
Subject: AR29: paper review results and next steps for Paper ID#1974

From: conference@arcom.ac.uk (conference@arcom.ac.uk)

To: olubukolatokede@yahoo.com;

Date: Monday, 3 June 2013, 7:06

Dear Olubukola

Your paper (ID#1974) has now been reviewed and the comments are provided below.

FOR PAPERS REQUIRING AMENDMENT:

- Please amend your paper in accordance with the review recommendations.
- The deadline for the submission of revised papers is 28 June 2013. Papers received after this date will be automatically rejected. No extensions will be given.
- Please note that there will be no further opportunity to revise the paper once it has been re-submitted. If you fail to adequately address the issues raised then your paper may be rejected.

FOR PAPERS ACCEPTED WITHOUT THE NEED FOR AMENDMENT:

- Congratulations. Please note that every paper must have a separate registered delegate attached to it or it will not be included in the proceedings.
- Please register immediately for the conference if you have not yet done so.
- You should also book your accommodation without delay as numbers in the conference hotels are limited.

If your paper has been rejected please note that the decision is final. However, you are welcome to register for the conference as a delegate if you would like to attend.

For further information about the conference, please go to: <http://www.arcom.ac.uk/conf-intro.php>

If you have any questions, please contact Simon Smith - Conference Chair (simon.smith@ed.ac.uk) or Dominic Ahiaga-Dagbui - Conference Secretary (d.ahiaga-dagbui@ed.ac.uk).

Please quote your ID number in any correspondence.

Kind regards
The ARCOM Conference Team

REVIEW COMMENTS:

Overall decision: Accepted - minor alterations

Are the references representative and correct? No

Do the abstract & keywords (for indexing) describe the content? Yes

Does the paper make a contribution to construction management research? Yes

Does the title reflect the content and purpose of the abstract? Yes

Is the English satisfactory? Yes

Is the paper in the template and size appropriate (> 10 pages)? Yes

Is the quality of illustrations, figures and tables satisfactory? Yes

Is the topic relevant to the constituent themes of the conference? Yes

Is this paper of sufficient quality for this conference? Yes

Overall quality of paper?(where 1=very poor; 8=excellent) 7

Comments:

Good paper. Please check for formatting consistencies, particularly with the references. You need to be consistent with smart- or regular-quotes. Reference for Chan (2012) is incorrect - check editor name.

Review 1 Comments:

This is a very good paper. There are some minor points for improvement: 1) the referencing needs to follow Harvard Style. 2) in Figure 2a the first row of Pascal Triangle is not correct. It should be 0C0 (not 1C0). 3) there is a claim/assumption that 'The rate of change of cost is assumed linearly progressive with time.', this is not necessarily the case in less-established economies. Apart from these minor points the contribution is of high standard.

Review 2 Comments:

This is a well written and balanced paper, which addresses an important aspect of construction economics and management. It is also critical of previous works on Whole-life cycle costing. The author(s) contend that 'that the values in the continuous whole-life cost technique are considerably higher than the other two whole-life cost techniques'. It is, therefore, important that wider implications of this positioning to academia, industrialists, and policy makers are offered. The paper should raise interesting discussions during the conference. It also informs the current thinking of whole-life cycle costing. More inferences and recommendations could be offered to those planning to conduct WLC on buildings such as housing and schools using the author(s) suggested approach and considerations.

----- End of message -----