

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_98600
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison between DS, DSS and Triaxial resistance tests in compacted tropical soils in the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
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.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) The manuscript is not important for scientific community</p> <p>2) The title of the article can be improvised</p> <p>3) The abstract are not comprehensive and should be revised according to the structure below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction - Problem and objective - Method - Result - Conclusion <p>4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are poorly written</p> <p>5) The manuscript is moderately scientifically correct</p> <p>6) All of the references are obsolete. I am suggesting the author to referred to the listed article for better writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Slope stability analysis using modified Fellenius's and Bishop's method - Analysis of slope stability on tropical residual soil - Slope mapping using unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) - Stability analysis and improvement evaluation on residual soil slope: building cracked and slope failure - Monitoring soil slope of tropical residual soil by using tree water uptake method - The effect of tree water uptake on suction distribution in tropical residual soil slope - Investigation of groundwater table under rock slope by using electrical resistivity imaging at Sri Jaya, Pahang, Malaysia - Physical Analysis Work for Slope Stability at Shah Alam, Selangor 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language quality of the article is moderately suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	Kindly update the references as all of your references are out of date	

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:	Muhammad Syamsul Imran Zaini
Department, University & Country	College of Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia