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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION 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)* |
| **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 an insightful contribution to the field of architecture and cultural heritage studies, particularly in the context of traditional Vietnamese wooden-frame construction. Detailing the design methods and construction processes of the Twin Buildings during the Gia Long and Minh Mang periods offers valuable knowledge on the historical evolution of building practices in Vietnam. The comparison between these two periods provides critical insights into the changes in architectural methodologies, highlighting both cultural and technological shifts. Overall, this manuscript is a significant addition to the literature, as it enriches historical understanding and has practical implications for modern conservation and restoration practices.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title of the article is somewhat appropriate. Still, it could benefit from more specificity regarding the focus on the design methods of the wooden frames in the context of the Twin Buildings. A suggestion for a more precise title could be:**  **"Design Principle of Hue Imperial Palace, Nguyen Dynasty (1802-1945), Vietnam - Analyzing design methods of Twin Buildings’ Wood Frames”** |  |
| 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 is comprehensive in terms of summarising the overall structure and objectives of the manuscript. However, I suggest expanding it slightly to highlight the significance of the two different design methods and their impact on architectural practices. The mention of historical context, such as the postwar stabilisation period and the later push for industrialisation in the Minh Mang period, would add depth. The addition of specific outcomes or findings would also strengthen the abstract. For example, a brief note on how these historical techniques can influence current architectural restoration or research would add practical relevance.** |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The manuscript’s structure and subsections are appropriate, with a clear division between design methods and construction processes for both periods.** |  |
| **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.** | **Scientific correctness is maintained through a well-organized step-by-step breakdown of early and later design methods, with diagrams supporting the descriptions. The manuscript’s technical rigour is evident in the detailed explanations of design and construction procedures and in the systematic comparison of methods between the Gia Long and Minh Mang periods. Including the historical context further strengthens the manuscript, providing technical and cultural layers to the discussion.**  **The manuscript is scientifically robust in its historical analysis and architectural methodology. It is technically sound because it provides a well-documented account of design methods backed by clear diagrams and a coherent narrative. This is enhanced by its historical, cultural, and architectural analysis, which ensures its scientific relevance in studying traditional Vietnamese architecture.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The references appear sufficient in the context of the manuscript, providing the necessary historical and architectural background. However, the manuscript could benefit from more recent references, particularly in architectural conservation and modern restoration of historical wooden structures. For example, references to recent studies on wooden-frame construction or conservation techniques in Southeast Asia could add depth to the manuscript’s technical aspects.** |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The language quality is generally good, but some sentences could be clearer for international scholarly communication. For example, certain technical descriptions could benefit from rephrasing to ensure precision. Simplifying complex sentence structures would improve readability. Some sections contain repetitive phrases that could be edited for conciseness. There are some spelling and grammar errors; correcting them will also increase readability.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript offers an informative and technical contribution to studying traditional Vietnamese architecture. With some revisions in language and adding a few more recent references, it could be an even stronger and more widely accessible contribution to the field.  (The manuscript is scientifically robust and provides valuable insights into the design methods and construction processes of Vietnamese wooden-frame architecture. It is well-researched, and the structure is clear and appropriate. However, minor issues are related to language clarity and the need for additional recent references. These can be quickly addressed with minor revisions, enhancing the manuscript’s accessibility and depth. Once these adjustments are made, the manuscript will be well-suited for publication.)  No ethical issues are apparent in this manuscript. The research appears to be based on historical architectural practices and does not involve sensitive data or ethical concerns. |  |
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