

RE: Invitation to Review a Paper – VietPol2025 Conference

 Summarize



Tien Dung Le
To VIET - POL

  Reply  Reply All  Forward  

Tue 09/09/2025 08:48



Viet-Pol 2025 REVIEWER COMMENTS 182.doc
63 KB

Please see the review report in the file attached.

Regards,
Dung.

From: VIET - POL <Vietpol@hmg.edu.vn>

Sent: 04 September 2025 10:26

To: Tien Dung Le <t.d.le@hmg.edu.vn>

Subject: Invitation to Review a Paper – VietPol2025 Conference

Dear A/Prof.Dr Le Tien Dung,

On behalf of the VietPol2025 Conference Organizing Committee, I would like to invite you to review a paper that closely aligns with your area of expertise. Your deep knowledge in this field will provide valuable insights and constructive feedback for the author.

The paper is attached to this email for your interest. We kindly ask that you send your review by 10 September, 2025. However, you may accept and suggest an alternative completion date if needed.

I sincerely hope you will accept this invitation. In case you are unable to review the paper, I would greatly appreciate it if you could kindly recommend a suitable colleague(s) to perform this review.

Please disclose any potential conflicts of interest you might have concerning the manuscript's content or the authors.

The peer review note can be found in the attachment for your reference.

Many thanks for your time and consideration. I look forward to your feedback of this invitation.

Thank you for your interest in submitting your paper. We have successfully received your submission through both the system and via email.

Best regards,

A/Prof. Nguyen The Vinh

On behalf of the Organizing Committee

The 8th Viet-Pol International Scientific Conference

REVIEWER COMMENTS
VIET-POL 2025 CONFERENCE
(First Assessment)

Article title: Design Optimization of Isolation Dams and Drainage LRDD Trajectories Using Integrated 3D Geological Models with Methane Release Forecasting – A Case Study from a Multiseam Coal Mine in Poland

Please use this guide to assist you in formulating your comments on the review form below:

(Please, **double-click on one square** for your selection)

1. Initial points to be considered:

- Does the subject fall within the scope of the journal? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is this a novel and original contribution? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Are interpretations and conclusions sound, justified by the data, and consistent with the objectives? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- Is the material too clinical, too specialized, or too preliminary for our readership?
 ☐ Yes ☒ No

If your answer(s) to any of the above points suggests that the paper is not suitable for the journal, please give a clear argument for rejection on the review form:

2. If the paper is appropriate for review, then please consider the following:

- Does the title clearly reflect the contents? ☒ Yes ☐ No
Comment:.....
- Is the abstract sufficiently informative, suitable to appear on the journal? ☒ Yes ☐ No
Comment: No need to mention the funding information in the abstract. Apart from the abstract and introduction sections, no further information of “polymer-based system” is presented in the text. No detailed information of “laboratory testing” is described in the text.
- Are keywords appropriate? ☒ Yes ☐ No
Comment: Rirectional?
- Is the statement of the article adequate and appropriate in view of the subject matter?
 ☒ Yes ☐ No
Comment:.....
- Is the description of materials and methods sufficiently informative to allow replication of the experiment? ☐ Yes ☒ No
Comment: See the comment below.
- Are the statistical methods used correct and adequate? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comment: Not available.

- Are the results clearly presented? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Comment:.....

- Is the organization of the article satisfactory? ☒ Yes ☒ No

Comment: The structure of Section 3 appears to be uneven: there is no section 3.2 and no subsection 3.1.2?

- Does the content justify the length? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comment:.....

- Are the figures, photos, and table all necessary, complete, and clearly presented?
☒ Yes ☐ No

Comment: There is no Figure 6A as mentioned in its caption.

- Are the references adequate? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Comment:.....

- Is the English correct and understandable to a multidisciplinary and multinational readership? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Comment:.....

3. Recommendation to the Editor:

- ☐ Acceptance with no revision
- ☐ Acceptance with minor revision
- ☒ Acceptance with major revision
- ☐ Rejection

Signature of Reviewer

Date (*Month/Day/Year*)

Name of Reviewer (*Please type or print*)

Title (*Please type or print*)

Addition comment/guide to the author for:

The manuscript presents a study on the optimisation of design for isolation dams and drainage Long Reach Directional Drillings (LRDD) trajectories for methane drainage in coal mine by using 3D geological models combined with numerical simulations. The research objective is of significant importance, and an enormous amount of works have been implemented as the result of a funded project. The manuscript is well written and logically structured with various methods being used. If the manuscript is going to be considered for publication as an original research paper, the reviewer suggests that the introduction section should include a literature review on the LRDD optimisation and dam sealing, from which the research gap can be better stated. For the research method, considering that the optimisation was done by using numerical simulation, further details regarding the development of the simulation should be added. A flowchart for the simulation can be added to clarify the process. The simulation results should be analysed/discussed in more details. The abstract and summary sections requires revision to better highlight the results and contributions obtained from the mentioned analysis/discussion. Some results regarding “three-stage approach” and “elastic properties of the selected resins” in the summary section were not sufficiently described in the main text.