

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_120607
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Structural Seismic Vulnerability Research Based on Seismic Time History Method
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

Review Form 3

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Seismic vulnerability of structures and infrastructures is an issue of great importance for practitioners and public managers in order to make the right decision about whether or not to rehabilitate the structure in question. Although seismic time history analysis is not widely used by practitioners, who prefer deterministic to probabilistic methods, the latter could be of great interest in certain complex cases. This paper is a contribution to knowledge on seismic vulnerability based on time history analysis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	May be the term review is not adequate Suggestion: Seismic Time History Method: Evaluating Structural Seismic Vulnerability	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In my opinion, there are a lot of gaps. In particular, there is confusion between fragility curves and vulnerability curves. The flow chart presented contains various steps that are not mentioned in the document (e.g. seismic intensity index, evaluation indicators, ...).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	Twenty-two (22) references are not enough to cover all aspects of the subject. Take a look at the following papers: S. ADAFER, M. BADAoui, M. BENSAlBI, S. MOKHBI "Assessing road vulnerability in seismic conditions: a comprehensive study" Studies in Engineering and Exact Sciences, Curitiba, Vol. 5, n° 1, pp.926-954, 2024 DOI: https://doi.org/10.54021/seesv5n1-049 F. DJAALALI, M. BENSAlBI "Assessing fragility functions of unreinforced masonry buildings " Studies in Engineering and Exact Sciences, Curitiba, Vol. 5, n° 1, pp.821-846, 2024 DOI: https://doi.org/10.54021/seesv5n1-044 F.Z. HALFAYA, M. BENSAlBI "Seismic vulnerability assessment of buried water supply and sanitation pipelines using the analytic hierarchy process: a methodology and application" Studies in Engineering and Exact Sciences, Curitiba, Vol. 5, n° 1, pp.585-602, 2024 DOI: https://doi.org/10.54021/seesv5n1-033 N. YOUSFI, M. AITBELKACEM, N. GUESSOUM, M. BENSAlBI "Seismic resilience scenario of Algerian buildings context: Blida city case study" journal of Earthquakes & Tsunami (JET), January, 2024 https://doi.org/10.1142/S1793431124500052	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	An effort must be done to improve the paper.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahmoud Bensaibi
Department, University & Country	Algeria