

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_119664</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Seismic Performance Study of PEC Structures</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Opinion Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is relevant to the scientific community as it addresses the seismic performance of PEC structures, which are an area of growing interest due to their application in resilient construction and post-earthquake recovery. The study contributes to the understanding of how these structures can improve the load capacity and seismic resistance of buildings.</p> <p>2. The current title, "Seismic Performance Study of PEC Structures," is appropriate, as it clearly reflects the focus of the study. However, an alternative suggestion could be: "Seismic Performance Analysis of PEC Structures".</p> <p>3. The summary is comprehensive, as it provides an overview of the advantages of PEC structures in terms of strength, load-bearing capacity and ease of post-earthquake repair.</p> <p>4. yes, they are appropriated</p> <p>5. The article presented some results but lacked graphs, figures, values and their respective statistical analyses. It lacked the scientific rigor required for a scientific communication article. Perhaps as an opinion piece it is adequate.</p> <p>6. The references mentioned seem to be relevant and adequate to support the study of PEC structures. However, it is suggested to check if there is a need to include additional more recent references, especially in specific areas such as advances in concrete materials or structural analysis methods.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Édson Avelar Guimarães</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</b>