

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_110868
Title of the Manuscript:	Review and Outlook on Seismic Vulnerability Analysis of Tunnel Engineering
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, because this article discusses how to prevent seismic earthquakes using a numerical simulation method approach, it should be a mini-review, not an article review.</p> <p>No, I recommend to change it with: <i>Seismic Vulnerability Assessment in Tunnels: Mini Review</i></p> <p>Need revision by author and explain in one or several sentences to give a general description of the methodological approach, including the material and data used.</p> <p>Yes, but it needs to be revised by author because it lacks of literature, make it stronger in terms of language and content. A complete revision of the introduction section is suggested.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Lack of literature of review, the literature review must be 50 for minimum (based on guidelines). Need to update latest references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript needs to be revised by a professional English speaker	
Optional/General comments	Make a review article or mini review with a discussion structure that suits your message. If you use software assistance, use this assistance only as a tool while critical reasoning is still with the writer.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fungky Dyan Pertiwi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang, Indonesia