

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
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>

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment: The paper contributes vital information and approaches in managing construction challenges given that construction contributes substantially to socio-economic growth and development globally.</p>	<p>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>
<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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Importance of manuscript to science: The manuscript is both important and relevant to science in particular and to the construction industry in particular.</p> <p>2. Title: The title is largely appropriate. However, please modify it to read as follows: 'Technical Rationality and Reflective Practice in Handling Intricate Construction Claims; A Case Study of Qatar'</p> <p>3. Abstract: The abstract was well written. However, please correct the few typographical errors highlighted in red and replace them with suggested revisions as highlighted in green.</p> <p>4. Structure of manuscript: The structure of the manuscript is largely acceptable. However, please improve it with the following modifications as highlighted in red (suggested deletions) and in green (suggested replacements and inclusions): 1. Include a section on research methodology, 2. Provide titles of tables at top of tables instead of at bottom of tables, 3. Where a the same table extends beyond one page, separate it and provide it as a new table on a page but with the same title of table at start of page with the word continuous enclosed in brackets e.g. Table 1: TR and RP (continuous). 4. Justify all text within a table for better appearance.</p> <p>5. Scientific correctness of the manuscript: The manuscript is scientific correct because it provides strong details and discussion of the relevance and application of TR and RP to the construction industry.</p> <p>6. References: 6.1 The references are unfortunately rather few (only 45 !). 6.2 Besides, most of the references are not so current. Please improve it by adding at least 15 more references on publications within the time period of 2015-todate (i.e. 2025-2023). 6.3 The author is advised to use only the first name(s) i.e. surname(s) in citations. Avoid initials of second name(s) in citations.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> <p>The quality of English language use in the manuscript is good. However, there are suggested corrections and modifications as highlighted in green to replace and or improve words and phrases highlighted in red. This was done without changing the meaning of author communication and without compromising the quality of the manuscript whatsoever.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comments: I found the paper very interesting to read and learnt from it.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Julius Caesar Kwio-Tamale
Department, University & Country	School of the Built Environment, College of Engineering, Design, Art and Technology, Makerere University, Uganda