

Review of: "Seismic intensity measure selection considering Record-to-Record and Angle-to-Angle uncertainties."

Djamalddine Boumezerane

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review: Seismic intensity measure selection considering

Record-to-Record and Angle-to-Angle uncertainties.

The authors presented a study to address the critical task of selecting an appropriate seismic intensity measure to assess structural performance under earthquake loading. The study focused on Angle-to-Angle variability and its influence on intensity measures.

The subject was clearly introduced, and a consistent review of literature shed more light on the seismic intensity measure selection.

Remarks:

Page 1:

In the abstract, the authors mentioned

$$E_v$$

which was not defined before. What is E? What is index v used for?

Page 2:

Line 4: "Shargh" instead of "Sharg". Citations need to be in one unique format in the manuscript (We usually don't use the full name of the first author, then use only the "surname" et al. (XXXX)).

Page 3: Use the same format for

$$a_x$$

and

$$a_y$$

in equation (1) and in the text.

CAD acronym was not explained in the text.

What is the reference (or the reason) for choosing

$$LS_{MIDR} = 0.01, 0.04$$

?

Page 5:

$$\beta_{\ln |IM, NoC}$$

that appears in equation (7) is written differently in the text and in equation (8).

Page 7:

In table (2), most of the formulas are not readable, hidden by the box limits.

The discussion covered different aspects; however, no conclusions were attached to the manuscript.

A section “Conclusions” is necessary to summarize how the objectives of the work were reached and to which extent.

Conclusions are key elements.