



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_11299
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating numerical- mathematical model of base-isolated rectangular liquid tanks under Bi-directional seismic excitation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1- This reviewer is mostly satisfied by the authors performance one the revised version; however, one important point is still remains, sloshing effect! The authors stated that they will consider this effect later in another paper; however, they still did not change the mathematical model for the boundary condition. This is not right technically and MUST be changed! This reviewer suggests the following change in the manuscript before final acceptance. Page 3, line 74: “Dynamic boundary condition of the free surface can be represented in general format by the following equation which accounts for the surface sloshing also [16 and 17]: $\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} + g \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = 0$ However, in the present study the free surface sloshing is neglected and the pressure is assumed to be zero at the water surface with some approximations.” [16] Mirzabozorg, H., Hariri-Ardebili, M.A. and Nateghi-A., R., 2012, Seismic Behavior of Three Dimensional Concrete Rectangular Containers Including Sloshing Effects, Coupled System Mechanics, Vol.1, No.1, pp.79-98 [17] Mirzabozorg, H., Hariri-Ardebili, M.A. and Nateghi-A., R., 2012, Free Surface Sloshing Effect on Dynamic Response of Rectangular Storage Tanks, American Journal of Fluid Dynamics, Vol.2, No.4, pp.23-30. <u>The authors need to add the abovementioned two references and reformat the rest of the reference list!</u> 2- Ansys software should be added to the reference list! 3- This code should be added to the reference list “Iranian code to set of ground water type maps, (Code 125)” 4- Paper is still needs some editorial revisions, as the authors seems did not work on it based on my previous comment! (They did not respond to this specific comment in the “Minor revision comments”).	1. Modified according to referee comment. 2. Modified according to referee comment. 3. Modified according to referee comment. 4. Modified according to referee comment.