

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Engineering Research: Perspectives on Recent Advances
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3891
Title of the Manuscript:	Salt creep: A critical parameter affecting the stability of underground excavations
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

[Review Form 3](#)

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Content Analysis</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Technical Depth: The paper demonstrates a high level of technical rigor, covering essential aspects of salt creep and its implications for underground stability.Methodology: The methodology, including sample collection, uniaxial and triaxial tests, and detailed rheological behavior analysis, is well-structured.Data Presentation: Tables and figures provide clear visualization of results, supporting the discussion.Relevance: The focus on practical applications, such as safety and efficiency in mining operations, adds value to the research. <hr/> <p>Weak Points and Suggestions for Improvement</p> <p>1. Grammar and Language Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The text contains numerous grammatical issues and non-standard phrasing. For instance:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Phrases like "salt samples from boreholes located at the Slănic Prahova mine were analyzed" could be streamlined to "Salt samples obtained from the Slănic Prahova mine boreholes were analyzed."Replace repetitive phrases (e.g., "creep phenomenon") with synonyms or variations for better readability.Suggestion: Engage a professional editor or use advanced proofreading tools to refine grammar, eliminate redundancy, and enhance clarity. <p>2. Structure and Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Some sections are overly detailed, potentially overwhelming readers.The introduction could benefit from a concise statement of research objectives and significance.The discussion lacks a clear distinction between results and interpretation.Suggestion: Rearrange sections to emphasize key findings and implications. Use subheadings for clarity and flow. <p>3. Figures and Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Some figures lack proper explanations or are insufficiently referenced in the text.<ul style="list-style-type: none">For example, Figure 4's caption and description should be expanded to clarify its relevance.Tables are dense and could be summarized to highlight the most critical findings.Suggestion: Add more descriptive captions and refer explicitly to figures/tables in the discussion. <p>4. Literature Review:</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

- The **theoretical framework** cites relevant studies but lacks a critical review of previous research. It fails to identify gaps that this study addresses.
- **Suggestion:** Expand the literature review to include a comparative analysis of past studies.

5. Methodology:

- While detailed, some steps are not adequately justified. For example, the rationale behind the chosen stress levels or durations in creep tests could be elaborated.
- **Suggestion:** Include a brief explanation of how parameters were selected and their relevance to practical applications.

6. Discussion and Interpretation:

- The discussion does not adequately link findings to practical applications, such as specific engineering implications.
- Some conclusions seem speculative without robust evidence.
- **Suggestion:** Focus on implications for mining operations and safety, using specific examples to strengthen claims.

7. Abstract:

- The abstract is overly technical and does not summarize key findings clearly for a broader audience.
- **Suggestion:** Revise to include the research objectives, main results, and practical applications in simpler language.

8. Conclusion:

- While comprehensive, the conclusion lacks concise takeaways and actionable insights.
- **Suggestion:** Highlight the most significant findings and suggest future research directions more explicitly.

Additional Information Needed

1. **Validation of Results:** Include a section on how the findings were validated, such as comparisons with existing models or field observations.
2. **Environmental Impact:** Consider discussing the environmental implications of salt creep and mining operations, if relevant.
3. **Safety Recommendations:** Suggest specific measures to mitigate risks in mining operations based on the findings.

Grammar and Language Examples

Before:

- "The rheological properties of rock salt analyzed show a pronounced creep phenomenon depending on the NaCl content."

[Review Form 3](#)

	<p>After:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The rheological properties of rock salt exhibit pronounced creep behavior, significantly influenced by NaCl content." <p>Before:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Creep tests were conducted to analyze the behavior of salt samples." <p>After:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Creep tests were performed to evaluate the mechanical behavior of salt samples." <hr/> <p>Publication Checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., "creep coefficient," "creep rate"). Verify adherence to journal formatting guidelines (citations, figure placement, etc.). Address ethical considerations if applicable (e.g., environmental risks). 	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Al-Hasnawi
Department, University & Country	Iraq