

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_124338
Title of the Manuscript:	Seismic Response of a 20-storey Flat Slab Building with Reinforced Concrete Outriggers in High-seismic Region in the Philippines: A Case Study
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Regardless of the level of English language and the formatting of the research paper according to the journal template, I can evaluate the research paper labeled " Seismic Response of a 20-storey Flat Slab Building with Reinforced Concrete Outriggers in High-seismic Region in the Philippines: A Case Study " according to the following points: In general, the research paper is very interesting, but only includes a comparative study without reinforced concrete outriggers and with reinforced concrete outriggers. As I said, I can't tell if the journal's template was followed as I don't have access to the required template. However, I found the introduction to be too short. I noticed that the data was very brief. This included the geometric properties of the component sections as well as the mechanical properties. The authors did not describe the calculation method used to analyze and design the proposed models. I also noticed that the presentation of the results was done with pictures and tables without commentary. In conclusion, this paper represents a very important aspect of the design of high-rise concrete buildings with reinforced concrete outriggers. To summarize, if we exclude the previous remarks, we can say that the paper deserves to be published after the required modifications and improvements.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Abdelkader Nour</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Abdelhamid, Algeria</p>