

Review of: "Enhancing Soil Stabilization in Soft Soils Through The Addition of Sand to Soil-Cement Piles: a Comprehensive Study"

Bestun Jumma¹

¹ Salahaddin University - Erbil

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Enhancing Soil Stabilization in Soft Soils Through the Addition of Sand to Soil-Cement Piles: A Comprehensive Study

The manuscript in question exhibits significant shortcomings in several key aspects, notably critical thinking, style of writing, coherence, deep analysis, and visualization. The critical thinking appears to be superficial, with a lack of depth in exploring nuanced perspectives or engaging with opposing views. The writing style is inconsistent and fails to maintain a cohesive narrative flow, making it challenging for readers to follow the logical progression of ideas. Coherence is compromised, as the manuscript lacks clear connections between key points, resulting in a disjointed presentation. Additionally, the depth of analysis is insufficient, with a need for more thorough examination and exploration of underlying concepts. The visualization, whether in the form of data representation or conceptual frameworks, is inadequate and fails to enhance the overall understanding of the subject matter. Overall, the manuscript requires substantial improvement in these critical areas to meet the standards of a well-crafted and scholarly piece of work.

Based on the above, I strongly recommend the rejection of the manuscript.

-

Below are several comments that can be useful for the authors to improve the manuscript.

1. Abstract: Please reword the abstract to address the highlighted general statement.
2. Ensure the abstract covers the main findings in the paper, specifically the percentage of increase.
3. Introduction: Consider using line numbers for comments, as it can be challenging to avoid adding comments/suggestions.
4. Page 2 - Comments 1 and 2: Provide references for these comments.
5. It is very weird to have a list of references when no single reference is stated in the main body.
6. Page 3 - Comment 3: Justify this comment.
7. Generally, reword the introduction for improved coherence and include appropriate references.
8. Pages 4 to 7: While the authors attempt to provide a literature review, many findings lack proper references.
9. Page 7: Explain the compaction process for the samples in more detail, including standards, water content, weight of the hammer, and other relevant details.

10. Page 7: Clarify how the samples were cured.
11. Page 8 - Comment 1: Justify and validate how this sentence relates to the sample methodology.
12. The conclusion appears superficial.
13. Ensure consistency between the conclusion and the abstract.