

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_122582
Title of the Manuscript:	Geo-sustainability Issues and Remediation: Sripur Coalmine Areas West Bengal, India
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	During the process of mining coal mines, there are often potential risks of unsafety. In particular, in underground coal mines with complex geological conditions, the risk of unsafety is even greater. During the mining design, people will rely on geological documents of the mining area, carefully evaluate to find suitable mining technology and avoid potential risks of unsafety. In the article, the authors have collected, analyzed and evaluated the phenomena that occur when mining in the Sripur Coalmine Areas West Bengal, India	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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.	In the abstract, the author should add the research results of the article. (The reader has not seen the specific results of this research, if possible, clarify and explain)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think that, they are appropriate	
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.	The author has spent a lot of time and effort to complete the article. The data collected for evidence in the article are all clearly analyzed by the author, and it has real-life illustrations. Readers believe that the data in the article that the author collected and evaluated from reality is reliable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The article cited 30 references. These references are all clearly and specifically sourced and referenced, so they are reliable.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Very good. English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Recommendations section is still general, but readers find it acceptable.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with the 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?	No.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	No	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	8.0

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:
This information is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate properly.
Certificate preparation will not be possible if incomplete information is received.

Name of the Reviewer	Vu Trung Tien
Department of Reviewer	Faculty of Mining, Department of Underground Mining
University or Institution of Reviewer	Hanoi University of Mining and Geology
Country of Reviewer	Vietnam
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Associate Professor, PhD, Senior Lecturer
Email ID of Reviewer	vutrungtien@gmail.com ; vutrungtien@humg.edu.vn
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	0302-11
5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	underground mining design; underground mining technology; underground mine pressure; displacement and deformation in underground mining; mining safety;

Review Form 3

Certificate for reviewing the manuscript: Ms/AIR/122582 ➤ Hộp thư đến x



Managing Editor <reviewer@sciencedomain.info>
đến tôi ▾

17:10 (8 phút trước) ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮

Dear Vu Trung Tien,

Thank you for your help and support to maintain the high peer review standard of this journal. We again thank you for your great help.

Please note that this Certificate has no relationship with Web of Science (Formerly known as Publons) record and enrolment. For Web of Science reviewer record, please follow the guideline as mentioned in the respective website.

Please refer to the links below to access your peer-reviewing certificate.

1. Direct certificate Download link:

<https://download.peerreviewcentral.com/search.php?search=vutrungtien@gmail.com>

2. Link for your reviewer dashboard (Here all certificates will be stored for your future use)

Login URL: <https://dashboard.peerreviewcentral.com>

Username: vutrungtien@gmail.com

Password: EjZ57WDC4G0T

(Please do not give space after typing your email ID)

3. Video guideline: https://youtu.be/kw_4xwo3nVc

With regards,
Dr. Basu
Journal editorial office

Reg. Offices:

India: Guest House Road, Street no - 1/6, Hooghly, West Bengal, India, Tele: +91 8617752708

UK: Third Floor, 207 Regent Street, London, W1B 3HH, UK, Fax: +44 20-3031-1429

Disclaimer: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If verification is required please request a signed hard-copy/scanned version. Our company accepts no liability for the content of this email, unless that information is subsequently confirmed in writing