

**ReviewForm3**

JournalName:	<a href="#">AdvancesinResearch</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AIR_128466
Titleofthe Manuscript:	ResearchStatusandProspectofSteelFrame-InfillWallStructure
TypeoftheArticle	OpinionArticle

**PART1: Comments**

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
<b>Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This paper comprises a very important research topic, which is the problems encountered in assembled steel structures while considering the influence of infill walls. Due to the increasing development of this type of structures world-wide, special attention should be given in seismic regions, so to improve their seismic performance. Hence, this work intends to address a relevant, current, and worthy issue of investigation, which is the present context and problems encountered in these assembled steel structures with infill walls, whileproviding a collection of appropriate research material.	
<b>Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)</b>	Yes.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggesttheaddition(ordeletion)ofsomepointsinth is section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract hasvery little information to contextualize a readerwho may be interested in this paper. Some ofthe main problems in the current research should be briefly added and emphasized. The assembled steel structure should be better linked to the matter of infill walls. The ALC acronym should be written in its longer version in the abstract, and in the paper development the acronym can be identified and used. The main conclusions of the paper should be added in the last sentence of the abstract. Note that this abstract as only one sentence.Punctuation marks should be added, dividing this abstract in at least 4 sentences with only one paragraph.	
<b>Isthemanuscriptscientifically,correct?Pleasewrite here.</b>	The current paper presents a very important topic of investigation. Overall, it deals with the importance of infill walls in steel structures. The authors provide some background on the research topic. Being a state-of-the-art paper it is scientifically correct. However, the authors should extend their conclusions and findings on this collection of information to better endorse the manuscript scientifically.	
<b>Aretherferencesufficientandrecent?Ifyouhave suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	More references should beadded asitisastate-of-the-art type ofpaper. From the 31 references, 15are within the last 10 years span, i.e., about 50%. More recent references should be added to highlight the current status of this research topic.	
<b>Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English text of this paper must suffer a major review to improve the language quality. Syntax errors (punctuations, commas, etc.) are frequent, and a more formal/appropriate vocabulary should be used in some instances. In some instances, there is a need to correct sentences for a better comprehension of the values being transmitted.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors already provide a general context, although the state-of-the-art problems in this research topic must be better identified, while substantiating this with references when possible. The abstract has very little information to contextualize a reader who may be interested in this paper. Some of the main problems in the current research should be briefly added and emphasized. The assembled steel structure should be better linked to the matter of infill walls. The ALC acronym should be written in its longer version in the abstract, and in the paper development the acronym can be identified and used. The main conclusions of the paper should be added in the last sentence of the abstract. Note that this abstract as only one sentence. Punctuation marks should be added, dividing	

### ReviewForm3

	<p>this abstract in at least 4 sentences with only one paragraph.</p> <p>During the development of the paper, a better connection between sections should be considered so that the sequence and purpose of the paper is not lost. Thus, at the end of each section and beginning of the following one, the reviewer suggests a type of follow through compatible with the subsequent introduction.</p> <p>The authors should add images/figures to better explain/depict some systems, e.g., Steel Tube Concrete Structures, ALC wall panels composition, etc.</p> <p>The authors should be careful with acronyms, viz., ALC and CFST. They must be identified the first time they are referenced (except in the abstract, where the long version is preferable). Conclusion section is missing, where the main findings, results and future directions should be placed in correspondence with the abstract. In this sense, the abstract also lacks the main conclusions and findings of this research work.</p> <p>A major review is required to improve the English text, as it contains many syntactical errors. In addition, in some instances, the reviewer suggests the use of a more formal vocabulary. There are instances where it is very difficult to understand the meaning of the sentences (e.g. section 3. of Significance and Prospect). The reviewer strongly recommends the use of more short and concise sentences, instead of less and longer phrases.</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)
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 Folhento
Department, University & Country	Universidade do Porto, Portugal