|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | [Engineering Research: Perspectives on Recent Advances](https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/engineering-research-perspectives-on-recent-advances-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_3714** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **Design Principle of Hue Imperial Palace, Nguyen Dynasty (1802-1945), Vietnam - Analyzing design methods of the Wooden Frames**  |
| Type of the Article | **BOOK CHAPTER** |

|  |
| --- |
| 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.** | **The manuscript is good enough to become a book chapter with many data. It is very useful for scientific community because of the reality data and analytic. That why I like it as well as appreciate the idea of the author.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is so long. It should be shortenned and cover all the content of the chapter. Such as “Analyzing a design methods of the Wooden Frame of Hue Imperial Palace, Vietnam”** |  |
| 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. | **Yes, it is. But it is should be shorter, remove the first paragraph (**deletion**).**  |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The structure should include these parts:**1. **Introduction**
2. **Literature Review**
3. **Methodology of research**
4. **Finding and discussion**
5. **Conclusion**

**Follow that structure, the author(s) must add the Introduction part to the chapter** |  |
| **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.** | **I think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because the author(s) collect many reality servey to get the data and assess the research object (see part 2,3,4)**  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **The authors use many kinds of references. That’s good. But the authors should write them on the right form of reference** |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, it is good enough for scholarly communication |  |
| Optional/General comments | The munuscript needs to fix some content as I mentioned above so that it is met the requirement of publishing. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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:** | **Pham Thanh Nga** |
| **Department, University & Country** | **National University Of Economics, Vietnam** |