

### 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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 is highly relevant as it addresses the challenges of seismic resistance in super high-rise buildings, an essential aspect of modern urban development in earthquake-prone areas. By exploring seismic isolation technology, the study contributes to safer building practices, which are critical for mitigating damage and protecting lives during earthquakes. The combination of isolation and damping techniques offers innovative insights that could reshape seismic design strategies globally. The focus on the hybrid application of technologies adds practical value by presenting a more comprehensive approach to seismic performance improvement.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, "An overview of seismic isolation technology for super high and rise buildings," is slightly unclear and grammatically awkward. A more precise and professional title would be: "Advancements in Seismic Isolation Technologies for Super High-Rise Buildings."	
<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>	The abstract provides a general overview of the study's relevance and methodologies but lacks specificity about key findings and their implications. Adding a brief mention of the comparative advantages of hybrid systems over traditional methods and highlighting any significant case studies or practical applications would improve its comprehensiveness.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate and well-supported by references. It systematically discusses various seismic design methods, the challenges of traditional approaches, and the potential of hybrid systems. However, more quantitative data or simulations demonstrating the effectiveness of proposed methods would strengthen its scientific rigor.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are relevant but somewhat limited in scope, with many sources focusing on Chinese studies and a few from broader international contexts. Incorporating more recent and diverse references, especially from globally recognized journals, would enhance the manuscript's credibility and appeal.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is functional but contains numerous grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistencies that hinder readability. For example, phrases like "shock absorption or shock insulation" could be rephrased for clarity. A thorough edit by a professional native English speaker is recommended to ensure suitability for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Matheus Rudo Antoniassi Pereira de Oliveira</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>University of Brasilia, Brazil</b>