



Rindu Bethary &lt;rindutwidibethary@gmail.com&gt;

## ICCIM 2021 notification for paper 35

1 pesan

**ICCIM 2021** <iccim2021@easychair.org>  
Kepada: Rindu Twidi Bethary <rindutwidibethary@gmail.com>

25 Juni 2021 pukul 16.25

Dear Rindu Twidi Bethary,

We would like to inform you that your paper

Paper ID: 35

Title: Performance of Polymer Modified Asphalt Mixture Using Gypsum Filler

Receive a Major Revision decision. Thus, you are asked to submit the revision no later than 9 July 2021. Please revise the paper as requested and fill out the response report for each review (see attached document). You can add the response report to the manuscript's first page. The editorial team might also do a review for you to revise your writing format. For that review, you don't have to fill the revision report.

The manuscript must undergo another assessment by the reviewer. We will send the acceptance letter, and you may register for the conference only after your reviewers give their consent. Please submit your revised manuscript on your EasyChair's submission page by selecting "Update file" at the top-right corner menu.

Thank you and we look forward to your participation in the Second International Conference of Construction, Infrastructure, and Materials (ICCIM 2021).

Sincerely,

Prof. Ir. Chaidir Anwar Makarim, MSE., Ph.D  
ICCIM 2021 Chairman

SUBMISSION: 35

TITLE: Performance of Polymer Modified Asphalt Mixture Using Gypsum Filler

----- REVIEW 1 -----

SUBMISSION: 35

TITLE: Performance of Polymer Modified Asphalt Mixture Using Gypsum Filler

AUTHORS: Rindu Twidi Bethary, Dwi Esti Intari and Siti Asyiah

----- Novelty and originality -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Relevance to the conference -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Comprehensibility, writing organization, and logical flow -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Accuracy and clarity of the written English language -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Adherence to the specified writing format -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Coherence and reflectiveness of the abstract in regard to the entire paper -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Clarity, relevance, and importance of the purpose of the study -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Scientific soundness of the methodology -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Rationale and ingenuity of the analysis -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Coherence of the conclusion -----

SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- Reliability and relevance of the references -----  
 SCORE: 3 (Excellent)

----- REVIEW 2 -----

SUBMISSION: 35  
 TITLE: Performance of Polymer Modified Asphalt Mixture Using Gypsum Filler  
 AUTHORS: Rindu Twidi Bethary, Dwi Esti Intari and Siti Asyiah

----- Novelty and originality -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Relevance to the conference -----  
 SCORE: 3 (Excellent)  
 ----- Comprehensibility, writing organization, and logical flow -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Accuracy and clarity of the written English language -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Adherence to the specified writing format -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Coherence and reflectiveness of the abstract in regard to the entire paper -----  
 SCORE: 1 (Poor)  
 ----- Clarity, relevance, and importance of the purpose of the study -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Scientific soundness of the methodology -----  
 SCORE: 1 (Poor)  
 ----- Rationale and ingenuity of the analysis -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Coherence of the conclusion -----  
 SCORE: 1 (Poor)  
 ----- Reliability and relevance of the references -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)  
 ----- Reviewer's remarks -----  
 - Section 1: flexible hardening is not a common term of kind of pavement structure  
 - What is the difference between this research and reference no. 11?  
 - In the paper, several complex sentences were used by the authors. It is suggested to use a simple sentence instead of a complex sentence to improve the paper clarity  
 - Table 1 and Table 2: people usually use a term of specific gravity instead of density. For example, bulk specific gravity, apparent specific gravity. Both of them are without a unit.  
 - why is the asphalt mixed first with gypsum filler and then mixed with aggregate?  
 - Section 3.1: .... to get the percentage escape of each fraction. It should be: ... to get the percentage passing of each fraction ...  
 - Figure 3: please translate all legends to English  
 - Figure 5: check the explanation. The lower the VFB is, the less durable the mixture will be  
 - Figure 6: what is the unit of stability? The value of stability is too high. please double check  
 - The high VIM and low VFB can be contributed by using a high percentage of fine aggregate in the mixture (up to 61%). this is also indicated by the high asphalt content required. For the AC mixture, the common asphalt content is 5.5% - 5.7%. Please check the film asphalt thickness to prove this fact.  
 - please check the Marshall Quotient (MQ) to check the rigidity of the asphalt mixture. The AC is flexible in nature, so that the mixture is suggested to have MQ that not too far from the lower bound.  
 - Please improve the writing and proofread the paper before resubmitting.  
 - what is the correct content of gypsum in the mixture? 0%, 1%, 2% and 3% (as stated in abstract) or 0%, 2%, 4% and 6% (as stated in section 2.4). Please mention that the content of the gypsum is a proportion to something (total filler, total mixture weight, or others)  
 - the last conclusion should be ever mentioned in the analysis.

----- REVIEW 3 -----

SUBMISSION: 35  
 TITLE: Performance of Polymer Modified Asphalt Mixture Using Gypsum Filler  
 AUTHORS: Rindu Twidi Bethary, Dwi Esti Intari and Siti Asyiah

----- Novelty and originality -----  
 SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Relevance to the conference -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Comprehensibility, writing organization, and logical flow -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Accuracy and clarity of the written English language -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Adherence to the specified writing format -----

SCORE: 1 (Poor)

----- TEXT:

No keywords yet.

Figures containing graphics look blurry, please use charts or enlarge.

There are no sentence statements that refer to figure 8.

----- Coherence and reflectiveness of the abstract in regard to the entire paper -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Clarity, relevance, and importance of the purpose of the study -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Scientific soundness of the methodology -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Rationale and ingenuity of the analysis -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Coherence of the conclusion -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Reliability and relevance of the references -----

SCORE: 2 (Satisfactory)

----- Reviewer's remarks -----

This is a review made by the editorial team. All scores except for the "Adherence to the specified writing format" do not reflect the quality of your paper.



**ICCIM 2021 Revision Report.docx**

66K