



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	This paper analyzes the capacity optimization in Nigeria's construction sector. Though the paper is fairly well written, the methodology is very simplistic. The organization of the paper is good but there is no literature review. In addition, the contribution of the paper to the existing body of knowledge is not very significant given the methodology and data used. The time period used in the analysis is very short and the results of simple linear regression analysis are not robust. The author may consider extending the sample period or use quarterly data instead of using annual data. The discussion of the results of the study is good. However, the author has not compared the finding of the study to that of previous studies. In Line 185, the equation used does not clearly state the confidence interval. It should be properly written as: $\widehat{\beta}_0 \pm t_{\alpha/2, t-2} Se_{\widehat{\beta}_0}$ The manuscript does require some revisions.	The methodology has been rewritten with more appropriate statistical tools chosen for analysis. Likewise, the literature review has been included in the paper. With new improvement in the paper using more appropriate methodology, the contribution of the paper to the existing body of knowledge has been very significant. The author has considered using the quarterly data from 2010Q1 to 2015Q since the study is looking at the output based on 2010 basic constant price and cannot extent below 2010. The findings have been compared with the results of previous studies. The equation has been properly written within the appropriate methodology. Revision has been done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In Figure 1, units for the variable measured along the vertical axis can be changed to N billions or trillions. Total GDP numbers in the table accompanying Figure 1 missing one digit. The calculations presented in Table 5 are very basic. Five years of data is not sufficient to estimate this model.	Figure 1 has been expunged This has been expanded to six year and on quarterly basis since the study considers post rebasing period (i.e 2010 is the base year for new re-basing).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		