

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127730
Title of the Manuscript:	Summary of Research Status on Seismic Performance of Multi-Tower Cable-Stayed Bridge
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

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.	The topic of the manuscript is important. The reader expects more details related to the experimental tests performed, but unfortunately, this information is not presented. Also related to the numerical analyses more details are welcomed. See Part 2.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>As I have mentioned the topic is of interest and I submit the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Related to the experimental tests, only the conclusions are presented. The protocol of the tests, a description of the shaking table, and the outcome of the results are missing.ii) In addition, no reference for other experimental equipments, e.g. centrifuge tests is made.iii) A reference for numerical analyses is made, but no reference for the explored computed codes, for the constitutive equations, for the use of linear and non linear models.iv) A better characterization of the seismic action for the experimental tests and for the numerical analyses is missing.v) A reference for PBSO is given, but a discussion related to safety and functionality, and acceptable level of damage, namely the structural damage and the loss of serviceability is welcomed. <p>Finally, will be important a reference if the obtained results were calibrated by the behavior of prototypes.</p>	

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:	Pedro Seco e Pinto
Department, University & Country	University of Coimbra, Portugal