

ReviewForm 1.7

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| JournalName: | JournalofScientificResearchandReports |
| ManuscriptNumber: | Ms_JSRR_114540 |
| TitleoftheManuscript: | ACOMPREHENSIVEREVIEWOFBULLDOZERSINMODERNCONSTRUCTION |
| TypeoftheArticle | |

PART1:ReviewComments

| | Reviewer'scomment | Author'scomment <i>(ifagreedwithreviewer,correct themanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthe manuscript.Itis mandatorythatauthorsshouldwrite his/herfeedbackhere)</i> |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| | | |

Review Form 1.7

Compulsory REVISION comments

1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?

(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)

2. Is the title of the article suitable?

(If not please suggest an alternative title)

3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?

4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?

5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?

6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.

(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)

1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? The manuscript provides a detailed exploration of contemporary bulldozer technologies and their impact on the construction industry. However, it's crucial to explicitly state the broader significance of this research for the scientific community. How does it contribute to existing knowledge, and what implications does it have for future developments in construction technology? Consider emphasizing the practical applications and potential advancements that may arise from this study.
2. Is the title of the article suitable? The title "A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF BULLDOZERS IN MODERN CONSTRUCTION" is informative but could be more specific. Consider incorporating key elements such as the focus on technological advancements, environmental sustainability, and safety features. A revised title could be "Technological Advancements, Environmental Sustainability, and Safety in Modern Bulldozer Design: A Comprehensive Review."
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract is informative but could benefit from a clearer statement on the specific contributions of the study. Additionally, it should briefly mention the methodology employed and the key findings. Consider revising to ensure that someone reading only the abstract can grasp the main objectives, methods, and outcomes of the research.
4. Are subsections and the structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and overall structure are well-defined and logically organized. However, consider including a dedicated section for the research methodology, providing clarity on how the investigation was conducted. This would enhance the transparency and replicability of the study.
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The content appears accurate and well-researched. However, ensure that specific data sources, methodologies, and statistical analyses (if any) are clearly mentioned. Verify that all information presented aligns with the latest industry standards and technological advancements.
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? While the references are mentioned in the manuscript, it is advisable to ensure that they are up-to-date, especially considering the rapidly evolving nature of technology. Provide publication years for each reference and consider incorporating the most recent studies, especially in areas such as telematics, automation, and environmental sustainability.

ReviewForm 1.7

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Please address these comments in the manuscript revision to enhance its clarity, significance, and overall scientific merit. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>1. In the "ABSTRACT" section, consider adding a sentence at the end summarizing the key findings or insights of the study to provide a clearer conclusion.</p> <p>2. In the "HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF BULLDOZER" section, consider rephrasing the sentence "Their evolution from early tractor-mounted blades to sophisticated, technologically advanced machines reflect the ongoing quest for efficiency, safety, and environmental responsibility in the construction industry" for better clarity.</p> <p>3. In the "OBJECTIVES OF ABULLDOZER" section, you may want to rephrase the sentence "Bulldozer designs and practices aim to minimize environmental impact, such as erosion control and responsible land management" for greater specificity.</p> <p>4. In the "CURRENT STATUS OF BULLDOZER" section, suggest mentioning the publication date of the sources (if available) for the most up-to-date information.</p> <p>5. In the "FUTURE SCOPE" section, consider reordering the points for a more logical flow. For instance, you might want to start with technological advancements before moving onto environmental sustainability.</p> <p>6. In the "FUTURE SCOPE" section, specify that the points mentioned are potential aspects and not certainties.</p> <p>7. In the "FUTURE SCOPE" section, add a brief sentence at the end summarizing the overarching themes or potential directions for the future of bulldozer technologies.</p> <p>8. In the "CONCLUSION" section, consider adding a sentence that explicitly states the implications of the study or how the findings contribute to the current understanding of bulldozer technologies.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>1. Ensure consistency in citation style throughout the document. 2. Check for any redundancy or repetition in the content, especially between sections. 3. Make sure the language remains clear and concise, avoiding unnecessary jargon. 4. Consider breaking down longer sentences or paragraphs for better readability. 5. If applicable, provide a reference list or bibliography at the end of the document. 6. Confirm that all relevant keywords are appropriately incorporated throughout the article. 7. Consider seeking feedback from colleagues or peers to gather additional perspectives on the content.</p> | |

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) |
|---|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name: | Tzu-Yao Lin |
| Department, University & Country | Nanhua University, Taiwan |