

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_91284
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical simulation of hygrothermomechanical deformations of bituminous pavements in the city of Ouagadougou subjected to tropical dry showers
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The title is in accord with article - The manuscript adheres to the journal's standards after revision - This article contains new aspects, but the authors must underline the major findings of their work and explain how this study represents a progress to other similar published papers. Please provide comparison with other articles - The Abstract section refers to the study findings, methodologies, discussion as well as conclusion. The Abstract section must be improved. The Abstract should refer to the study findings, methodologies, discussion as well as conclusion. In this form the abstract is too generally - The keywords permit found article in the current registers or indexes - In the introduction it is not clearly described the state of the art of the investigated problem. More references are necessary. The references from last years are necessary for demonstrated that this study is actual - The text can be understood by specialists from other domains - The paper was written in standard, grammatically correct English, more corrections are necessary - In Tables are presented necessary results - The literature is sufficiently critical, current, and internationally evaluated - The size of the article is appropriate to the content - More discussions are necessary 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The relative perspectives and suggestions to the goal of this paper should be addressed in the Abstract. Abstract need to be rewritten as in the current format - Should be clearly discuss and explain the software used in Methodology - Some explanations are too speculative. Please provide some theories or compare the results with previous research - Conclusion it is not possible to list the results of experimental analysis. It is suggested that the author should summarize it carefully 	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Mastura Binti Wan Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia