

Manuscript: “**Études De Lithostabilisation De La Latérite Avec La Dolérite De Mansadala (Sud-Est Du Sénégal) Pour Une Utilisation En Couche De Base De Chaussée**”

Submitted: 22 February 2022

Accepted: 15 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author:

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p59](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p59)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: M. Ibrahima Khalil CISSE

Reviewer 2: Kawtar Ouatiki

M. Ibrahima Khalil CISSE

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-02-25 01:19 PM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*** Yes it is and adequate to the content of the article**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** Yes it is ; juste write " agence de----Travaux " and not "Agence de --- "travaux"**

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No, all is correct

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** Yes it is clearly explained**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*** Yes it is but it is better to put able translating curves to explain the eolution of the parameters like maximal dry density and CBR**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** Yes it is**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** it is necessary to number the bibliographical references which refer to the cited documents to facilate resarch and confirmation of the arguments put forward**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

this is a goog article confirming the conclusions of previous studies on the lithostabilisation of lateritic gravels by other local materials

kawtar ouatiki

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-02-28 04:36 PM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper.

You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*** Yes the title is correct and reflects the content**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

***yes**

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Keywords should be translated in french (first abstract)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** Yes. The researcher has explained well all methods and materials required to process the lithostabilization of soil by using dolerite. Few laboratory analysis have been done to compare the results with guideline used in senegal**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*** No errors, except the fact that references should be mentioned in the body of the text, if they are used.**

Also, it is recommended to dedicate a paragraph to explain the geology of the region, properties of soils used on road works, damages caused by untreated laterics soils (or treated but not necessary in accordance with notional standards)

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** Yes the conclusion is correct. It contains suggestions and an opening, which is good.**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** The list of references is sufficient at this stage of research. But it should be mentioned in the body of the text.
(Except the ones concerning norms)**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Bonne chance et bonne continuation!