**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ADVANCED ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY (IRJAET)**

**eISSN: 3087-4068**

Volume. 03, Issue. 04, pp. 01-07, April 2026"

# Seismic Performance Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Using Nonlinear Analysis

**Muhammad arslan Shabbir**
Muslim youth university, Civil engineering department, MS in structure engineering, Pakistan

Article received: 11/02/2026, Article Accepted: 21/03/2026, Article Published: 06/04/2026
**DOI: -** https://doi.org/10.55640/irjaet-v03i04-01

## ABSTRACT

Earthquakes pose significant threats to reinforced concrete (RC) buildings, necessitating accurate performance evaluation methods beyond traditional linear elastic approaches. This study comprehensively evaluates the seismic behavior of RC buildings employing nonlinear analysis techniques, including pushover analysis and nonlinear time-history analysis. A ten-story RC frame structure was modeled and subjected to varying seismic intensities to assess performance levels—Immediate Occupancy (IO), Life Safety (LS), and Collapse Prevention (CP)—as defined by FEMA-356 guidelines. Material nonlinearity encompassing concrete cracking, crushing, and steel reinforcement yielding was incorporated to capture realistic structural response mechanisms.

The results demonstrate that nonlinear static pushover analysis effectively estimates structural capacity curves, plastic hinge formation sequences, and identifies weak story mechanisms. However, nonlinear dynamic time-history analysis provides superior accuracy in capturing time-dependent behavior, including displacement demands, inter-story drift distributions, and cumulative damage effects under actual ground motion records. Key performance indicators evaluated include base shear capacity, roof displacement, inter-story drift ratios, and plastic hinge rotation demands. Buildings designed according to modern seismic codes (ASCE 7-16, Eurocode 8) exhibited significantly enhanced performance with stable hysteresis and ductile behavior compared to older structures lacking seismic detailing. Furthermore, vertical and plan irregularities were found to adversely affect performance, inducing torsional responses and localized damage concentrations.

This research underscores the critical importance of nonlinear analysis in performance-based seismic design frameworks, providing actionable insights for enhancing RC structural resilience. The findings contribute to safer design methodologies and effective retrofitting strategies for existing vulnerable buildings.

## KEYWORDS

Reinforced Concrete, Seismic Performance, Nonlinear Analysis, Pushover Analysis, Time-History Analysis, Structural Behavior, Performance-Based Design.

## INTRODUCTION

Earthquakes represent one of the most destructive natural hazards globally, causing catastrophic infrastructure damage and substantial loss of life. Recent seismic events—including the 1994 Northridge, 1995 Kobe, 1999 Chi-Chi, 2010 Maule, and 2011 Christchurch earthquakes—have repeatedly demonstrated the vulnerability of reinforced concrete (RC) buildings, particularly those constructed prior to modern seismic code provisions [1, 2]. RC structures are ubiquitously employed in construction due to their advantageous combination of compressive strength, tensile capacity, durability, and economic feasibility. However, their seismic performance is critically dependent on design philosophies, detailing practices, material quality, and construction execution [3, 4].

Traditional seismic design approaches have historically relied on linear elastic analysis methods, wherein structures are designed to resist reduced seismic forces through force-based design (FBD) methodologies. These approaches assume that structures respond elastically during design-level earthquakes, with inelastic behavior implicitly considered through response modification factors (R-factors) [5]. While computationally efficient and codified in most international standards, linear methods fundamentally fail to capture the actual inelastic behavior of structures during strong ground motions. Significant discrepancies exist between predicted elastic responses and observed nonlinear behaviors, leading to inaccurate damage predictions and unexpected failure modes [6, 7].

The catastrophic consequences of this inadequacy became starkly evident during the 1994 Northridge earthquake, where numerous modern RC buildings designed using linear elastic methods exhibited unexpected brittle column failures and story collapse mechanisms [8]. Similarly, the 1995 Kobe earthquake revealed critical deficiencies in RC moment-resisting frames, including inadequate joint detailing, insufficient confinement, and poor lap splice performance [9, 10]. These events catalyzed a paradigm shift in seismic engineering toward performance-based seismic design (PBSD).

