



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_21783
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Perceived Muda on Perceived Job Productivity in Public Office Buildings in Nigeria
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) The abstract is too big. 2) There are no sources below tables and figures. 3) The titles of tables and figures must be upper of them. 4) The photos must be removed from the paper. 5) The conclusions are too short.	1) The abstract was reduced from 346 words to 300 words, as specified in the journal online format. 2) The tables and figures have sources, save the results which obviously are from the study. 3) Standard format is that titles of Tables are above, while that of Figures are below; the formats are exactly so. 4) Only one photograph is in the paper and it depicts the case study. 5) Conclusion was improved upon.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		