

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_97900
Title of the Manuscript:	SITE INVESTIGATION AND SHEAR STRENGTH PROPERTIES OF SOIL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? The manuscript presents an empirical proposal. The contribution focused on field survey, interesting. I think authors need to clarify so they can contribute to the literature. 2. Is the title of the article adequate? It is adequate, I think that I would not need to present the Site investigation and shear strength properties of soil 3. Is the article summary comprehensive? R) No, it is too brief, it does not present the objective, methodological procedures, results and conclusion 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? R) For the empirical study yes, but from the theoretical point of view, it is very succinct 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R) In an empirical way, it lacks more scientific knowledge 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? R) There are 16 in total, a procedure for searching and filtering references was not shown. Since only 4 are references after 2018.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK, but needs a review.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sérgio Murilo Petri
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil