

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_110104
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Plastic Waste in Flexible Pavement Design- A Sustainable Approach
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>I believe that the manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing issue of plastic waste management and road infrastructure development concurrently, presenting a practical and cost-effective solution through the incorporation of recycled plastics in flexible pavement design, thereby contributing to both environmental sustainability and infrastructure enhancement</p> <p>The title 'Use of Plastic Waste in Flexible Pavement Design - A Sustainable Approach' effectively captures the essence of the manuscript by succinctly conveying the focus on sustainable solutions for flexible pavement design through the utilization of plastic waste. However, to enhance its impact and specificity, I would suggest considering titles that emphasize the innovative aspects of the study. For instance, 'Innovative Integration of Recycled Plastics for Sustainable Flexible Pavement Design' or 'Advancing Road Infrastructure Sustainability: A Novel Approach Using Plastic Waste in Flexible Pavement Design' may better highlight the unique contributions of the research. Overall, the title could be refined to better showcase the novelty and significance of the study</p> <p>The abstract provides a clear and concise overview of the study, covering key aspects such as the problem statement, objectives, methodology, and findings. However, to enhance comprehensiveness, it could benefit from briefly mentioning the environmental and economic implications of the proposed solution. Additionally, specifying the scale and relevance of the observed improvements in pavement properties could further strengthen the abstract. Overall, the abstract effectively outlines the study but could be enriched by incorporating a bit more detail on the broader implications and significance of the findings</p> <p>The organization of subsections and overall structure in the manuscript is good and easy to follow</p> <p>I have reviewed the manuscript and find that it is scientifically sound</p> <p>The manuscript currently relies on a limited number of references, with only seven cited throughout the text. To enhance the scholarly quality and relevance to current research, it is essential to expand the reference base and incorporate more recent works, especially those published within the last five years. The inclusion of a more comprehensive range of references will not only strengthen the manuscript's academic standing but also demonstrate a thorough review of the current literature on the subject matter. Additionally, I suggest that the author provides a comparative analysis with related works and technologies used for similar purposes, offering readers a broader perspective on the advancements in the field</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article meet the standards for scholarly communication. However, I recommend a thorough proofread to address minor grammatical and syntax issues for further improvement</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1) While the methodology is well-detailed, I recommend enhancing its clarity by presenting certain aspects, particularly those involving processes, in the form of a diagram or flowchart. A visual representation could provide readers with a more intuitive understanding of the sequential steps and relationships within the methodology, thereby augmenting the overall accessibility and comprehension of the research process</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>2) The figures presented in the manuscript are integral to understanding the study; however, it is observed that they are not consistently cited within the text. It is crucial to ensure that each figure, particularly Fig 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, is appropriately referenced in the relevant sentences to establish a clear connection between the textual content and the visual representations. Additionally, there is a need for further clarification, including appropriate labeling, to enhance the overall readability and coherence of the figures. Providing detailed captions and explicitly referring to these figures in the text will greatly contribute to the clarity and effectiveness of the manuscript.</p> <p>3) While the overall structure of the manuscript is logically organized, I noticed inconsistencies in the usage of certain terms, particularly in figure captions. For instance, some captions use 'Fig. X,' while others use 'Figure Y,' creating an inconsistency in terminology. I recommend that the author carefully revises and standardizes the use of terms, ensuring uniformity in figure captions and throughout the manuscript. This revision will contribute to the overall professional appearance and readability of the document.</p> <p>4) I recommend that the author enhances the introduction section by incorporating a concise summary of the contributions made by the study. This addition will offer readers a clear and upfront understanding of the novelty and significance of the research, providing a roadmap for what to expect in terms of unique contributions. By explicitly stating the study's contributions early on, the introduction will effectively engage readers and highlight the distinct value of the research in the context of existing knowledge.</p> <p>5) The description of the proposed solution would benefit from a more formal presentation. I recommend the inclusion of visual aids such as flowcharts or diagrams to enhance the clarity and formality of the explanation. These visual elements can effectively supplement the textual content, providing a structured and visually appealing representation of the proposed solution. Integrating such visuals will not only improve the formal presentation of the manuscript but also enhance the reader's comprehension of the proposed solution.</p> <p>6) I recommend that the experiments be updated to include a comparison with newer studies and alternative approaches. Providing a comparative analysis with more recent research will strengthen the robustness of the study and offer valuable insights into the advancements in the field. Including references to relevant and recent studies will enhance the contextualization of the experiments and contribute to the overall depth and relevance of the manuscript.</p> <p>7) The discussion of the experimental results needs more detail. Please provide a more thorough analysis, including the implications and significance of the findings. Consider referencing relevant literature to support your discussion and offer a clearer understanding of the results.</p> <p>8) Some figures are blurred, small, and have low quality. Authors should use higher-resolution figures or redo them as vector graphics.</p> <p>9) The latest article and work need to be added to the manuscript.</p> <p>10) Some text must be added to discuss future work or research opportunities.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vigneswara Rao Gannapathy
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia