



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_45332
Title of the Manuscript:	Aeroelastic analysis of an atypical geometry building by solving fluid-structure interaction problem through load transmission method
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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		
Minor REVISION comments -	1. Authors must specify the origin of Eqs. (1)-(2). 2. Details on obtaining Eq. (3) are needed. 3. From where were taken the values in Table 1? 4. Some editing "glitches" need to be corrected. There are a lot. 5. Punctuations are used randomly. Insert comma or full stop after each and every equation accordingly. 6. Authors must strengthen the References section with some articles that use some techniques, to make the techniques used more plausible, for instance: - Contributions on uniqueness in thermoelastodynamics on bodies with voids, Cienc. Mat.(Havana) 16 (2), 101-109, 1998 - Weak Solutions in Elasticity of Dipolar Porous Materials, Math Probl Eng Vol. 2008, Art. No. 158908, pp. 1-8, 2008 - On temporal behaviour of solutions in thermoelasticity of porous micropolar bodies, An. St. Univ. Ovidius Constanta-Seria Mathematics, vol. 22 (1), 169-188 (2014)	1. The origin of equations (1)-(2) is now explained inside text. 2. A short explanation about the obtaining of equation (3) is now presented. 3. The values were proposed by the team in disagreement with the pressure coefficients given by the codes for standard shapes. The building is fictitious. 4. The found mistakes were corrected. 5. Punctuations were corrected. Commas and full stops are inserted in every equation. 6. The reference section has been improved with different methodologies with different research purpose for the same model that we have tested and atypical models.
Optional/General comments	Report on the manuscript Title: Aeroelastic analysis of an atypical geometry building by solving fluid-structure interaction problem through load transmission method Manuscript ID: CJAST-45332 I think the readers of this valuable Journal will appreciate the results of this manuscript. I have not found another approach for this kind of aero-elastic analysis of an atypical geometry building by solving fluid-structure interaction problem through load transmission method. The results are illustrated by appropriate figures. The manuscript is well organized. For these reasons I can recommend the acceptance of this paper. However, before that the Editor make a decision, I suggest that the authors take into account the following corrections: 7. Authors must specify the origin of Eqs. (1)-(2). 8. Details on obtaining Eq. (3) are needed. 9. From where were taken the values in Table 1? 10. Some editing "glitches" need to be corrected. There are a lot. 11. Punctuations are used randomly. Insert comma or full stop after each and every equation accordingly. 12. Authors must strengthen the References section with some articles that use some techniques, to make the techniques used more plausible, for instance: - Contributions on uniqueness in thermoelastodynamics on bodies with voids, Cienc. Mat.(Havana) 16 (2), 101-109, 1998 - Weak Solutions in Elasticity of Dipolar Porous Materials, Math Probl Eng Vol. 2008, Art. No. 158908, pp. 1-8, 2008 - On temporal behaviour of solutions in thermoelasticity of porous micropolar bodies, An. St. Univ. Ovidius Constanta-Seria Mathematics, vol. 22 (1), 169-188 (2014) If the authors take into account all these corrections, then without a doubt the manuscript	Thanks for your kind words for this work. All these questions have been answered lines above.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	deserves to be published.	
--	---------------------------	--

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>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.