



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_48109
Title of the Manuscript:	Megaprojects - Socioeconomic and Environmental Dynamics in D. Pedro I-Tamoios Road Axis, São Paulo, 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	This is a good paper if it can be properly structured and represented. There is no cohesion in the manner of presentation. For example, author's stated discussing results without data presentation and suddenly they move to present information on the study area which should have been presented much earlier under methods. Comments on the body manuscript.	The paper was re-written considering SOME comments. THE DATA WERE ANALYZED BASED ON THE METHODOLOGY FOR ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION USED
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	