

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

Mahboobeh Pirizadeh¹

¹ Tarbiat Modares University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject of the article is innovative, but the text seems to have been prepared in haste, which prevents the authors' efforts from being properly conveyed to the readers.

1. The use of the term "waveform" is inaccurate; please use "acceleration ground motions" instead.
2. On page 4, cite the reference for the last sentence.
3. Recheck Equation 7, as it seems that the subscript k in the expression η may not be used. Also, introduce a and b in the text for Equation 6.
4. The article needs a conclusion section.
5. At the end of Section 6, a separate figure besides Figure 3 should be added to illustrate the selection of the $\bar{\epsilon}$ criterion more clearly. Additionally, similar to Figure 1, show the impact of this criterion on the dispersion of the fragility curves.
6. In Section 2, the reason for choosing three criteria (MIV, CAD, SA(T1)) to check the uncertainty of the angle is unclear, and the researcher's point of view is not conveyed to the readers.
7. Please address the following editorial issues:
 1. Most cells in Table 2 are unreadable, and a solution for presenting the parameters in a more readable format is necessary.
 2. Remove the point at the end of the article title.
 3. There is repetitive abbreviation in some parts (e.g., on pages 1 and 2 for IM), whereas in some parts, abbreviations are not mentioned (e.g., MIV and CAD on page 3).
 4. A consistent format is not used for writing specific terms; some terms are italicized in some sections and not in others, or irregular capitalization is used for some terms.
 5. On page 3, the subscripts x and y should be written as subscripts.
 6. On page 5, move the location of Table 1 to after its reference in the text.