

Interactive comment on “Seismic Assessment Of Multi-Span Steel Railway Bridge In Turkey Base On The Nonlinear Time History Analyses” by Mehmet F. Yilmaz and Barlas Ö. Çağlayan

M. Bostenaru Dan (Referee)

csipike@web.de

Received and published: 9 July 2017

The paper presents the seismic analysis using finite elements method of a historical heritage bridge in Turkey. Through this the paper presents an important topic, as heritage bridges are less researched. The methods used are conventional. The paper reads difficultly due to poor English, however the structure of the paper is generally good (see comment on discussion). The succession of steps and the proposed curves are appreciated as being valid. A shortcoming is not describing in detail the finite elements software used and the assumptions done in using this software. Also, given the heritage quality, more data as for location of the bridge (relevant also for the ground

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



motion chosen, and why it is only one) would be needed. For the finite elements software it would be necessary to know the material data given it is a historic material and how it was modelled. The references part of the paper is relying too much on a single author. More diverse background in the seismic assessment of bridges exists in a task group of the European Association of Earthquake Engineering. Describing the importance of fragility curves and their computation in time history of capacity spectrum analysis are well known and it is not this what references are for. For the equations used the references are not mentioned, or how they were developed. This would have been more important. The paper further lacks a proper discussion of the results.

Specific comments: - The placing of references with regard to punctuation is wrong. Also, sometimes the names are misspelled (Cornell) or accompanied by the first name, which is unproper. - As said, the English needs a thorough checking.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-168>, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