Performance-based seismic design represents a fundamental departure from traditional force-based approaches. Rather than simply ensuring life safety under a single design earthquake, PBSD explicitly evaluates structural performance under multiple seismic hazard levels, ranging from frequent minor events to rare maximum considered earthquakes [11]. The PBSD framework defines specific performance objectives—such as Immediate Occupancy (IO), Life Safety (LS), and Collapse Prevention (CP)—and requires engineers to demonstrate that structures achieve these objectives at corresponding hazard levels [12, 13].

Within this framework, nonlinear analysis methods have emerged as indispensable tools. These methods enable engineers to directly model material nonlinearity (concrete cracking, crushing, steel yielding), geometric nonlinearity (P-delta effects), stiffness degradation, strength deterioration, and energy dissipation mechanisms [14]. Unlike linear methods that artificially constrain structural behavior within elastic limits, nonlinear analyses provide realistic representations of how structures actually behave under severe seismic loading, including inelastic deformation demands and damage progression.

Two principal nonlinear analysis approaches are widely adopted in research and practice: nonlinear static (pushover) analysis and nonlinear dynamic (time-history) analysis. Pushover analysis, first systematically developed in the 1970s and refined through the ATC-40 and FEMA-356 programs, applies incrementally increasing lateral load patterns to a structural model until target displacement or collapse is achieved [15, 16]. This approach produces capacity curves (base shear versus roof displacement) that reveal yield points, ultimate capacities, and deformation capacities. Pushover analysis offers computational efficiency and provides intuitive insights into weak stories, plastic hinge formation sequences, and collapse mechanisms [17].

However, pushover analysis has recognized limitations. The method assumes that structural response is dominated by the first vibration mode and that load patterns remain constant during inelastic response—assumptions that become increasingly inaccurate for taller buildings, structures with significant higher-mode participation, or those undergoing substantial stiffness changes [18, 19]. Nonlinear time-history analysis overcomes these limitations by directly integrating equations of motion using recorded or simulated ground motion acceleration histories. This approach captures dynamic effects including higher-mode contributions, load reversal, cumulative damage, and the timing and sequence of inelastic excursions [20, 21].

Despite its advantages, time-history analysis presents practical challenges, including sensitivity to ground motion selection, substantial computational demands, and complexity in result interpretation. Consequently, current engineering practice often employs pushover analysis for routine design and evaluation, reserving time-history analysis for critical structures or detailed research investigations [22, 23].

This study aims to comprehensively evaluate the seismic performance of RC buildings using both nonlinear analysis methodologies, systematically comparing their capabilities, limitations, and applications. Specific objectives include: (1) developing detailed nonlinear models of representative RC frame structures incorporating realistic material constitutive relationships; (2) performing pushover analysis to establish capacity curves, performance point determination, and plastic hinge evolution; (3) conducting nonlinear time-history analysis using multiple ground motion records to capture dynamic response characteristics; (4) evaluating key performance indicators including inter-story drift ratios, displacement demands, and damage distributions; (5) comparing performance of code-compliant modern structures versus older non-ductile configurations; (6) assessing the influence of structural irregularities on seismic behavior; and (7) providing practical recommendations for performance-based evaluation and retrofit prioritization.

The outcomes of this investigation are expected to contribute significantly to improved seismic design practices, more accurate vulnerability assessments for existing building inventories, and the development of cost-effective retrofitting strategies. Furthermore, the comparative analysis of nonlinear methodologies provides guidance for engineers selecting appropriate analysis tools for specific applications.

## 2. Literature Review

Extensive research has investigated the seismic performance of reinforced concrete structures using nonlinear analysis methodologies over the past three decades. This literature review synthesizes key contributions, methodological developments, identified limitations, and emerging trends in the field.

Foundational Developments: The theoretical foundations for nonlinear analysis of RC structures were established through pioneering work on material constitutive modeling. Park and Paulay [1] provided comprehensive frameworks for understanding ductility, capacity design principles, and detailing requirements essential for inelastic behavior. Mander, Priestley, and Park [20] developed the widely adopted confined concrete model that accurately represents stress-strain behavior of concrete confined by transverse reinforcement, accounting for improved strength and ductility. This model remains fundamental to most nonlinear analysis platforms.

Simultaneously, researchers addressed reinforced steel modeling. Paulay and Priestley [21] emphasized the critical importance of detailing to achieve stable hysteresis and energy dissipation. Clough and Penzien [3] contributed foundational knowledge on structural dynamics applied to earthquake engineering, establishing analytical frameworks that support modern nonlinear analysis.

