

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

Nur IzieAdiana Abidin¹

¹ Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract:

The flow of abstract and sentence structure requires a lot of improvement

Introduction:

Lack of recent citations (5 years' latest references with high-impact sources of journals)

In producing a manuscript, the introduction is the element that requires a comprehensive explanation to attract the readers and to make the readers understand the issues related to the topic. This paper has a poor flow of explanations in the introduction, too general. Since the title is about facility management challenges, thus it is expected to highlight the issues that lead to the challenges of facility management specifically

In the introduction, there is no significant contribution to explaining the arrangement of the paper flow.

The issues about facilities management shall also be highlighted in the context of public higher education institution since it is the scope of the study.

Literature review:

Lack of critical analysis. The title is focusing on challenges, it is hoped that there is a critical analysis of the challenges

Methodology

In the abstract, it has been mentioned that the number of respondents are 44, but the in methodology it is mentioned as 55.

Weak methodology explanations. Explanations are needed on the number of population and sampling, how the population was determined, the process of data collection and how the data obtained from the questionnaire being analysed.

Results:

The demographic shall be explained instead of presenting the Table independently. With much demographic information available, the explanations are only available for 'male' and 'years of experience'. The reasoning is needed during the

explanations for each percentage obtained and the relevance of the demographic information to this study. Besides, explanations of the method used for data analysis are also needed for this demographic information.

The Cronbach alpha explanation seems confusing whether the results are from the research or cited from Pallant?

However, based on fundamental knowledge of reliability analysis, the value mentioned is not from Pallant.

The presentation of the paragraph for the Cronbach Alpha totally needs to improve. What is meant for Section B and Section C?

The results and discussion were not thoroughly explained which makes the section less meaningful. Furthermore, the results and discussion shall include support from the scholars to enhance the content.

Discussion

The sub-topic is discussion is like a conclusion of the paper but it has been labeled as a discussion