

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_106156
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of non-uniform seismic response of intercity tunnel with defective shields
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>In this paper, the author/authors studied the "Study of non-uniform seismic response of intercity tunnel with defective shields."</p> <p>. The results are interesting. Quality of presentation of the paper is good. I would like to recommend the paper for publication after some minor revision.</p> <p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Typographical errors and repeated word shall be removed. Proper space should be maintained between two words.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Krishna Gopal Singha
Department, University & Country	Pragya Academy Junior College, India