

Sample of *Reply to Reviewers letter* English editing

- The editing fee is based on the word count of the responses only. The word count of the reviewer comments is excluded.
- The English in the replies is corrected.
- The English in the replies is made polite and respectful.
- The changes are made in parallel with the changes made in the main manuscript.

Time-dependent Seismic Fragility Curves on Optimal Retrofitting of Neutralized Reinforced Concrete Bridges

Manuscript No. SIE-HF-085

We would like to express our sincere appreciations ~~for of~~ the reviewers' comments ~~given to~~ regarding this paper. ~~The followings are e~~ Our responses ~~are as to~~ follows:-

■ Response ~~es to the R~~reviewer 1 :

1. This paper describes interesting results of evaluating seismic capacity of RC bridges subjected to neutralization. The solution process and example are relatively well described. After all, review recommends this paper to be published without big modification except following:
Quality of figure 1 has to be improved.

【Response】

The quality of ~~F~~figure 1 has been improved by reworking. We are Ssincerely ~~acknowledgement grateful for is given to~~ the reviewer's ~~affirmation on the publication~~ positive response to of thisthe paper.

■ Response to ~~R~~the reviewer 2 :

1. This paper has to be rewritten, hopefully with the aid of a third author who is more proficient in written English, before it can be published.

【Response】

The reviewer's valuable suggestion is highly ~~noticed~~ regarded. As can be seen in the revised paper, the written English has been ~~read~~ checked by a native English speaker and is significantly improved.

2. Many of the figures did not print well. The use of color made some of the

graphs appear blank when printed on a blank and white printer. Figure 7 was not helpful. It would be better to show a drawing or a photo of the bridge from the case study which includes the dimensions that are listed in the main text.

【Response】

All the figures have been rearranged in order ~~to hat they are be~~ clear even when printed on a black and white printer.

Figure 7 has been redrawn to include the dimensions listed in the main text.

3. The data seemed realistic and based on real world data, with the exception of the cost data. It was not clear where the cost data in the case study came from. Some additional explanation would be helpful. The interest rate used in the analysis was 1.7%. Where did that come from? It is much lower than that seen in many other studies where governments often impose an interest rate of 5 or 6% for such analyses.

【Response】

The cost data in the case study came from a report on ~~the~~ seismic evaluation and the feasibility of retrofitting for 2,213 highway bridges in Taiwan (DGH 2008), ~~where -t~~ The required retrofitting costs for the bridges ~~with respect in consequence of to~~ different levels of seismic damage are analyzed statistically. In this study, the ~~data of~~ retrofitting cost ~~data wa~~ is ~~cited~~ ~~obtained~~ from ~~the this~~ report and we have ~~enhan~~ ~~rich~~ed the explanation.

We agree with the reviewer's comment on the popular interest rate of 5 or 6% imposed by the government. To ~~have~~ ~~facilitat~~ ~~encourage~~ a more reasonable analytical result, a value of 5% is adopted in the revised paper.

4. The paper was logically organized with appropriate space allocated to both underlying theory and the case study. The presentation of the results was efficient and appropriate. It just needs to be written more clearly and correctly. Once that occurs, the article should be published.

【Response】

In order to ~~improve clarity~~ ~~have more clear and correct writing in~~ , the ~~written English in this~~ revised paper, ~~the written English~~ has been ~~checke~~ ~~read~~ by a native English speaker. The reviewer's comments are ~~greatly~~ appreciated.