustainability principles, which in turn have a significant impact on the environment. 2-Suitable title. 3-Comprehensive abstract 4- Appropriate sections 5-The manuscript is scientifically correct 6-Some missing references such as Shiers et al. (2006, Renukappa et al. (2012) Akadiri & Fadiya (2013) Alex Opoku and Vian Ahmed 2014, Ogunbiyi et al. (2014), Higham et al. (2016), Higham & Thomson, (2015) and Shan et al. (2017) 7-Must compare with others results and conclusions especially with that mentioned in point 6 above to see the differences if compatible or contradicted	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1-Suitable Language	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gafel Kareem Aswed
Department, University & Country	College of Engineering, University of Kerbala, Iraq