



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 <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	1. Please add reference(s) for this sentence "There are intensive researches into alternate binders which are more environmental 28 friendly". 2. Please add reference(s) for this sentence "Some of the new binders that are being used as full or partial replacement of cement are Ground Granulated Blastfurnace Slag (GGBS), Pulverised Fuel Ash (PFA), and Magnesium Oxide (MgO)." 3. Please add reference(s) for this sentence "Also reported is the use of different forms of lime which are specifically used in treating fine-grained soils (clayey gravel and clays) and in conjunction with many other binders. 4. It is suggested to change 3. Methodology to 3. Experimental Design. 5. Results and Discussion (with no "s" for discussion). 6. Figure 2 (first figure) needs to be improved, please revise accordingly.	Comments 1 – 3: Statements are contained in paragraph 22 – 33 and references have been given appropriately. Comment 4: Change has been effected in line 87 Comment 5: correction has been effected line 115 Comment 6: Title of the referred figure clearly written
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper needs to be improved before it can be considered for publication. Also I believe that the English usage needs to be polished	