

Review of: "Analytical Study and Amelioration of Plastic Pavement Material Quality"

Valeria Loise¹

¹ University of Calabria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors,

The research conducted is interesting, especially in the light of the creation of a circular and virtuous economy that encourages the recycling of waste materials.

Here are some suggestions for improving the article.

The abstract is too long and confusing. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to rewrite it.

The twelfth line of the abstract reads 'In the third phase', but phases 1 and 2 were not mentioned.

In the abstract, "Physical and mechanical tests carried out on both samples gave interesting results," it is not clear what the two samples on which the tests were carried out are.

In the abstract, "The results showed that this quality could withstand," which quality you are referring to is unclear.

In Formula 1, the unit of density should be in brackets.

Two x's appear in the formula for calculating volume, indicating two different quantities. Changing the notation of one of the two quantities would be appropriate.

The authors write that they conditioned the samples for 2 and 7 days and performed measurements on both sets of samples. Unfortunately, the figures only show the results obtained for the 7-day samples. How come the authors do not also show those for the 2-day samples?

It would be useful to include errors when presenting results.

In general, the quality of the figures should be improved. Care should be taken not to overlap the labelling of the axes with the legend (as in the case of Figure 6). Attention should also be paid to how the units of measurement, specifically MPa, are written.

In Figure 6, the authors write "variation in compression." Variation from what exactly?

Below Figure 8, "The results show that the pavement with the formulation of 25%:75%," this comment probably refers to Figure 8 and not 9.

In “Results of mechanical tests,” how was the evaluation of the best mechanical resistance made, whereas the authors also present the results for 30% PP?

In “Porosity and water absorption test results,” the authors only show the results of the samples after 7 days. Why are those after 3 days not shown?

In the conclusions, it would be useful to justify why a certain formulation is applicable for a certain type of flooring, i.e., monument premises, less traffic, and so on.