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**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the discussion section, on MDD and OMC, author needs to explain why the values are different in each location. What is causing the disparity? Any variations in all locations from top to bottom? I do not see detailed reason(s) why this is so. Also, for every explanation given for the results I expect to see citations showing other works which corroborate or negates the reasons behind the explanations. This also applies to the chemical analyses and explanation for the variation in silica to sesquioxide ratios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor REVISION comments</td>
<td>In the abstract and some sections of the general paper, ppercentage symbol should be typed close to the numbers. In the first paragraph of the introduction, laterite soils and lateritic soils were used interchangeably. It should be lateritic soils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional/General comments</td>
<td>In the conclusion section, “would require” instead of “required” should be used. It was written in such a way that shows the samples are already being used as subbase and subgrade which is not so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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