

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_123545
Title of the Manuscript:	Summary of research on exemplary management of engineering project construction under the concept of intelligent construction
Type of the Article	Review 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Overall, the paper is well organized and well written, with strong integrity. Nevertheless, there are grammatical and spelling errors found in sections 3.1 and 3.2 and some other sections as if concerning the entire paper submitted. There are more than 100 of these errors while being ignorable since these errors are not big mistakes, and it is inevitable in the procedure of writing a paper. From my point of view, as a reviewer, I would say the paper got my attention, and I am satisfied all in all.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	The title might become a little bit stronger to be more attractive as well. However, the current title corresponds to the included parts in the paper, especially for sections 2 and 3.	
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.	As a reviewer, I believe that using words for second and third times should be considered wisely and it is well-recommended to use synonyms in lieu of the aforementioned words. One of these instances could be the word "labor" which could be altered with the appropriate word. Other than the abstract is well written and is also strong enough to provide adequate information.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it might be even better to add a section on discussion and future works.	
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.	I think when you find negligible and almost ignorable mistakes both in grammar and spelling as well as the concept and method of conveying information, the paper is trustable and written with extra care and revisions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references was almost enough for such a paper, however the flow of the papers used as references was not well organized for instance there should be a good balance in gathering references in terms of data and also release dates which were not carefully paid attention, other than references were OK.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is clear and understandable.	
Optional/General comments	Regarding plagiarism, the paper is written in a truly original way, which is important In terms of this, everything was OK. No, there is no and I could not find anything. There is not even 1 percent plagiarism! Minor Revision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammatical and Spell Corrections • Stronger Framework 	

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:	Iman Bagheri
Department, University & Country	Montazeri Technical and Vocational University, Iran