

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJAST_3041
Title of the Manuscript:	Improvement of the Properties of Black Cotton Soils Using “Ionic Soil Stabilizer 2500”.

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer’s comment (REVIEWER 2)	Author’s comment
<u>Compulsory</u> Revision comments	1. Abstract to be corrected to remove discrepancy with Conclusion. Standard for CBR for sub-base material in Nigeria is 30%. The stabilized soil met this standard at 2ml dosage of ISS and above. 2. Literature review is too long because it contains unnecessary theoretical material which can be referenced in the Technical Report on ISS2500, Road Material Stabilizers (1990). Lines 62-113 can be retained while Section 2.1 can be expunged without affecting the quality of the paper. Note that, lines 95-113 already explains the mechanism of the behaviour of ISS2500. 3. References should be expanded to include more recent works on black cotton soil. For example, the statement in lines 92-94 need to be qualified with references, this in itself will enrich the Literature review. The Literature review is over-reliant on one reference and three old works on black cotton soil.	1. Abstract corrected. Discrepancy between specs for sub-base and conclusion corrected. 2. Section 2.1 is expunged as suggested. 3. Statements in lines 92-94 corrected according to Reviewer 1’s comment
<u>Minor</u> Revision comments	1. Consider changing title to: “The Effect of ‘Ionic	1 The suggested title is hereby adopted.

	Soil Stabilizer 2500' on the Properties of Black Cotton Soil" 2. Statement in lines 45-47 unclear 3. Location of sampling in lines 229-237 should be given in latitude and longitudes or GPRS format 4. The curing regime stated in lines 269-271 should be clarified especially as to the standard that was adopted. 7days curing of specimen is not what is specified by the Nigerian General Specifications but rather by BS 1924 (1990). NGS (1997) specifies 6 day curing plus 1 day soaking in water before C.B.R test. Can the result be observed be compared with the Nigerian CBR standards for Sub-base and Base materials, if the curing specification in Nigeria has not been adopted? 5. Location of Fig. 12 after References appears inappropriate. 6. OMC, MDD & CBR are at what energy level, BSL, BSH or WAS? This information should be included under methodology and captured in the Abstract.	2. Statements 45-47 clarified according to Reviewer 1 comments. 3. The sampling location is at latitude 12° 19' 24.06" and longitude 14° 09'16.81" 4 The standard for curing is 7 days in accordance with BS 1924 (1990). The outcome indicates that the base materials spec was not met under the NGS (1997). 5. Figure appropriately relocated to page 11 under line 339 6. Optimum Moisture content, Maximum Dry Density and California Bearing Ratio were determined using British Standard compaction at 2.5Kg energy level for 5 layers.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		