

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_111199
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Seismic Performance of Infill Wall Frame Structures under Flexible Connections
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This research has limited significance due to its descriptive nature. It can give some insights for freshers into this topic.</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES DIO Should be included wherever available.</p> <p>KEY Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures are of inferior quality and should be upgraded. 2. The review should be summarized with in detail table including all the journals used for the survey. It should have the nature of work, ,key parameters of study, key findings, concluding remarks and scope of further research. Based on this the MAIN ISSUES FOR REFLECTION, should be accounted and conclusions should be drawn. 3. Some numerical data used by reviewed authors should be summarised as tables and graphs for representation should be incorporated in the study. 4. The conclusions should be to the point and not in general statements. 5. The outlook should be precise based on the concluding remarks. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	YES	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pranoy Roy
Department, University & Country	DR. B.C. Roy Engineering College, India