

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_87137
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS AND STUDY OF SEISMIC RESPONSE OF A G+13 MULTISTORIED BUILDING FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF DAMPERS USING ETABS SOFTWARE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)																																	
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presentation shall be improved using better English language. Grammatically, incorrect sentences The building is G+10 or G+13 or G+20? <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Line No.</th> <th>As appearing</th> <th>Remarks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>external future</td> <td>Requires explanation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>44</td> <td>FBS is now the best security system in the world today</td> <td>To be justified</td> </tr> <tr> <td>47</td> <td>quake work</td> <td>To be explained</td> </tr> <tr> <td>67, 131, 141 & 148</td> <td>(Guerreiro, 2006).</td> <td>References not cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td>82</td> <td>size of the strain.</td> <td>To be quantified</td> </tr> <tr> <td>101</td> <td>modulus</td> <td>Units to be mentioned</td> </tr> <tr> <td>120</td> <td>Table 1; Units of stiffness; kN/m kN-m</td> <td>Mention the correct unit</td> </tr> <tr> <td>123</td> <td>OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY</td> <td>State as a verb</td> </tr> <tr> <td>187</td> <td>1893-2002; This has been revised</td> <td>Adopt 1893-2016 Version</td> </tr> <tr> <td>209 & 210</td> <td>This results in the reduction of inertia forces.</td> <td>To be justified</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Line No.	As appearing	Remarks	20	external future	Requires explanation	44	FBS is now the best security system in the world today	To be justified	47	quake work	To be explained	67, 131, 141 & 148	(Guerreiro, 2006).	References not cited	82	size of the strain.	To be quantified	101	modulus	Units to be mentioned	120	Table 1; Units of stiffness; kN/m kN-m	Mention the correct unit	123	OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	State as a verb	187	1893-2002; This has been revised	Adopt 1893-2016 Version	209 & 210	This results in the reduction of inertia forces.	To be justified	
Line No.	As appearing	Remarks																																	
20	external future	Requires explanation																																	
44	FBS is now the best security system in the world today	To be justified																																	
47	quake work	To be explained																																	
67, 131, 141 & 148	(Guerreiro, 2006).	References not cited																																	
82	size of the strain.	To be quantified																																	
101	modulus	Units to be mentioned																																	
120	Table 1; Units of stiffness; kN/m kN-m	Mention the correct unit																																	
123	OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	State as a verb																																	
187	1893-2002; This has been revised	Adopt 1893-2016 Version																																	
209 & 210	This results in the reduction of inertia forces.	To be justified																																	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same font and font size may be adopted Diagrams shall be more attractive (avoid cut and paste method) References shall be in alphabetical sequence, starting with the name followed by the initials 																																		
Optional/General comments																																			

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Suppiah
Department, University & Country	Periyar Maniammai Institute of Science and Technology, India