

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_103512
Title of the Manuscript:	Using Exploratory Factor Analysis Technique for Establishing Barriers to Total Quality Management Implementation in the Construction Industry
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The author should provide additional evidence to demonstrate why Total Quality Management (TQM) is a crucial philosophy for organizations. This will help to establish the manuscript as an important contribution to the scientific community 2. No adverse comments 3. Usually an abstract of a paper is a concise summary that should convey the most important aspects of the study, including its value and potential impact. Therefore, the results presented in the abstract should provide relevant and valuable information that can help readers determine if the paper is worth reading in full. 4. No adverse comments 5. No adverse comments 6. No adverse comments	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No adverse comments	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No adverse 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lee Wing Hang
Department, University & Country	China