

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_128954
Title of the Manuscript:	Research status and development of assembled lightweight steel composite structures
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

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.	This manuscript discusses the development and benefits of assembled lightweight steel composite structures, which are important for modern construction. These structures are lightweight, strong, and environmentally friendly, aligning with the global focus on sustainable building practices. By summarizing recent research and highlighting technical advantages, the paper contributes to understanding how such structures can improve building efficiency and safety, especially in areas prone to earthquakes. This knowledge can help scientists, engineers, and policymakers promote innovative and green construction solutions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title, "Research status and development of assembled lightweight steel composite structures," is ok but could be more engaging and specific. I think a more suitable alternative is: "Advancements and Challenges in Assembled Lightweight Steel Composite Structures for Sustainable Construction"</p> <p>This title highlights both progress and challenges, aligning with the manuscript's focus on sustainability and innovation in construction.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides an overview of the topic, focusing on the advantages, applications, and future prospects of assembled lightweight steel composite structures. But, it lacks clarity and depth in some areas. Some suggestions: Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the main objectives: Clearly state the research problem or gap the paper addresses. Include methodology: Briefly mention how the research findings were derived, such as through experimental studies, literature reviews, or simulations. Highlight key findings: Specify the most significant findings or conclusions, such as advancements in seismic performance or environmental benefits. Simplify technical language: Some sentences are overly complex and could be rephrased for better readability. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>After checking the manuscript, the scientific accuracy appears questionable due to several issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Poor citation practices: The references are not consistently formatted, and some claims lack proper attribution, raising concerns about the reliability of the cited data. Unclear methodology: The manuscript does not provide detailed information on the methods used for deriving conclusions, which is critical for validating scientific findings. Ambiguities in content: Some explanations, particularly in the sections on seismic performance and structural advantages, are unclear or overly generalized, making it difficult to assess their scientific validity. Reused images: The images seem to be sourced from other publications without clear acknowledgment, which undermines the credibility of the research. <p>While the topic is relevant and aligns with current trends in sustainable construction, these issues detract from the manuscript's scientific reliability. Addressing these concerns is necessary to ensure accuracy and credibility.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are numerous but have the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of recent studies: While some references are relatively new (2020–2022), many are older, limiting the reflection of the latest advancements in the field. Incomplete citations: Some references lack complete details, such as journal names, issue numbers, or page ranges, making it difficult for readers to locate the sources. Insufficient diversity: The references rely heavily on studies conducted in China, which limits the global perspective on the topic. <p>Suggestions for Additional References: To improve the reference list, the authors could include recent studies from international journals, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Articles on lightweight modular construction from the Journal of Structural Engineering (ASCE). Studies on the seismic performance of lightweight steel structures published in Engineering Structures. Research from the Journal of Constructional Steel Research on sustainable and innovative steel construction practices. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the language quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is unclear in many places, with grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that make it difficult to understand. Technical terms are not always used appropriately, and the sentences are often overly complex or poorly structured. To improve, the manuscript needs a thorough revision by a professional editor or someone with expertise in academic writing to ensure clarity, coherence, and proper use of scholarly language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on Structure and Clarity: The manuscript covers an important topic, but its overall structure needs improvement. Clear sections for methodology, findings, and implications would enhance readability. 2. Improve Visuals: The images used are unclear and appear to lack proper citations. Replace these with original or better-attributed visuals. 3. Consistency in Terminology: Use consistent terminology throughout the manuscript, especially for technical terms related to steel structures and seismic performance. 4. Address Gaps: Include more details on the challenges and limitations of assembled lightweight steel structures to provide a balanced perspective. 5. Professional Editing: The manuscript requires professional editing for language, grammar, and formatting to meet the standards of scholarly communication. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shahir Ahmad Safi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Engineering and Technology, Pakistan</p>