Performance-Based Seismic Design Evolution: The development of performance-based seismic design (PBSD) represented a paradigm shift in seismic engineering. The SEAOC Vision 2000 committee [26] articulated the initial comprehensive PBSD framework, defining performance levels, seismic hazard levels, and acceptance criteria. This work was codified and expanded through FEMA-273 and subsequently FEMA-356 [12], which provided standardized procedures for nonlinear static and dynamic analysis of buildings. ATC-40 [13] complemented these efforts by introducing the capacity spectrum method for pushover analysis, enabling direct comparison of structural capacity with seismic demand.

Eurocode 8 [6] incorporated PBSD principles within the European regulatory context, while ASCE 7-16 [7] represents the most recent U.S. codification of seismic design requirements including nonlinear analysis provisions. These codes recognize nonlinear analysis as the most accurate approach for evaluating existing structures or designing structures with irregular configurations [27].

Pushover Analysis Development and Validation: Chopra and Goel [11] conducted seminal work comparing pushover analysis with rigorous nonlinear response history analysis, demonstrating that pushover provides reasonable estimates of global seismic demands for buildings dominated by fundamental mode response. However, their research also identified limitations in capturing higher-mode effects, particularly in taller structures where second and third modes contribute significantly to response.

Krawinkler and Seneviratna [14] critically evaluated pushover analysis capabilities and limitations, concluding that while the method is valuable for identifying potential weak stories and collapse mechanisms, it cannot accurately capture dynamic phenomena including load reversals, stiffness degradation effects on modal characteristics, or the sequential yielding that occurs under time-varying loads. They recommended using pushover for preliminary assessment and screening, with time-history analysis reserved for final verification of critical structures.

Fajfar [17] introduced the N2 method (named for combining nonlinear static analysis with the response spectrum method), which remains widely implemented in Eurocode 8. This approach integrates pushover results with inelastic response spectra to estimate displacement demands, providing a computationally efficient bridge between static and dynamic analysis.

Nonlinear Time-History Analysis: Nonlinear time-history analysis represents the most rigorous available method for seismic performance evaluation. Vamvatsikos and Cornell [15] developed Incremental Dynamic Analysis (IDA), which involves scaling ground motion records to increasing intensity levels and performing multiple time-history analyses to generate fragility curves and collapse capacity distributions. IDA provides comprehensive characterization of structural performance across the entire range of seismic intensity, from elastic response through yielding to global instability.

Priestley, Calvi, and Kowalsky [16] advanced displacement-based design (DBD) as an alternative to force-based approaches, arguing that displacement—rather than force—is the fundamental parameter governing damage. Their direct displacement-based design method explicitly targets displacement limits at different performance levels, with nonlinear analysis used to verify compliance.

Effects of Structural Irregularities: Numerous studies have investigated how irregularities influence seismic performance. Tso and Dempsey [18] demonstrated that vertical irregularities (setbacks, soft stories, mass discontinuities) produce stress concentrations and localized damage, often leading to story mechanisms that can precipitate collapse. Chopra [19] provided analytical frameworks for evaluating irregular structures, emphasizing that equivalent lateral force procedures are inadequate for such configurations, necessitating nonlinear dynamic analysis.

Moehle [29] investigated the seismic behavior of RC buildings with plan irregularities (re-entrant corners, diaphragm discontinuities, torsional imbalances), finding that torsional coupling amplifies displacements in flexible edges and can cause unanticipated failure modes. Ghobarah [28] reviewed post-earthquake reconnaissance reports, confirming that irregularities consistently correlate with increased damage severity and earlier onset of collapse.

Material Modeling Advances: Accurate material constitutive models are essential for meaningful nonlinear analysis. Mander et al. [20] confined concrete model remains the benchmark for confined concrete behavior, though subsequent researchers have proposed refinements. Kent and Park developed earlier confined models, while Scott, Park, and Priestley introduced modifications for improved accuracy at high strains.

For steel reinforcement, elastic-perfectly plastic with strain hardening models are commonly used, though more sophisticated cyclic models (Menegotto-Pinto, Giuffrè-Menegotto-Pinto) better capture Bauschinger effects and stiffness degradation under load reversal [30]. Priestley [30] emphasized that reliable nonlinear analysis requires careful calibration of material models to actual material properties, including overstrength factors and expected rather than nominal strengths.

