

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_74236
Title of the Manuscript:	PROSPECTS FOR IMPROVING BUILDING MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>1. Title of Manuscript and Methodology</b></p> <p>The title of this manuscript is about improving building maintenance management in Nigerian Public Universities.</p> <p>However, the study conducted at Nnamdi Azikiwe University as a case study which could not reflect the public universities in Nigeria.</p> <p>It is recommended to correct the title from "Nigerian Public Universities" to "A Case study of Nnamdi Azikiwe University"</p> <p><b>2. Literature Review</b></p> <p>Recommend inserting "Matrix Table" of literature review on building maintenance management to view variables of the study.</p> <p><b>3. Result and Discussion</b></p> <p>The author stated about hypothesis tested using Pearson's parametric Chi-square.</p> <p>However, there are simple descriptive statistics (mean) have been done.</p> <p>No hypothesis created in the manuscript in order to analyses the significant of variables developed in this study.</p> <p>It is suggested to remove this result from the manuscript.</p> <p><b>4. Conclusion</b></p> <p>It advises to the author if could do the conclusion based on study and giving opinion on it. Must include also about recommendation for further study and any significance of study.</p> <p><b>5. Technically</b></p> <p>The words length of 3000-6000 words are not complied.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Please refer to the template for cross-checking the format of manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The comments are not purposely criticizing the author writing, it just a constructive comment which to enhance the writing.</p> <p>These comments are only the suggestions from second perspective, and it is depending on the author either to accept it or not.</p> <p>Thank you for preparing the interesting topic.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Nur'ain Binti Ismail</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia</i></b>