

Peer Review

Review of: "Turkey's Earthquakes: Damage Prediction and Feature Significance Using A Multivariate Analysis"

Savas Karabulut¹

1. Department of Civil Engineering, Gebze Technical University, Turkey

This article is not suitable for publication. The writing language of this article is not focusing on the scientific outputs. For this reason, I have to regret it.

Some minor comments are following as:

Comment to the Authors:

Abstract: This section is not summarized to the paper's objectiveness. For this reason, this section should be rewritten by the authors. Which methods and dataset were used, and which comparisons did they conduct? The authors did not share any important results obtained about the outputs of the MS.

Introduction: The authors should share specific literature information about their study topic. Why does the reader need to focus on this MS?

2. Methodology

Why did the authors need to use the intensity and scaling intensity value of any earthquake? What are the differences between them? What are the authors' purposes (i.e., Deterministic Hazard Analysis??).

Are the authors sure that the pga values like 2.8 g are equal to the MMI of IV? I think it's not possible to say that.

The hazard analysis is separated into two different parts, such as deterministic and probabilistic. Firstly, the authors should focus on the hazard analysis and then on the risk, vulnerability, and fragility analysis for the prediction of loss estimation of damage in any earthquakes.

If the authors do not have outputs of these analyses, the obtained results are open to debate, too.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.