

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_98601
Title of the Manuscript:	Oedometers tests in compacted tropical soils in the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
Type of the Article	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.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The article submitted for review is purely research in nature. However, its design, in my opinion, is transformative, as it needs some improvement. The article is very uninformative, because, although it formally contains all the necessary sections, these sections are presented very poorly and do not contain the necessary explanations for readers. article At the same time, a certain scientific interest in the material that the authors tried to present in the peer-reviewed article should be noted.</p> <p>The title of the article suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references sufficient and recent</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In my opinion, the text of the article needs to be revised. In addition, when revising the article, it should be taken into account that out of 30 references cited, 15 have a very old year of publication (more than 20 years). I think they need to be updated	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yakov G. Verkhivker
Department, University & Country	Odessa National University of Technology, Ukraine