

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	

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)																								
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Needs improvement</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references shall be included</p> <p>Typographical and grammatical mistakes to be rectified</p>																									
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Need improvement																									
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Line No.</th> <th>To be Read as/ Remarks</th> <th>Instead of</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9, 10</td> <td></td> <td>References in CAPS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22</td> <td>Very clayey and very sandy</td> <td>very clayey and sandy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24, 35, 42, 48 & 55</td> <td>Grammatical errors</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>56, 57 & 64</td> <td>How the specific values of tension were measured</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>58</td> <td>Shear velocity</td> <td>This should be the speed of the shear box?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75</td> <td>To be clarified / explained</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>78</td> <td>Needs more clarification</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Words with red colour require correction</p>	Line No.	To be Read as/ Remarks	Instead of	9, 10		References in CAPS	22	Very clayey and very sandy	very clayey and sandy	24, 35, 42, 48 & 55	Grammatical errors		56, 57 & 64	How the specific values of tension were measured		58	Shear velocity	This should be the speed of the shear box?	75	To be clarified / explained		78	Needs more clarification		
Line No.	To be Read as/ Remarks	Instead of																								
9, 10		References in CAPS																								
22	Very clayey and very sandy	very clayey and sandy																								
24, 35, 42, 48 & 55	Grammatical errors																									
56, 57 & 64	How the specific values of tension were measured																									
58	Shear velocity	This should be the speed of the shear box?																								
75	To be clarified / explained																									
78	Needs more clarification																									

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Suppiah
Department, University & Country	PMIST, India