



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_26268
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimising Capacity of Nigeria Construction Sector for Socio-Economic Sustainability
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. Abstract – not based normal journal format & need re-structure 2. L15-20: hanging sentence & based on word-by-word 'C-P' without clear links btw sentences; 3. L41-49: is it Nigerian case @ general issues? Then what links with para 36-40? 4. L49: 3 liars...what is this meant? 5. L51: sector data for econ dec...? 6. L51/52: how are they related to 53/55 ie data for Nigeria vs policy for world economy? 7. L61-2: no clear link & meaning 8. Intro too long – yet doesn't establish true/clear gaps on issue in Nigeria & how wanted to overcome 9. Lit Rev: no need for many subsections: eg delete 2.1 10. L88-90: what is trying to explain? 11. Overall LR: no clear links between para – need to re-structure sentences & link them; when female issue was raised-up – do you intend to establish that female should hv equal opportunities in this hard-L jobs; how do you relate this with situation in other African @ developing C's? From LR – gaps are not clearly been addressed & link them esp with the following method section @ to the title as a whole.	1. The abstract is according to the journal's structure (structured abstract). 2. The sentences have been reconstructed and linked. 3. The issues have been appropriately separated and linked accordingly. 4. This supposed to mean tiers. 5. As 3. 6. As 3. 7. As 3. 8. It has been beefed up to establish a gap. 9. Action taken. 10. Re-structured. 11. LR has been included, restructured and linked with the title and aim with gap established.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	12. Section 3 esp L164/5 -201: merely technical part/info of statistical method – no need to over-emphasis on this; more relevant – how they will be applied & provide results for this study. 13. T2 L284-286: more important – where does females L concentrated? Need to provide brief info on this vs just provide static data 14. L323: re-structure sentence & results elaboration, than just referring to T1, T5 & T6: explain how those data are being applied in your rgr model! 15. L341/344: any direct evidences/statistical data to support? 16. While most of results indicated low to modest contributions/effects, yet your conclusion present a ‘strong’ indication – pls provide clear line of argument/conclusion; as for recommendation – eg L380-2: just a general suggestion vs clear & concrete policy to overcome such issues.	12. Section 3 has been rewritten with appropriate statistical tools used. 13. Ok. 14. Action has been taken in this respect. 15. This has been supported with evidence. 16. The result has been appropriately rewritten with clear line of argument and conclusion made based on the result.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Overall English – need further editings; use simple, clear & short sentences.	The overall paper has been edited.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		