

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129665
Title of the Manuscript:	Seismic response of curve bridge with frictional pendulum system under multidimensional seismic excitation
Type of the 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>
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 paper explores the impact of multidimensional seismic excitation on the seismic performance of a curved bridge utilizing a friction pendulum. Despite the interest of the paper it will be interesting to calibrate the obtained results combining the use of mathematical models with experimental models (shaking table, centrifuge equipment) or with the results of monitoring seismic equipment installed in the bridge.	Thank you for your comments !
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, but the definition of seismic action could be improved using response spectra or power spectra	The seismic waves referenced in the article are produced directly from the software input parameters, with minimal influence from the response spectrum.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent. Additional comments are offered in Part 2	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is fair	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. There is no compatibility between the names referred to in the text and the References. As an example in pp2 is referred to Khashayar et al., but no compatibility with [1] The author's surname must be referred.</div> <div>If there are more than 2 authors, should be used e.g. Cai et al.</div> <div><div>- Before the reference in the text a space should be used.</div><div>- For References [21] and [22] delete August and also January</div></div> <div>2. pp5 and pp 6 replace sap 2000 by SAP 2000</div> <div>3. pp 8 replace Fig 3 by Fig 7</div> <div>4. pp 8 number equation (1)</div> <div>5. pp 9 -Fig 7 is confusing, does not show the six modes of vibration, some modes are repeated, and other modes are not referred</div> <div>6. pp 10 replace the subsequent picture by Fig 8</div> <div>7. In the text sometimes is used Fig xxx and other times Figure xx, please uniformize</div> <div>8. pp 14 -Fig 17 -Y axis is Displacements</div> <div>9. pp 14- Fig 18-y axis is acceleration amplitude</div>	<div>1. Revisions have been finalized on Section 1</div> <div>2. Revisions have been finalized on pages 5 and 6.</div> <div>3. Corrections have been made</div> <div>4. Revisions have been finalized on page 9</div> <div>5. Revisions have been finalized on page 9</div> <div>6 .Revisions have been finalized on page 10</div> <div>7. It has been changed to uniform use Fig xxx</div> <div>8. Revisions have been finalized on page 14</div> <div>9 .Revisions have been finalized on page 14</div>

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)	