

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JERR_89621  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Automated Onsite Construction: 3D Printing Technology</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Case study</b>  |

### **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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | Reviewer's comment   | Author's comment (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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstract looks generic but there is no information about why this work is carried out? Gap not highlighted? Few sentences to connect with the problem is a must? What is the benchmark here? What makes them to be compared? Does this study help in any sense?</li> <li>• Most of the references are outdated. There is not many references of recent year such as 2022, 2021 or 2020. It seems they have not updated the manuscript with current technology.</li> <li>• Some of the relevant articles on 3D printing can be included in the work. From various diversified application how, 3D printing has potential to be considered in construction sector is explained neatly in below references. These can be of help –               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• doi.org/10.1007/s11665-021-05843-9</li> <li>• doi.org/10.3390/polym13172951</li> <li>• doi.org/10.3390/polym13172905</li> <li>• 10.21272/jnep.13(2).02033</li> <li>• doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121750</li> <li>• doi.org/10.3390/su132011411</li> <li>• doi.org/10.3390/polym13173013</li> <li>• doi.org/10.3390/ma14144039</li> <li>• doi.org/10.1007/s11665-021-05843-9</li> <li>• 10.3390/sym12111823</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The work looks like review manuscript! If so then need to work exhaustively with the parameters already discussed in relevance to data requirement in current industry context</li> <li>• Authors have to cross verify the quoted references as not more than 2-3 articles are self-cited. Which looks to be bit on higher side (as it's not a good practise)</li> <li>• Introduction part deals with old articles so no latest information in it. Latest article information along with gap and it would give more clarity if you compare the data with some results or outcomes.</li> <li>• How this work might attract the readers and hook to it has to be perceived and applied accordingly...</li> <li>• Results and discussions are acceptable only with any correlation between the current used material and existing data's in public domain</li> <li>• The discussion section lags in explanation with respect to the work carried out. there are limited citations in discussion section to compare the work with existing cotton materials</li> <li>• All the mentioned objectives have to be stressed with more information such as               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the 3D printing form of onsite construction.</li> <li>• Identify the innovation patterns of 3D printing.</li> <li>• Explore the drivers for the 3D printing in construction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In conclusion part there should be only description. Table has to be explained prior to this either in results or discussion</li> <li>• Conclusion looks to be generic need to compile the outcomes and state based on the tests conducted and convey how best this can fit in the current context for any application.</li> <li>• In conclusion section, values have to be displayed with explanation. It's better to mention the salient features of the entire work in terms of bullet points with current context</li> <li>• Some useful references for authors to consider to match the topic of sustainability of plastic waste</li> </ul> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |  |   |

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Arun Y. Patil</b>                       |
| Department, University & Country | <b>KLE Technological University, India</b> |