



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

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

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Because of the reasons given below, the reviewer suggests rejecting the paper. • The English of the paper is very poor and not easy to understand. • The manuscript is not very well written and is poorly organized. • Novelty of the study is missing. • Many assertion made by the authors are not supported by data and so they remain pure speculations. • Data are incomplete, e.g. the mineralogy of the black cotton soil is missing. What is the percentage of montmorillonite in the soil samples used in the study? • In the "Introduction" section, the results in the published literatures were explained too detailed, but the research ideas of this study were limited. • In the manuscript, there are poor and unclear sentences, e.g. lines: 25, 41, 42, 46, 47, 85, 86, 144, 145, 343. • Some references need to be given in the manuscript, e.g. line 77: <i>waste disposal</i> (reference should be given), Line 94: <i>are improved</i> (reference should be given), Line 99: <i>marginal soils</i> (reference should be given), etc. • Figures 9-13 have been explained very superficially. The results of the study have not been discussed sufficiently in the "Discussion" section. • There are some contradictions in the findings, e.g. in Figure 10, the plasticity index of the TRIAL PIT 1 is increasing with the increase in the stabilizer content. However, the linear shrinkage limit of the same soil decreases with	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the increase in the ionic soil stabilizer. How? Should be explained. In Figure 13, the maximum dry density decreases at 2 ml and 3 ml ionic soil stabilizer. However, at the same concentrations, an increase in the CBR values was obtained. How? Should be discussed in detail. • The results of the study have not been summarized accurately in the conclusion section. The third paragraph (lines 388-390) given in the conclusion section is not clear and understandable. It is not in harmony with the fact that the soils with higher cation exchange capacity have higher plasticity index values. • Overall, the discussion of the findings is poor and insufficient.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The quality of the figures (Figs. 2-5) in pages 4-6 is not good. The figures are not clear and readable. • Figure 1 does not indicate an equation. It describes a chemical reaction. • Table 1 is not well organized. The format should be checked. • References should be given for Figures 2-5: whose findings are those given in these figures (Figs 2-5). Not clear. • Line 298: It should not be written as: <i>Atterberg parameters</i>. It should be <i>Atterberg limits</i>. • Line 306: Is it the <i>shrinkage limit</i> or the <i>linear shrinkage</i>? These two terms are different. Should be corrected. • The format of the figure captions is not the same for all the figures in the manuscript. Should be corrected. • Figures 9, 10 , 13 are too small and they are not clear and understandable. It is difficult to follow the changes in the soil behaviour.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Limited references are given in the manuscript. In many places, the authors refer to the <i>Road Material Stabilizers, 1990</i>. What about the other publications related to the subject? More references should be given. • In page 2, line 33 <i>Smectite</i> is not a group of soil. It is a type of mineral. Should be corrected. • In page 2, line 88 Montmorillonite is a mineral type. It is not a soil type. Should be corrected.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer