

Review of: "Facility Management Challenges of Public Educational Facilities in Nigeria"

Syed Bukhari

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Facility Management Challenges of Public Educational Facilities in Nigeria

The article, "Facility Management Challenges of Public Educational Facilities in Nigeria" presents contextual and global contribution. However, it has some areas to be improved. For example, every section seems too short and needs some more elaboration. Similarly, there is a need to the conclusion section. Generally, the manuscript shows loose relationship/integration of different section. Thus, authors are encouraged to revise the below sections thoroughly.

1. Firstly, the title can be revised as, "Facilities Management Challenges of Public Educational Facilities in Nigeria".
2. Introduction: this section is short and does not provide the rationale to build this study. Moreover, there is a need to visit more literature to extend introduction and literature review section. It is suggested that the research question, "does the extent of TETFUND funding cover the livelong maintenance of these facilities as enshrined in the TETFUND Act?" should be revised.
3. The Maintenance Structure for Public Higher Educational Institutions needs some more detail.
4. Funding Structure: this section is too short to elaborate the funding on facilities management.
5. Methodology section is very short, it must explain, the research design, its reason to select it, population, sampling, data collection and data analysis.
6. Data Analysis: in data analysis section, it is suggested that firstly, an introductory paragraph should be added. Then table should be given first and analysis on that table should be give after the table. Thus, there is also a need to add once concluding paragraph in the data analysis section.
7. Discussion part is very shallow. There is no reference in the "Discussion" section. It needs thorough revision. In fact, when above mentioned literature review section is revised only then the discussion section can be improved.
8. Conclusion: There is no conclusion. It is recommended to add one to two paragraph on conclusion section.
9. I think the term, "TETFUND" is not so standardized. Therefore, it is suggested that it should be elaborated and then it can be abbreviated.
10. There are some grammatical mistakes. If proof-reading is done, it will surely improve the manuscript.
11. Last but not least the present references are insufficient and it is suggested to add some fresh references under each section.

