

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_112937
Title of the Manuscript:	A Multi-Stakeholder Perspective on the Limitations of Implementing Artificial Intelligence in Highway Transport
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><b>Compulsory</b> 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>1. The manuscript addresses an important topic with significant implications for the future of transportation. It offers a comprehensive view of the multifaceted challenges associated with implementing AI in highway transport and provides actionable insights for stakeholders. This makes it relevant for policymakers, engineers, and AI researchers. However, it could benefit from a more in-depth analysis of each limitation to enhance its contribution to the scientific discourse.</p> <p>2. The title appropriately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, providing a succinct overview of the study's purpose, methodology, and key findings.</p> <p>4. The structure is logical.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically valid.</p> <p>6. Yes, they are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are instances where the phrasing is awkward, and the sentence structure could be improved for better readability. For example, the abstract could be more concise, avoiding repetition of the term 'Artificial Intelligence' and using acronyms after the first introduction. In the main text, transitions between sections should be smoother, and technical terms should be clearly defined to be accessible to a wider academic audience. Consistency in the use of terms (e.g., AI vs. Ai, which appears inconsistently throughout the text) should be addressed. Attention to punctuation, especially the use of commas to separate clauses, would improve the overall flow of the text. Professional proofreading is recommended to refine these aspects.</p>	<p>All review comments have been adequately attended to.</p>
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>For consistency with other figures, Fig. 5 is suggested to include percentage bars.</p>	<p>Figure 5 results is the same even when presented in percentage bars. The number of respondents barsshown is the same as when presented in percentage bars.</p>

Review Form 1.7

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>	