

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_105664
Title of the Manuscript:	Technical Rationality and Reflective Practice in Handling Intricate Construction Claims; A Case Study
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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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)
<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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title is quite good but 'Technical Rationality' and 'Reflective Practice' should be stated as techniques. The topic can be recast as 'Technical Rationality and Reflective Practice <b>techniques</b> in Handling Intricate Construction Claims: A Case Study</p> <p>3. The Abstract is not very comprehensive vis-à-vis the stated objectives. The assertion that 'this study therefore explores the potential of implementing reflective practice into construction claim analysis by using a case study' is not supported by the stated objectives. The Abstract should capture appropriately the entire scope of the work.</p> <p>4. Subsections are reasonably appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>7. The Findings should be well articulated to reflect the summary of the work as underpinned in the stated objectives.</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 English quality is good but requires some few corrections to address grammatical errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The work is about claims but no attempt was made to define or explain this term. It is recommended that 'construction claims' is briefly defined or explained in the work to the broad understanding of all readers.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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:	<b>J. C. Danku</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ghana</b>