

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_103955
Title of the Manuscript:	A review of studies on the seismic vulnerability of structures
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Location should be added; "in China"</p> <p>No. Author should refer to journal guideline on abstract writing.</p> <p>Lots of missing link</p> <p>Not convincing. Lots of review of literatures should be done</p> <p>It doesn't suffice for a review. Quite shallow</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Manuscript should be overhauled using loads of literatures and clear understanding of intent should be demonstrated from the theory and methods. Since 2 decades is being reviewed, it should show from the citations.</p> <p>Author should state clearly the findings and make recommendations haven thoroughly discussed the reviewed results.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Ohakwere-Eze
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Kashere, Nigeria