

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_128237
Title of the Manuscript:	Explicit dynamic failure analysis of a reinforced concrete beam
Type of the Article	Opinion 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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 article presents: 1. The article presents an interesting analysis, investigating the behavior of concrete beams under loading impact. 2. The authors provide a good foundation and justification for the choice of the method used in Ansys. 3. Although the authors present good ideas, it would be important for them to base their work on arguments and previously published articles to establish a more consistent theoretical foundation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Explicit dynamic failure analysis of a reinforced concrete beam using impact load"	
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 abstract is well aligned with the text, but it lacks the presentation of some of the results found by the authors	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	I have marked only a few points that need further clarification and organization in the writing, but, in a global analysis, the article is well-structured.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Bosse, R. M., Flórez-López, J., Gidrão, G. M., Rodrigues, I. D., & Beck, A. T. (2024). Collapse mechanisms and fragility curves based on Lumped Damage Mechanics for RC frames subjected to earthquakes. <i>Engineering Structures</i> , 311, 118115.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Suggestion at adjustment of the text according to the comments inserted in the review file, where: 1. Be careful not to repeat too many terms consecutively. 2. Present references that contribute to and support the analysis presented PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Guilherme Santos da Silveira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology of Paraná, Brazil