

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Seismic vulnerability assessment of school buildings in Tehran city based on AHP and GIS” by M. Panahi et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 30 October 2013

Dear authors,

In my opinion this work is a very important investigation, not only for Tehran city but also as an example for elsewhere countries threaten by earthquake hazards. Reading the manuscript, I had in mind several questions I would greatly appreciate your commenting about:

1. According to figure 1 there are many faults in the Tehran area and since this is an active zone I believe some of them might have the potential of surface rupture. I believe this hazard should also be incorporated in your assessment.
2. It is not clear whether the division of the structures into four age groups is related with the implementation and upgrading of the anti-seismic building code. Is the BHRC

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



set of regulations relate only with the quality and type of construction materials or also with earthquake shaking?

3. I am afraid the overall conclusion saying that only 72 schools are in danger, does not reflect the overall vulnerability of schools in Tehran. Point 4 in the discussion states that only 9% of the schools are safe, and that means that the other 91% are in trouble, this way or another. Decision makers and budget suppliers may very easily adopt the '3%' while in fact the number of schools that need reinforcement is much higher. I would suggest a more balanced presentation of the vulnerability assessment.

---

Interactive comment on *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 1, 4511, 2013.

**NHESSD**

1, C1574–C1575, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

