

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_119175
Title of the Manuscript:	Causes and hazards of perimeter rock cavities behind shield tunnels
Type of the Article	Opinion 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript is apparently authored from the tunnel construction point of view. Its way forwards and conclusion are valuable to the tunnel builders who often encounter cavities behind the design line. 2. Yes, title is appropriate partially; except the point that cavity forming is common to all the tunnels and not limiting to the shielded tunnels. 3. One or two lines giving premise to the shield tunnels could have made the abstract more attractive. 4. Yes, structure of the paper is appropriate for the Opinion Paper. 5. Since paper is if opinion type so it has personal opinion of author(s) and most of the opinions developed on the causes and prevention are limited to the personal experience of author(s) 6. References are sufficient for the type of paper. <p>Additional Comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion paper has touched a very practical problems which is often an issue for tunnel builders. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are certain syntax errors which need revision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General Comments: Opinion type paper is well structured to be part of journal. Line wise review is as under:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 5 – 12: Abstract of the paper could have been more comprehensive to attract the readers. • Line 16: Our Country be replaced with country name of region or maybe omitted. • Line 18: The sentence eending on line 18 nneeds to have a reference as its not opinion but referred fact. • Line 30: The sentence ending on line 30 may replace with construction scheme instead construction. • Line 31: Replace water transfer shield tunnels with Urban Utility Tunnels • Line 34 & 38: Replace Disease Problem/Disease with Problem. • Line 37: Replace voids with cavity. • Line 40: Sentence starting from line 40 needs reference. • Line 42: Reduces the resistance – it needs clarification. • Line 52: Backfill material is supposed not to be dissolved / corroded. • Line 51-54: This opinion is very strong and subjective – Please offer reference. • Line 66-69: Such ground water effect will pose a complete tunnel failure. • Line 76: Concrete lining in the tunnel is exposed to less temperature variations so there are less likely chances of concrete shrinkage etc. • Line 84: Syntax error • Line 89-93: Syntax error • Line 94: Word dehollowing and arch waist be clarified • Line 102: “lining wall cavity defects in many operational tunnels are more common” be referred through literature. • Line 105&106: Syntax error 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Line 113: hollow be replaced with cavity• Line 126 & 132: Please distinguish cavity phenomenon between soil and rock (as both are discussed separately).• Line 127: Please add word adversely before effecting.• Para 4.1: Very well explained.• Line 175: Artificial excavation method be explained.• Line 201: Perfect monitoring system be explained in few lines (degree of perfectness) <p>Concluding remarks: Well concluded.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</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:	Asif Riaz
Department, University & Country	Tunneling Institute of Pakistan (TIP), Pakistan