

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_124448
Title of the Manuscript:	Characteristics of vibration sources and their propagation properties in shield construction
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**Jack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly in the field of geotechnical engineering and urban construction. It provides a comprehensive review of vibration sources and propagation characteristics in shield construction, which is crucial for understanding and mitigating environmental impacts in urban tunnel projects. The paper's synthesis of current research on vibration frequencies, amplitudes, and propagation laws offers valuable insights for researchers and practitioners alike. However, the manuscript could benefit from more in-depth analysis and discussion of practical implications to further enhance its contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Characteristics of vibration sources and their propagation properties in shield construction" is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It clearly indicates the focus on both vibration sources and propagation in the context of shield construction.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, covering the main points of the study. However, it could be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing more specific quantitative findings, such as the exact frequency range of vibrations. • Briefly mentioning the methodology used (literature review and analysis). • Including a sentence on the practical implications of the findings. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, following a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. However, the paper could benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding a dedicated "Methods" section to explain the literature review process. • Expanding the conclusion section to include more discussion on implications and future research directions. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive review of current literature and synthesis of findings from various studies. The inclusion of mathematical models for vibration amplitude and propagation adds to its technical soundness. The paper's analysis of vibration characteristics across different frequencies and soil conditions shows a nuanced understanding of the complex phenomena involved in shield construction vibration. However, the scientific merit could be further enhanced by including more quantitative comparisons between studies and a more critical analysis of the current state of research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references appear to be sufficient and include recent studies. However, the manuscript could benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including more international studies to provide a global perspective. • Adding references on vibration mitigation strategies in shield construction. 	

Review Form 3

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but could benefit from professional editing to improve clarity and correct minor grammatical issues.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Not Applicable	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohit Hemanth Kumar
Department, University & Country	Alliance University, India