

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
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	Research paper

#### 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	Bridge design has specific and advanced techniques. The finite element model of a bridge requires appropriate scientific capabilities, which the author of the paper has. Bridge performance is (one of) the most important issues in structural engineering. The seismic performance of a bridge during an earthquake can help many projects in the world. The author has chosen a good topic.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	This title is better and more comprehensive:  Seismic Performance Evaluation of Curved Bridges with Friction Pendulum System under Seismic Loadings	
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ At the beginning of the abstract, say 3 sentences about the seismic performance of the bridge and its impact on structural engineering.</li> <li>■ In the methodology, state what type of analysis you used (Type of analysis).</li> <li>■ Also state the number of accelerograms applied to the bridge.</li> <li>■ Write a numerical value (the most important numerical achievement of the paper) of the results in the last section of the abstract.</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Why did you write this way for an author? Chen et al. [8-9]examined ...</li> <li>■ Omit the names of the authors in writing references. Example: Mahmood Minavanda et al ...</li> <li>■ If you used software like SAP 2000 or MATLAB in any part of the paper, you should write about it in the methodology and abstract of the paper. I mean MATLAB. Because you wrote about it somewhere in the paper.</li> <li>■ Did you use modal analysis or nonlinear time history?</li> <li>■ In research papers, the effect of an important factor or parameter on the performance of a structure should be compared under different conditions. You have examined a bridge under different earthquakes. What do you think the results will be useful for other future studies and applied projects?</li> <li>■ How would you know if your results are wrong? You need to compare them to other studies to see if the results are consistent. You didn't include any validation in your paper. Do a validation, even a simple one.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	ok	

### Review Form 3

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Some sections need to be revised and simpler sentences added. Some sentences are too long and complicated.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The paper has a good quality surface. Some necessary corrections and a few more output from the figures should be added to increase the surface of the work.</b>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Masoud Mahdavi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>K. N. Toosi University of Technology, Iran</b>