

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127500
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges in Construction Technology During Project Implementation
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper highlights the challenges encountered in real time during the construction process of a project. This article is important for the scientific community in order to generate awareness and be able to encourage the use of technology-based solutions where necessary. However, it seems that the whole article was written based on the observation of a single project. This is not good enough.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is not comprehensive enough. It should also indicate the number of projects observed and the number of contractors involved as stipulated in the objectives of the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and the subsections are appropriate. However, the literature review section is omitted. This is very important and it should be inserted.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript lacks a little bit of vigour. The literature review which was omitted could have inputted a scientific touch to the entire work. The discussion of results needs to be able to compare the findings generated from the observed projects of this research with other similar researches. The manuscript is therefore not scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient even though a few are very recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Corrections have been made on the manuscript with respect to the appropriate use of the English language. These when effected will improve the English quality of the article and make it suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Bukola Aluko-Olokun
Department, University & Country	Nigeria