

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.	The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it offers a comprehensive and critical evaluation of polyphosphoric acid (PPA) modified asphalt technology, highlighting both its advantages and limitations. It provides valuable synthesis of current research and practical applications, which is essential for guiding future studies and improving asphalt pavement performance. I appreciate the thorough analysis and practical recommendations presented in the manuscript, which can significantly contribute to advancing road engineering practices. However, I would have liked to see more emphasis on long-term field performance data to strengthen its conclusion.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title of the article could be more specific to better capture the essence of the research. Here is a suggested alternative title: "Comprehensive Review of Polyphosphoric Acid Modified Asphalt Technology: Mechanisms, Road Performance, and Future Prospects"	
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.	This paper reviews polyphosphoric acid (PPA) modified asphalt technology, detailing its chemical modification mechanisms and impact on road performance. It highlights the benefits of PPA in improving high-temperature performance and aging resistance while noting the need for further research on its effects on water stability and low-temperature performance. The paper recommends developing standardized application guidelines to promote widespread use of PPA technology.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, providing a clear and organized flow of information.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, offering a comprehensive review of polyphosphoric acid (PPA) modified asphalt technology with a detailed analysis of chemical modification mechanisms and pavement performance. It integrates findings from multiple studies, enhancing the reliability of its conclusions. Additionally, the evaluation of research gaps and future recommendations demonstrates a methodical approach to advancing the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient, but it is recommended to include more recent sources to ensure the most up-to-date research is covered. If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communications, but some improvements for clarity and conciseness are recommended.	
Optional/General comments	The study provides a comprehensive review of polyphosphoric acid (PPA) modified asphalt technology, highlighting its benefits and challenges. It showcases improvements in thermal performance and aging resistance, and suggests developing application guidelines to enhance usage. The research is valuable and contributes to advancing road engineering practices. Based on the provided content and analysis, I would say that the manuscript is comprehensive and well-structured, but could benefit from improvements in clarity, conciseness, and the inclusion of more recent references.	

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:	Khalid Awadh Mohammed
Department, University & Country	Anbar University, Republic of Iraq