

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Engineering Research: Perspectives on Recent Advances
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3727
Title of the Manuscript:	Seismic Analysis of Irregular (G+ 8) Shear Wall Building having Floating Columns at Different Floors and Braced to Enhance Torsional Rigidity
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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.	This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of seismic engineering: enhancing the resilience of irregular RCC structures with floating columns. By comparing the seismic performance of models incorporating shear walls and bracings, it provides actionable insights for designing safer buildings in earthquake-prone regions. The study's use of time history analysis with real earthquake data adds depth and reliability to the findings, offering practical implications for structural engineers. I appreciate the manuscript for its comprehensive approach and clarity in presenting complex results, making it a significant contribution to the field of earthquake engineering.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested Alternative Title: "Seismic Performance of Irregular RCC Structures with Floating Columns: Effects of Shear Walls and Bracings Using Time History Analysis"	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it can be improved for clarity and impact. Specify Data Source: Include a brief mention of the Northridge earthquake dataset used in the time history analysis to provide context. Highlight Practical Implications: Explicitly state how the findings can inform future design guidelines or retrofitting strategies. Focus on Results: Summarize numerical results more effectively (e.g., percent reductions in displacement, drift) to emphasize key findings without excessive detail.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, using appropriate methodologies and analysis to address the research questions. It is technically sound, with well-supported results and comparisons to existing literature. The conclusions align with the data, ensuring the study's credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant, but including more recent studies on seismic design and code revisions would strengthen the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, though some sentences could be refined for clarity and flow. Minor revisions in phrasing and grammar would improve readability and ensure that the technical details are conveyed more clearly.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 2](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rushikesh Vijaykumar Bandal
Department, University & Country	COEP Technological University, India