

[Review Form 3](#)

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Book Name:               | <a href="#">Engineering Research: Perspectives on Recent Advances</a>               |
| 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. | In this book chapter entitled "Salt creep: A critical parameter affecting the stability of underground excavations", the author evaluated the stability of underground mining work via the study of the rheological behavior of rock salt.   |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)   | The proposed title is appropriate but it would be more acceptable if it were reworded as follows: Critical parameter affecting the stability of underground excavations: Salt creep.   |   |
| 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 summary is comprehensive, but the author needs to make additional efforts to succinctly present the results and findings.  |   |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.   |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              | The references are not sufficient and not recent enough for some.  |   |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | The manuscript is quite well written and the quality of the language is suitable for scientific communications.  |   |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ By relying on the literature, the author must densify the introduction with the context.</li> <li>✓ The manuscript must be enriched with bibliographical references, in particular the introduction and methodology. Many claims and comments are not supported by references.</li> <li>✓ Please improve the texts of figures 15, 20 and 21 because they are blurry.</li> </ul> |   |

**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> |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | Veved Albert                           |
| Department, University & Country | The University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon |