

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

S. Alias Alias¹

¹ Universiti Teknologi Mara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

1. The abstract is lengthy.
2. The English in the article requires improvement.
3. Why did the author choose a different ratio between PP and PET? There are 9 for PP and 7 for PET.

Introduction

1. Please emphasize the significance of water absorption and compressive strength as crucial parameters in pavement construction.
2. Please enhance line 11 in the introduction. The author should refrain from providing detailed explanations of the methods used by other researchers in the introduction.
3. The final paragraph of the introduction needs improvement. The study gap is not clearly highlighted, and it fails to explain the significance of this research in Cameroon. Additionally, the issue concerning pavement in Cameroon is not adequately addressed. Furthermore, the paragraph should elaborate on how using plastic can reduce plastic waste and enhance pavement quality.

Materials and methods

1. Please check the chemical formula for PET, which was written as $(C_2H_4)_n$.
2. "Did you mistakenly write 'course aggregate' when you meant 'fine aggregate'?"
3. Please define fine aggregate.
4. Is there any reason why 2 and 7 days were chosen as the setting time? What is the purpose of?
5. Does the PET melt at the temperature of 168°C?
6. Please be consistent when explaining the ratio, either in percentage (15%) or by ratio (1.5:8.5).
7. Are you certain that method EN7721-11 is used to check the porosity of masonry samples?

Results and discussion

1. Presentation of tables needs to be improved.
2. Results must be properly presented.

3. There is no discussion of the finding that leads to the aim of the study.
4. It is better if the author sends for proofreading .