

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	Technical Paper

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the seismic behavior of high-rise flat slab buildings with reinforced concrete outriggers, which are commonly used in urban construction. By focusing on high-seismic regions like the Philippines, it provides crucial data that can help to improve safety standards. The research enhances understanding of the complex interactions between structural elements under seismic forces, offering practical insights for engineers and researchers focused on earthquake resilience. The study contributes to the advancement of knowledge in seismic design, making it a valuable resource for both academia and industry.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Seismic Performance of High Rise Flat Slab Structure with Reinforced Concrete Outriggers in Seismically Active Regions – A Case Study</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Ensure the abstract effectively outlines the rationale behind the study, provides a clear and concise summary of the methodology, and presents the key findings in a succinct and precise manner.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No, the subsections in Section 3 are not in the correct format. Additionally, the tables are not formatted properly, and both the formatting and font size need to be revised to ensure consistency throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through a well-structured analysis of the seismic response of high-rise flat slab buildings with reinforced concrete outriggers, grounded in established engineering principles and methodologies. The study uses appropriate modeling techniques and seismic simulation tools, ensuring that the results are reliable and reproducible.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>The references are not entirely sufficient, and some are not recent enough to reflect the latest advancements in the field. Specifically, Minimol JS (2023) and Young -il Seo (2021) appear to be sourced from blogs or other internet/social media platforms, which are not appropriate for use in scholarly research. These should be replaced with peer-reviewed journal articles or reputable sources. Additionally, the author must check the reference format, as the in-text citations and reference list are not consistently formatted according to the required style. A thorough revision is needed to align all references with the correct citation guidelines.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article require improvement to meet the standards suitable for scholarly communication. Enhancing clarity, grammar, and overall readability will significantly contribute to the manuscript's professionalism and effectiveness in conveying the research findings. As a reviewer, I recommend a thorough review and revision of the text to ensure it meets academic expectations.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference to theconstructor.org mentioned in Section 3 is not appropriate for inclusion in the manuscript, as it is not a peer-reviewed source. It is important to utilize credible and scholarly references to uphold the scientific integrity of the research. Please replace this source with appropriate citations from reputable academic journals or recognized institutions. 2. Please provide the full forms of NSCP, Soil Profile SC, and SDL as mentioned in Table 1 within the manuscript for clarity. 3. Ensure that all spellings are checked and corrected throughout the document to maintain professionalism. 4. In Section 4.4, please elaborate on connectivity and meshing. Specify the types of elements used, the loading patterns applied, and clarify whether the analysis conducted is nonlinear or linear, as well as whether it is dynamic or static. 5. Authors have to explain the purpose of using the over strength factor in the analysis, as this is an important aspect of structural design and performance evaluation. 6. The graphs are not formatted correctly, please ensure the background is set to white or transparent. Additionally, the graphs need improvement, so please revise them for better clarity and presentation. 7. In the conclusion, it is stated that the study is an analytical study; however, it actually represents a numerical analysis. Please correct this terminology for accuracy. 8. Consider presenting the future scope of the study under a separate heading to enhance clarity and organization in the manuscript. <p>These revisions will enhance the clarity and completeness of the manuscript.</p>	

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)
<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:

Name:	Sherine Stanly
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, India