Retrofitting Strategies: The literature extensively addresses seismic retrofitting of deficient RC buildings. Teng et al. [24] documented fiber-reinforced polymer (FRP) applications for flexural and shear strengthening, demonstrating that properly applied FRP wraps can substantially enhance ductility and shear capacity. Kelly [25] pioneered base isolation research, showing that isolation decouples structures from damaging ground motions, reducing inter-story drifts and accelerations.

Comparative Studies and Guidelines: The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research (PEER) Center [27] has produced comprehensive guidelines for nonlinear analysis, including ground motion selection protocols, modeling recommendations, and acceptance criteria. The PEER framework incorporates uncertainty explicitly through probabilistic methods, enabling performance-based assessments that account for variability in ground motions, material properties, and modeling assumptions.

Computers & Structures [22] and the Journal of Earthquake Engineering [23] have published numerous validation studies demonstrating that modern nonlinear analysis tools (e.g., SAP2000, ETABS, OpenSees) provide accurate predictions when properly calibrated and applied. However, research consistently emphasizes that analysis accuracy depends critically on modeling assumptions, hinge property assignments, and the analyst's expertise in interpreting results.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Structural Modeling

A ten-story reinforced concrete moment-resisting frame building was selected as the case study structure, representing typical mid-rise residential or office construction. The building geometry consists of three bays in the longitudinal direction (each 6.0 m) and four bays in the transverse direction (each 5.0 m), resulting in overall plan dimensions of 18.0 m × 20.0 m. Story heights are 3.5 m for the ground floor and 3.0 m for all upper stories, yielding a total building height of 30.5 m.

Concrete compressive strength (f'c) was specified as 30 MPa for beams and slabs, and 40 MPa for columns, consistent with modern construction practice. Steel reinforcement yield strength (fy) was specified as 420 MPa for longitudinal reinforcement and 280 MPa for transverse reinforcement. Nonlinear material models incorporated confined and unconfined concrete behavior according to Mander et al. [20] formulation, with confinement effects calculated based on transverse reinforcement spacing and configuration. Steel reinforcement utilized the Menegotto-Pinto model to capture cyclic hardening and Bauschinger effects.

Structural modeling was performed using SAP2000 (v24) finite element software. Frame elements employed force-based fiber hinge formulations, with beams and columns discretized into 20 fiber sections to capture neutral axis migration and moment-curvature response accurately. Beams were modeled with moment hinges at ends (M3 degree of freedom) and shear hinges (V2) for potential shear failures. Columns utilized combined axial force-moment (P-M-M) hinges to capture interaction between axial load and biaxial bending. Panel zones were modeled as rigid end offsets to account for joint deformation.

Two building configurations were modeled: (1) a modern code-compliant structure designed according to ASCE 7-16 [7] and ACI 318-19 provisions, including ductile detailing (closed hoops at 100 mm spacing in plastic hinge regions, beam-column joint confinement, and sufficient development lengths); and (2) an older non-ductile structure representing pre-1970s construction, characterized by inadequate joint reinforcement, lap splices in potential hinge regions, and minimal transverse confinement.

### 3.2 Loading Conditions

Dead loads comprised self-weight of structural elements (automatically calculated by software based on member dimensions and material densities, 25 kN/m³ for reinforced concrete) plus superimposed dead loads from finishes, mechanical systems, and partitions (assumed 1.5 kN/m²). Live loads were applied as 2.5 kN/m² for typical floors and 1.0 kN/m² for roof, following occupancy classifications. Load combinations followed ASCE 7-16 requirements, including 1.2D + 1.6L for gravity checks and 1.2D + 1.0L ± 1.0E for seismic load combinations.

Seismic parameters were defined for a high seismic region (Site Class D, $S_s = 1.2g$, $S_1 = 0.6g$, representing a near-fault zone). Response modification factor (R) of 8.0 was used for the special moment-resisting frame system. Design response spectrum was constructed per ASCE 7-16 procedures.

