Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_128454**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Finite element analysis of spherical bearing based on Abaqus**
Type of the Article	**Short communication**

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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 research highlights the use of multi-material modeling, addressing mechanical behaviors such as stress, strain, and deformation under seismic conditions. This approach appears incremental rather than groundbreaking since similar studies have been referenced. Dynamic analysis under earthquake conditions is innovative in its application for verifying the practical reliability of the bearing under seismic scenarios. However, the study builds upon existing practices rather than introducing fundamentally new methods.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes, it is sound.	
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 findings of the study can be highlighted more if the length of the abstract doesn't impose the restriction.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Although the simulations appear robust, the inclusion of experimental validation (or references to prior experimental studies) would strengthen confidence in the findings. Sensitivity analysis to assess the robustness of the results against variations in material properties or loading conditions could be valuable. Recommendations for implementing the findings in practical engineering designs, such as guidelines for installation or performance optimization under varied seismic intensities, could enhance the paper's practical utility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Since it is a short communication, the number of references is sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The methodologies in this study are logically structured and provide a clear pathway to evaluate the seismic spherical bearing's performance. The alignment of objectives, simulation steps, and results ensures a coherent approach. However, to enhance scientific rigor, additional details on model validation, parameter justification, and extended discussions on results are recommended.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mohammad Mehdi Pardsouie**
Department, University & Country	**Estahban Islamic Azad University, Iran**

Review Form 3