

[ReviewForm3](#)

JournalName:	<a href="#">Advances inResearch</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AIR_123175
TitleoftheManuscript:	ReviewofEarthquake ResistanceandMitigationofUndergroundStructures
TypeoftheArticle	OpinionArticles

**PART1:** ReviewComments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author's Feedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportance ofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo youlike(ordislike)thismanuscript?Aminimum of3-4 sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.	Themanuscript providesa comprehensivereviewof earthquakeresistanceand mitigation techniques forunderground structures. Given the increasing reliance on underground infrastructure, thistopic is highly relevant to the scientific community.	
Isthethetitleof thearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternative title)	Thetitle, "Earthquake Resistanceand Mitigation of Underground Structures," is appropriate and accuratelyreflects the content of themanuscript. It is concise, informative, and captures the main focus oftheresearch.	
Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Do you suggesttheaddition(ordelation)ofsomepointsinthis section?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.	Theabstract provides a good overview ofthe manuscript's key points. Itcovers the importance of underground structures, the challenges posed by earthquakes, and the various methods used to assess seismic response and mitigate damage.	
Aresubsectionsandstructureofthemanuscript appropriate?	Thesubsections and overall structure ofthe manuscript arewell-organizedand logical.	
Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingthescientific correctness ofthismanuscript.Whydoyouthinkthat thismanuscriptisscientificallyrobust andtechnically sound?Aminimum of3-4sentencesmayberequired forthispart.	Themanuscript demonstrates a strong foundation in scientific principles and methodologies. Theauthors citerelevantliterature and providedetailed explanations of thevarious techniques used for seismic analysis and mitigation.	
Aretherferences sufficientandrecent?Ifyouhave suggestionsof additionalreferences,pleasemention theminthereviewform.	Thereferencesappear tobe sufficient andrecent,supporting the claims madein the manuscript. However, amorethorough review ofthe literaturemightreveal additional relevant studies that could be included.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISIONcomments  Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable forscholarlycommunications?	While theoverall language quality is generallyVery good	

[ReviewForm3](#)

Optional/General comments

The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of earthquake engineering and offers a comprehensive review of the current state of research on underground structures. The authors have done an excellent job of summarizing the existing literature and providing insights into future research directions.

Based on the provided manuscript, there are no overt ethical issues immediately apparent.

The manuscript does not explicitly declare any competing interests.

While a cursory review of the manuscript does not reveal any obvious instances of plagiarism, it is always possible that there may be undetected instances.

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bereket Netsanet Bekele</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia</b>