

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122036
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovative Geotechnical Solutions for Sustainable Infrastructure Development
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical and timely issue—sustainable infrastructure development through innovative geotechnical solutions. The detailed exploration of sustainable practices and integration of modern methodologies like Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), Building Information Modeling (BIM), and Lean Construction into geotechnical engineering highlights its relevance for researchers, engineers, and policymakers. The case study provides a practical application of the proposed framework, making the research applicable to real-world scenarios.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, covering the aim, problem statement, significance, methodology, discussion, and conclusions effectively. However, it could benefit from more clarity in the methodology section by specifying the types of recent articles reviewed. Additionally, emphasizing the practical implications of the case study in the abstract would strengthen its appeal.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and well-organized. However, the manuscript would benefit from more distinct subsections in the discussion, particularly separating the general discussion of innovative solutions from the specific case study analysis. This would enhance readability and clarity.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The integration of LCA, BIM, and Lean principles into geotechnical engineering is well-explained and demonstrates a forward-thinking approach to sustainable infrastructure development. The use of the Envision framework to align with EU Taxonomy goals is a strong point, providing a structured methodology for sustainability assessments. The inclusion of a real-world case study strengthens the manuscript's practical relevance.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Afam Uzorka
Department, University & Country	Kampala International University, Uganda