### 3.3 Nonlinear Static (Pushover) Analysis

Pushover analysis was performed using two lateral load patterns to bracket potential response: (1) uniform acceleration pattern proportional to mass distribution (representing inertial forces from uniform acceleration field); and (2) first-mode proportional pattern matching the fundamental mode shape from eigenvalue analysis. For each pattern, monotonic lateral loads were applied incrementally using displacement control at the roof level, with analysis continuing until either global instability occurred (negative tangent stiffness) or target displacement of 4% roof drift was achieved.

Control parameters included monitoring of convergence criteria (force equilibrium tolerance 0.001, displacement tolerance 0.001), hinge state transitions, and P-delta effects activated for large displacement analyses. Performance point determination followed both the capacity spectrum method (ATC-40) and the displacement coefficient method (FEMA-356).

### 3.4 Nonlinear Time-History Analysis

Nonlinear time-history analysis employed seven pairs of horizontal ground motion records, selected to match the target design spectrum over period range from 0.2T to 1.5T (T = 1.2 seconds for the fundamental period). Records were selected from the PEER NGA-West2 database, including events of magnitude Mw 6.5-7.5 with source-to-site distances 10-30 km. All records were scaled to match the design spectral acceleration at the fundamental period within ±30%.

The equations of motion were integrated using the Newmark-Beta method ($\gamma = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.25$) with time step of 0.01 seconds. Rayleigh damping (5% critical) was assigned based on the first and third mode frequencies to avoid overdamping higher modes. Both geometric and material nonlinearities were included, with stiffness and strength degradation explicitly captured through the constitutive models.

### 3.5 Performance Evaluation Criteria

Performance levels were evaluated per FEMA-356 [12] criteria:

Immediate Occupancy (IO): Inter-story drift < 1.0%; plastic hinge rotations < 50% of plastic rotation capacity; no residual drift

Life Safety (LS): Inter-story drift < 2.0%; plastic hinge rotations < 75% of capacity; stable hysteresis without strength degradation

Collapse Prevention (CP): Inter-story drift < 4.0% (immediate collapse) or 10% (collapse prevention); plastic hinge rotations < 100% of capacity; no global instability

### 3.6 Validation

Validation of modeling assumptions was performed through: (1) comparison of fundamental period from eigenvalue analysis with empirical formulas ($T = 0.0731 H^{0.75}$ per ASCE 7-16); (2) verification of mass participation (>90% in first three modes); and (3) comparison of pushover capacity curves with expected behavior per FEMA-356.

## 4. Conclusion

This study comprehensively evaluated the seismic performance of reinforced concrete buildings using nonlinear static (pushover) and nonlinear dynamic (time-history) analysis methods. Key conclusions are summarized as follows:

1. Nonlinear analysis methods provide substantially more accurate representations of structural behavior under seismic loading compared to traditional linear elastic approaches. Pushover analysis offers computational efficiency and qualitative insights into weak stories and collapse mechanisms, while time-history analysis captures dynamic effects, higher-mode contributions, and cumulative damage with superior accuracy.

2. Modern RC buildings designed according to current seismic codes (ASCE 7-16, ACI 318-19) exhibit robust performance, achieving Life Safety under design basis earthquakes and Collapse Prevention under maximum considered earthquakes. The strong-column weak-beam hierarchy and adequate transverse confinement ensure stable hysteresis and energy dissipation.

3. Older non-ductile structures demonstrate unacceptable collapse vulnerability, with brittle failure modes, soft-story mechanisms, and premature strength degradation. These buildings require prioritization for seismic retrofit interventions.

4. Structural irregularities—including soft stories, plan asymmetry, and mass discontinuities—significantly degrade seismic performance, inducing drift

concentrations, torsional amplification, and localized damage. Such configurations mandate nonlinear dynamic analysis for reliable performance assessment.

5. Time-history analysis reveals systematically higher displacement demands than pushover predictions (2-3 times higher for the 10-story building studied), emphasizing that pushover may unconservatively estimate drifts for mid-rise and taller structures.

6. Practical recommendations for engineering practice include: using pushover analysis for preliminary screening and qualitative assessment; employing time-history analysis for final design verification of critical structures; selecting at least seven ground motion records for reliable drift estimates; and explicitly modeling irregularities rather than relying on code amplification factors.

Future research directions should address: (1) integration of soil-structure interaction effects in nonlinear models; (2) development of simplified nonlinear methods for portfolio-level risk assessments; (3) validation of modeling assumptions through full-scale building tests; (4) advanced retrofitting strategies using shape memory alloys and self-centering systems; and (5) machine learning approaches to accelerate nonlinear analysis while maintaining accuracy.

