

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_121130
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Foundation Materials Bearing Capacity Using MASW Techniques in Opolo and Amassoma, Bayelsa State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In this paper, the author has conducted a comparative analysis of the foundation material bearing capacity of soils in Opolo and Amassoma, Bayelsa State, Nigeria, utilized Multichannel Analysis of Surface Waves (MASW) techniques and Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) in order to highlight the effectiveness of MASW in assessing soil properties.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clear and comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author carried out a comparative study between two different sites to show the effectiveness of MASW in assessing soil properties and bearing capacity. It's better to add a second method that is widely used for evaluating soil properties and recalculate the bearing capacity using Terzaghi(1948) method. Finally, the author can compare the obtained results from the two different methods to highlight the effectiveness of MASW.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	It's suitable to cite other works used for evaluating soil properties and bearing capacity.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable.	
Optional/General comments	It's better to improve the quality of figures and center their captions	

Review Form 3

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:	Filali Kamel
Department, University & Country	University August 20, 1955, Algeria