

Review of: "Analytical Study and Amelioration of Plastic Pavement Material Quality"

M. A. Abdelzاهر¹

¹ Beni Suef University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The theme is relevant and is a current approach, as it meets the needs. We also appreciate the authors' willingness to readapt some elements of their research. However, in its current form, I recommend **REJECTION** of the work in the current edition of the journal. Among the reasons for this, we list below some observed needs that, once met, can enable a new presentation of the research.

1. This content contains many technical errors, vague assertions, and misnomers. Kindly highlight the abstract to include problem statement, aim, methods, results, and conclusions, sequentially.
2. The author should highlight the research objectives of the research in the introduction separately.
3. The authors provided little to no background information needed to understand the study, the core findings from the cited literature, and the reasons why they conducted this research. Moreover, what question/problem was addressed to fill a gap in the knowledge or to answer a previously unanswered question? These cogent studies would further demonstrate an adequate understanding of cogent findings established in the relevant literature compared with the current study, improving its novelty:

- <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142113883>
- <https://doi.org/10.3390/w15040780>
- <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-49229-4>
- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13204-023-02766-w>
- <https://doi.org/10.21608/ejchem.2021.89060.4276>
- <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-55494-8>
- <https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.786.248>

With these aforementioned references, the authors would be able to draw a relevant research gap and provide a rationale for conducting this research.

4. English (language, sentence structure, and grammar) needs improvement.
5. The discussion needs to be improvised with theoretical contribution.
6. The conclusion is very weak. It should also be an extrapolation of the key findings from the research and not a

summary. So, there should be conclusions around the background theory, data theory/analysis, and key outcomes. The authors should have included the following sub-sections within the conclusion section with more details:

- Implications to theory and practice should be clearly stated;
- Key lessons learned;
- Limitations of this research;

7. Authors should consult Environment, Development and Sustainability author guides for guidance on referencing.

Good Luck