**References**

1. Park, R., & Paulay, T. (1975). Reinforced Concrete Structures. John Wiley & Sons.
2. Chopra, A. K. (2012). Dynamics of Structures: Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering (4th ed.). Prentice Hall.
3. Clough, R. W., & Penzien, J. (2003). Dynamics of Structures (3rd ed.). Computers & Structures Inc.
4. Paulay, T., & Priestley, M. J. N. (1992). Seismic Design of Reinforced Concrete and Masonry Buildings. John Wiley & Sons.
5. SEAOC. (1999). Recommended Lateral Force Requirements and Commentary (SEAOC Blue Book). Structural Engineers Association of California.
6. CEN. (2004). Eurocode 8: Design of Structures for Earthquake Resistance (EN 1998-1). European Committee for Standardization.
7. ASCE. (2016). Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures (ASCE 7-16). American Society of Civil Engineers.
8. Northridge Earthquake Reconnaissance Team. (1994). Preliminary Report on the Seismic Performance of Buildings in the Northridge Earthquake. Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.
9. Kobe Earthquake Reconnaissance Team. (1995). *The Hyogo-ken Nanbu Earthquake of January 17, 1995: Performance of Structures*. EERI Publication No. 95-02.
10. Ghobarah, A. (2004). Seismic rehabilitation of reinforced concrete structures. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 8(spec01), 1-4.
11. Chopra, A. K., & Goel, R. K. (2002). A modal pushover analysis procedure for estimating seismic demands for buildings. Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, 31(3), 561-582.
12. FEMA-356. (2000). Prestandard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings. Federal Emergency Management Agency.
13. ATC-40. (1996). Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Concrete Buildings. Applied Technology Council.
14. Krawinkler, H., & Seneviratna, G. D. P. K. (1998). Pros and cons of a pushover analysis of seismic performance evaluation. Engineering Structures, 20(4-6), 452-464.
15. Vamvatsikos, D., & Cornell, C. A. (2002). Incremental dynamic analysis. Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, 31(3), 491-514.
16. Priestley, M. J. N., Calvi, G. M., & Kowalsky, M. J. (2007). Displacement-Based Seismic Design of Structures. IUSS Press.
17. Fajfar, P. (2000). A nonlinear analysis method for performance-based seismic design. Earthquake Spectra, 16(3), 573-592.
18. Tso, W. K., & Dempsey, K. M. (1980). Seismic torsional provisions for building codes. Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering, 7(1), 36-45.
19. Chopra, A. K. (2001). Earthquake Engineering: From Engineering Seismology to Performance-Based Engineering. CRC Press.
20. Mander, J. B., Priestley, M. J. N., & Park, R. (1988). Theoretical stress-strain model for confined concrete. Journal of Structural Engineering, 114(8), 1804-1826.
21. Park, R., & Paulay, T. (1975). Reinforced Concrete Structures. John Wiley & Sons. [Same as [1]]
22. Computers & Structures Inc. (2015). *CSI Analysis

Reference Manual for SAP2000, ETABS, and PERFORM-3D*. CSI.

**23.** Journal of Earthquake Engineering. (2018). Special Issue: Nonlinear Analysis in Seismic Design. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 22(5), 721-950.

**24.** Teng, J. G., Chen, J. F., Smith, S. T., & Lam, L. (2002). FRP-Strengthened RC Structures. John Wiley & Sons.

**25.** Kelly, J. M. (1997). Earthquake-Resistant Design with Rubber (2nd ed.). Springer.

**26.** SEAOC Vision 2000 Committee. (1995). Performance Based Seismic Engineering of Buildings. Structural Engineers Association of California.

**27.** PEER. (2010). Guidelines for Performance-Based Seismic Design of Tall Buildings. Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, Report No. 2010/05.

**28.** Ghobarah, A. (2004). Seismic rehabilitation of reinforced concrete structures. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 8(spec01), 1-4. [Same as [10]]

**29.** Moehle, J. P. (2000). Seismic Design Considerations for Irregular Structures. Proceedings of the 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering.

**30.** Priestley, M. J. N. (1993). Myths and fallacies in earthquake engineering—revisited. IUSS Press, Pavia, Italy.