

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_129302
Title of the Manuscript:	An overview of seismic isolation technology for super high and rise buildings
Type of the Article	Method Article

#### 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>

#### 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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of seismic isolation technology and its application in super high-rise buildings. It addresses a critical area of urban development, considering the increasing prevalence of skyscrapers in earthquake-prone regions. The detailed analysis of traditional and advanced seismic design methods, including hybrid approaches, contributes valuable insights to structural engineering practices. Moreover, its focus on the integration of damping and isolation devices and the global case studies enhances its relevance and applicability, making it a significant resource for advancing building safety and resilience in the scientific community.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is very much relevant and suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	<p>The abstract provides a general overview of seismic isolation technology and its relevance to super high-rise buildings. However, there are areas where the abstract can be refined for better clarity and impact. Below are the suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comprehensiveness and Clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the abstract describes the importance of seismic isolation and its methods, it lacks specific mention of the key advancements or unique contributions highlighted in the article. Including a brief mention of the novel insights or findings presented in the article would improve its completeness.</li> <li>The use of terms like "shock absorption" and "shock insulation" should be consistently clarified or defined to prevent ambiguity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Specific Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition: Incorporate a sentence or two summarizing the comparative analysis or evaluation of seismic isolation technologies discussed in the article. Highlighting practical applications or case studies mentioned would make the abstract more informative.</li> <li>Deletion/Reduction: The sentence about skyscrapers symbolizing urban progress could be shortened or removed to prioritize technical details over descriptive context.</li> <li>Rephrasing: Simplify and clarify sentences that describe hybrid applications to make the abstract more concise and reader-friendly.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Keywords: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The keywords could include terms like "seismic isolation technology," "energy dissipation," or "hybrid systems" for better alignment with the article's focus.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>By implementing these suggestions, the abstract can better reflect the article's scope and value, while also engaging the reader more effectively.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, providing a detailed review of seismic isolation technologies for super high-rise buildings. However, for confirmation and rigorous validation of its scientific accuracy, the following points should be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>References Validation:</b> The cited sources should be verified for credibility and relevance to ensure they support the claims made in the manuscript.</li> <li><b>Technical Detail Assessment:</b> Ensure all technical aspects, such as descriptions of seismic isolation methods (e.g., base isolation, hybrid control systems), and their effectiveness, are accurate based on recent scientific findings.</li> <li><b>Terminology and Precision:</b> Ensure technical terms like "damping control" or "energy dissipation" are consistently used and explained clearly.</li> <li><b>Figure Completeness:</b> The manuscript mentions figures (e.g., "Fig.1 Type of isolation bearing"), but these are not visible in the uploaded text. Verify that all referenced figures are included and correctly labeled.</li> <li><b>Mathematical or Analytical Models:</b> If the manuscript involves calculations or simulations (e.g., for energy dissipation or vibration control), these should be cross-checked for correctness.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references provided in the document are focused on recent advancements and case studies in seismic isolation technology and its applications in super high-rise buildings. Most of them appear to be from the last 5 years, which is quite recent and relevant for the topic.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally adequate for conveying technical information, but it is not fully polished for scholarly communications. Key improvements needed include:</p> <p><b>Consistency:</b> Terms like "shock absorption," "shock insulation," and "seismic isolation" are used interchangeably but might benefit from precise and consistent usage to avoid confusion.</p> <p><b>Academic Tone:</b> The tone occasionally leans toward casual, such as the use of contractions like "can't," which should be expanded (e.g., "cannot") for a formal tone.</p> <p><b>Clarity and Conciseness:</b> Certain paragraphs contain redundant phrases or overly verbose explanations. Streamlining the content could enhance readability and impact.</p> <p><b>References and Citations:</b> While references are provided, in-text citations are not clearly integrated into the text, which is essential for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of seismic isolation technologies for super high-rise buildings. However, some sections, particularly the technical descriptions, could benefit from clearer phrasing to ensure accessibility to a broader audience.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The structure of the paper is logical, but transitions between sections can be improved for smoother readability.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Including additional visuals, such as detailed diagrams of isolation devices or case studies of buildings that implemented these technologies, could enhance the reader's understanding.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Figure captions should be more descriptive to explain the context and relevance of the illustrations.</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>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)</b></p>
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Koyndrik Bhattacharjee</b></p>
<p><b>Department, University &amp; Country</b></p>	<p><b>Dr. B.C. Roy Engineering College, India</b></p>