

Manuscript: “**Adaption Of Construction Management Modelling System Through The Use Of Internet Of Things (IoT)**”

Submitted: 07 June 2021

Accepted: 01 July 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Ali Bakhit Jaafreh

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p263

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emhaidy Saleh Gharaibeh
German Jordanian University, Jordan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: İsmail İpek
Istanbul Aydın University, Turkey

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Emhaidy Saleh Gharaibeh	
University/Country: German Jordanian University, Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: 6.17.2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Construction Management modelling system proposal by Using the Internet of Things	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0653/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. İsmail İPEK	
University/Country: Istanbul Aydın University/TURKEY	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/6/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/6/2021
Manuscript Title: Construction Management modelling system proposal by Using the Internet of Things	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0653/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is good enough to present process.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

Well written..	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Ok.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
The results should be considered based on research questions and step by step better.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Conclusions are given well. I think that summary should be given shortly.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
That's good enough.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

Thank you for your performances about this paper. I think that you should review and write conclusions to make more easily readable the effects of IoT and its integration in scientific and social learning environments.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication
