

Interactive comment on “State of the art of fragility analysis for major building types in China with implications for intensity-PGA relationships” by Danhua Xin et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 28 October 2018

The authors of the present paper claim that evaluated 69 papers from Chinese literature that document observations of seismic events occurred in densely populated areas in China over the past four decades. They provide empirical fragilities for 4 building types. Also, they provide fragilities as functions of PGA using analytical methods. The authors say that they “scrutinize 69 papers”. However the 18 of them are “thesis”. Is this acceptable? According to the reviewers knowledge the macroseismic intensity is influenced by many factors (e.g.: population, economy level etc.). So earthquakes of the same magnitude may cause different macroseismic intensity levels in various cities. Moreover the time period is too long. The damage stage depends not only on the type of the building but on the kind of the construction and the construction type has

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



changed during these years. A list of the ground motions used for this study is required. The link on page 5, line 27 does not work. Many references are not adequately written (e.g.: the journal is missing, or the pages are missing etc.)

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-254>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

