

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_123175
Title of the Manuscript:	Review of Earthquake Resistance and Mitigation of Underground Structures
Type of the Article	Opinion Articles

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 feedback here)</i>
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.	The paper presents the following objectives: a comprehensive review of the seismic response characteristics, failure mechanisms, seismic design methods, mitigation measures, and future research directions of underground structures. The topics are current and of great importance in light of the damage caused by recent earthquakes, such as the one in Turkey. The significance lies in the fact that entire populations could be isolated due to the collapse of this type of structure.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Assessing the Seismic Performance of Tunnels: A Review	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and complete.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	While it provides a description of the seismic response of tunnels and the analysis methods (theoretical, numerical, and experimental), it lacks depth in the mitigation section. In fact, only one reference is cited, and no concrete examples of how seismic effects would be mitigated are given. It also does not elaborate much on future research directions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In section 3 Analysis Methods you should add references to hybrid methods (experimental-numerical) based on sensor measurements in real tunnels (such as monitoring with accelerometers i.e.).	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and quality of writing is adequate.	
Optional/General comments	The article is scientifically sound; it should delve a bit deeper into the suggested topics. It is considered suitable for publication.	

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:	Francisco Alberto Calderón
Department, University & Country	National Technological University, Argentina