



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18256
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Cement and Lateralite on the Engineering Properties of Niger Delta Soils for Pavement Construction
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. In 3.1 binder properties, chemical composition of laterite should be normalised in 100% like Portland cement. 2. Due to your study in chemical stabilization technique in soil. It should be mentioned pozzolanic reaction in result before in conclusion. You explained or discussed in low or high only to effects of engineering properties changing. But it was not exactly solution which is concerned to change properties.	Comment 2: Correction in line 213 - chemical reaction has been replaced with pozzolanic reaction to complement the statement in the conclusion. The effects of these binders were investigated on the engineering properties applicable to pavement ONLY
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Grain size distribution of binders and 3 soil samples should be displayed. It can be regarded compressibility of mixture. 2. It should be discussed OMC on first 2 samples rather decreased and in third sample was increased.	Comment 1: Grain size distribution of the 3 soil samples added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. It is not indicated different soils in disturbed or undisturbed samples. 2. It is completely resulted if you analysed XRD of soak samples and confirmed with figure of SEM in same samples.	Comment 1: Correction in lines 79 and 80 Comment 2: XRD and SEM are additional tests in understanding the mechanism of stabilisation; the authors are currently investigating this.