

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 '**lack 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 provides a brief review of vibrations caused by shield construction. Now-a-days, when underground transit systems are becoming popular, understanding the characteristics of vibrations caused by tunnel construction process is important as it might affect the infrastructure and buildings on ground surface. Though this paper provides a review of vibration sources, and their attenuation procedure, the scientific content is not critically discussed. Also, some of the statements are convoluted and confusing to the reader. While the abstract and introduction sections are written well, the quality of discussion tapers down afterwards. May places, it is mentioned that soil modulus affects the vibration attenuation, however, its effect is not explicitly discussed. Also, some representative figures are needed to further improve the paper. The titles of Section 3.2 and section 4 are misleading as they do not look appropriate to the text. Referencing style is not correct. A simple numbered format should be used as per the guidelines. Conclusion statements are very general and do not comprehensively cover all points discussed.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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>Yes, No additions required.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Titles of Section 3.2 and 4 are not appropriate to the text. Section 3.1 heading to be changed to Characteristic frequencies.</p>	
<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 authors reviewed and presented some information on the sources of vibrations in shield construction. Information about vibration sources is robust. But discussion on the vibration frequency needs further improvement to highlight how the type of soil affect vibrations and their attenuation with distance.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Sentence structuring needs significant improvement especially when something from a past study is summarised. Several other English corrections are needed. Some statements at the end are not clear at all.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Rakesh Sai Malisetty
Department, University & Country	University of Technology Sydney, Australia