

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_121579
Title of the Manuscript:	Research Progress and Prospect of Polyphosphoric Acid Modified Asphalt Technology
Type of the Article	Commentary

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	You have done good work. This manuscript offers a comprehensive review technical status of polyphosphoric acid (PPA) modified asphalt technology, solve its road problems and promote its further application, this paper summarized the research progress of PPA modified asphalt technology in scientific research and engineering.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is quite meaning a lot. The title of the article is misleading, and it is suggested that the title should be further modified to clarify the object of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract needs to summarize the main points and avoid unnecessary parts to understand better and readability. The abstract is very general Please revise the abstract. Please, underscore the scientific value added in the abstract. Add some of the most critical quantitative results to the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The organization of the manuscript should be improved. The methodology must be written in more detail for better understanding.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper represents a large amount of information. Firstly, the mechanism of chemical modification of asphalt by PPA was revealed from the aspects of composition, chemical reaction and microstructure. Secondly, the impact of PPA on the pavement performances of asphalt and asphalt mixture were analyzed. Thirdly, the application and service of PPA modified asphalt pavement at home and abroad were evaluated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The paper needs to a few new articles in the literature cited in the past three years.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English writing needs further improvement.	
Optional/General comments	<p>-The conclusion seems somewhat general and could benefit from a deeper technical discussion on why certain methods or techniques are preferred based on the findings from the reviewed studies. This is the important section in the article, so focus more on it. The authors lack the evaluation and discussion of the existing conclusions to explain the necessity of this paper.</p> <p>-The objective of the study is not clear and needs to be specified in the introduction section.</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed M.Sawan
Department, University & Country	Zagazig University, Egypt