

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_122854
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Impact Assessment of Reusing Baghouse Dust in Asphalt Concrete Production
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into sustainable practices within the asphalt concrete industry by evaluating the environmental impact of reusing baghouse dust. The study addresses a critical issue of waste management in asphalt production, offering potential environmental and economic benefits. The findings could significantly influence sustainable construction practices, making it a valuable contribution to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Environmental Impact Assessment of Reusing Baghouse Dust in Asphalt Concrete Production" is suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus. However, a slightly more specific title could be: "Evaluating the Environmental Impact of Reusing Baghouse Dust in Asphalt Concrete: A Sustainable Approach."	
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 is comprehensive, covering the study's purpose, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the specific mechanical properties tested and summarizing the limitations of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, with a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. However, the inclusion of more detailed headings within the results section could enhance clarity and readability.	
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 manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodologies employed, such as life cycle analysis and statistical techniques, are appropriate for assessing the environmental impact. The results are presented clearly, with sufficient data supporting the conclusions. The study's approach is methodical, and the findings are relevant to both industry and academia.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering key studies related to the topic. If additional references are needed, the manuscript could benefit from including more recent publications on the long-term performance of asphalt mixtures containing recycled materials	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderately acceptable	
Optional/General comments		

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:	V Sai Neeraja
Department, University & Country	Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Science and Technology (A), India