

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_119168
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Seismic Response Analysis Methods for Underground Structures
Type of the Article	Method 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>No. The abstract must be Re-written</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. All the reference are outdated</p> <p>The paper reviews seismic response analysis methods for underground structures but most of the methods discussed are outdated. It is very important that the authors must address all the points mentioned below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The author must mention about the latest techniques and tools about the proposed work which is significantly missing in the article ➤ Most of the references are outdated. ➤ The comparison study of all the proposed method is very essential in the review paper ➤ The methodology and materials are mainly focussed in the review but failed to discuss about the results achieved. ➤ The abstract of the paper need to be fine-tuned and the authors must mention about the predominant methods and its result in the abstract ➤ Spell check and grammar check throughout the article needs to done some areas are difficult to understand due to poor sentence formation ➤ All the figures and equations must be cited properly most of the citation is missing ex fig 1, fig 3 etc. ➤ Fig 4 is not clear and must be updated or improved ➤ The paper needs a complete format check. The author should adhere to the journal format strictly. Throughout the paper the font size and spacing differs 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The typo error and grammar check needs to be done</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Major Revision Required</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight
--	--------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

		<i>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:	R.Prasanna
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India