

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
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	Original 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1.YES.The manuscript may be important for scientific community but the presentation of abstract needs to Rewrite. The numbering for citations must be given in superscript in the Text of the paper.  2. YES  3. NO. The Abstract of paper must needs to summarize the concept and research findings of paper.  4. NO. Table 1 needs to Redraw with appropriate rows and columns.  5. YES 6.YES, but All References are not arranged as per the alphabetical order.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES, the quality of English language of the article was suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	T. Phani Madhavi
Department, University & Country	Bapatla Engineering College, India