

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	

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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>It is relevant.</p> <p>The title is grammatically incorrect and not quite representative of the content of the document. The suggested title should be: "Investigating the Challenges of Engineering Project Managers in achieving Sustainability in the UK Construction Industry."</p> <p>(The abstract should be rewritten to be consistent with the editorial requirements of the journal and international standard).</p> <p>The manuscript is structured like a class project and needs to be reworked as a journal article</p> <p>Not quite</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent enough but not well applied</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is fair but verbose</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have made extensive comments on the manuscript. • The title is grammatically incorrect and confusing. Project Engineering Manager should actually read Engineering Project Manager • (Suggested Title) Investigating the Challenges of Engineering Project Managers in achieving Sustainability in the UK Construction Industry. • The abstract should be rewritten to be consistent with the editorial requirements of the journal and international standard. It should be concise in less than a page and with not more than 3 – 4 paragraphs. • What kind of Interview was conducted and which survey instrument, if any, was used. What informed the choice of these techniques? • Your sample size is not sufficient to make any scientific deductions about the UK construction industry. UK has one of the oldest construction industries in the world and yet your sample is harvesting information from people with 3-years experience. Clearly not even up to the rank of Senior Managers. Were the respondents/participants Clients, Architects, Structural Engineers, Mechanical Engineers, Electrical Engineers, Quantity Surveyors, Contractors, etc.? • Was any instrument used to assess the levels of agreement amongst the respondents? • What were the variables in the survey and interviews and how were they selected. • What are your primary and secondary criteria for this analysis and what are the results of the pairwise comparisons? • How were the impact factors derived? • The categories and sub-categories above should be discussed in the methodology, so that we can understand how they fit into the research before we start seeing results. Are they the Primary criteria in your AHP and which ones are the Secondary criteria?? • The sample size and the selection criteria of respondents/participants are too limited to be representative of the UK Construction Industry. • The Interview and Survey instruments used are not quite clear, perhaps a sample of the questionnaire should have been included as an appendix. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The work will require extensive reworking and lacks sufficient details to draw any conclusions that can be representative of the UK Construction Industry	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nathaniel Anny Aniekwu
Department, University & Country	University of Benin, Nigeria