



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Although you stated that you have analyzed the period of 1998-2013 within the scope of the study, it has been seen that the data you provided within the scope of the study was until 2010 when it did not cover the year 2013. And also no detailed information about 1998 data. Also the other data (growth rates) did not match the same periods. How can you compare or relate these datas? The data belong to the same period is necessary for comparison.</p> <p>2. In the abstract and methodology part, please explain which method/methods did you use to analyse the results of your study.</p> <p>3. It would be useful to give information about the changes in the land use rates, the area size of each settlement, the distance of the roads mentioned in the study, also how much of the roads pass through urban areas and protected areas and etc.</p> <p>4. Discussion part should be revised.</p> <p>5. The conclusion section should be rewritten by establishing a relationship with the results of the study.</p> <p>6. Suggested changes are marked on the text.</p>	<p>1. <b>The correct data period was highlighted in the methodology and in the text</b></p> <p>2. <b>It was explained in the abstract and methodology</b></p> <p>3. <b>Some information requested, when the data was available, was inserted in the manuscript.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The Discussion part was revised.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The conclusion was re-written</b></p> <p>6. <b>OK</b></p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	