

SEISMIC FRAGILITY OF LOW DUCTILE PARTIALLY INFILLED
REINFORCED CONCRETE FRAME IN MALAYSIA

NUR AMALINA BINTI ANUAR

A project report submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Structure)

Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JUNE 2017

To my beloved mother and father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, all praises to Allah Almighty for giving me accomplishment in completing this project report through many people and sources. In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many dedicated academicians of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. They have contributed towards my understanding and thoughts. In particular, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my main supervisor, Dr. Mohammadreza Vafaei for his patience, motivation, immense knowledge and providing me with continuous support with regards to my study and related research. I am also very thankful to my co-supervisor, Dr. Sophia C. Alih for her insightful advices and encouragement. Their guidance helped me throughout the process of researching and writing of this project report.

My appreciation also extends to Ministry of Education Malaysia for funding my Master's degree course in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia through MyBrain15 scholarship programme.

I am indebted to my family for the support they provided me spiritually throughout the writing of this thesis. And finally, I acknowledge my friends who have been providing me assistance throughout this research. My fellow postgraduate students should also be recognized for their continuous support and advices throughout the accomplishment of this project report.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to develop analytical fragility curves for low ductile partially infilled reinforced concrete (RC) frames building under seismic ground motions. Three RC frames with their ground story open and masonry walls infilled in all of the upper stories (pilotis) comprise of three-, six- and nine-stories were selected, modelled, and analysed representing common building type in Malaysia. These frames were designed in accordance with BS 8110-1997 code specification. 45 seismic ground motions were used and subdivided into three groups namely low (L), medium (M) and high (H) records based on peak ground acceleration (PGA) over peak ground velocity (PGV) ratio. ETABS 2015 was used to perform Incremental Dynamic Collapse Analysis (IDA) with increment every 0.1g until 0.5g. The PGA was compared to the maximum inter-story drift demand obtained from nonlinear time history analysis and also to the three levels of performance-based seismic designs, namely, immediate occupancy (IO), life safety (LS), and collapse prevention (CP) to assess structural performance. The results show that as the height of structure increases, the intensity of damage decreases. Therefore, 3 story is the most damaging structure followed by 6-story and 9-story. For all types of structure assessed, the most devastating type of earthquake records is M. For 3 and 9 story, there are no difference observed between IO and LS. This shows that the preserved strength was very small where IO suddenly jumps straight to CP with increasing intensity. As for 6 story there is a clear distance between IO, LS and CP and this shows that the structure is not very fragile.

ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk menghasilkan lengkung kerapuhan bagi rangka konkrit bertetulang (RC) bermulur rendah separa penuh dibawah pengaruh pergerakan tanah seismik. Bingkai RC dengan tingkat bawah terbuka tanpa dinding dan semua tingkat atas dipenuhi dinding yang terdiri daripada tiga-, enam dan sembilan tingkat telah dipilih, peringkat, dan dianalisa mewakili jenis bangunan biasa di Malaysia. Kerangka ini direka mengikut spesifikasi kod BS 8110-1997. 45 rekod pergerakan tanah telah dibahagikan kepada tiga kumpulan iaitu rendah (L), sederhana (M) dan tinggi (H) rekod berdasarkan puncak tanah pecutan (PGA) nisbah halaju (PGV) puncak tanah. ETABS 2015 telah digunakan untuk melakukan analisis kejatuhan dinamik tokokan (IDA) dengan kenaikan setiap 0.1g hingga 0.5g. PGA adalah permintaan maksimum antara tingkat drift yang diperolehi daripada analisis tolakan statik tak linear dan juga kepada tiga peringkat berasaskan prestasi seismik reka bentuk, iaitu serta-merta penghunian (IO), keselamatan hidup (LS), dan pencegahan runtuh (CP) untuk menilai prestasi struktur. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa apabila ketinggian struktur bertambah, kerosakan struktur berkurangan. Oleh itu, bangunan 3 tingkat adalah yang mengalami kerosakan paling merosakkan struktur diikuti dengan bangunan 6 tingkat dan 9 tingkat. Untuk semua jenis struktur yang dinilai, jenis rekod gempa bumi yg paling menghancurkan adalah jenis M. Bagi bangunan 3 dan 9 tingkat, tiada perbezaan yang diperhatikan antara IO dan LS. Ini menunjukkan bahawa kekuatan dalaman struktur adalah sangat kecil di mana IO tiba-tiba bertukar terus ke CP dengan peningkatan intensiti gempa bumi. Bagi 6 tingkat terdapat jarak yang jelas antara IO, LS dan CP dan ini menunjukkan bahawa struktur itu tidak begitu rapuh.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	x
	LIST OF FIGURES	xii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xv
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Research Background	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	3
	1.3 Objectives of Research	5
	1.4 Scopes of Research	5
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
	2.1 Introduction	7
	2.1.1 Earthquake Formation	7

2.2	Seismotectonic and Geological Setting of Malaysia	10
	2.2.1 Seismic Hazard in Malaysia	12
2.5	Ground Motion Intensity Measures	21
2.6	Seismic Vulnerability Assessment	21
	2.6.1 Nonlinear Analysis	23
2.7	Limit States	27
2.8	Fragility Curve	29
3	METHODOLOGY	33
3.1	General	33
3.2	Selection of appropriate plan and number of stories for studied building	35
3.3	Finite Element Simulation and Design of Buildings According to Common Practice in Malaysia	37
	3.3.1 Concrete Material Properties	37
	3.3.2 Steel Material Properties	38
	3.3.3 Load Assignments	39
	3.3.4 Cross section of beams and columns	44
	3.3.5 Partially infilled frame	48
3.4	Selection of Appropriate Seismic Records	50
3.5	Determination of Performance Limit State and Acceptance Criteria	54
	3.3.6 Hinge Assignment	54
3.6	Performing Incremental Dynamic Collapse Analysis	57
3.7	Data extraction and analysis	58
3.8	Derivation of Fragility Curves	58
4	RESULTS & DISCUSSION	60
4.1	Failure mechanism of studied frame	61
	4.1.1 Plastic hinges formation in 3-story frame	62
	4.1.2 Plastic hinges formation in 6-story frame	65
	4.1.3 Plastic hinges formation in 9-story frame	68
	4.1.4 Summary of failure mechanism formation	71

4.2	Inter-story drift demand	72
4.2.1	Inter-story drift demand of 3 story frame	72
4.2.2	Inter-story drift demand of 6 story frame	76
4.2.3	Inter-story drift demand of 9 story frame	80
4.3	Capacity of structure	83
4.3.1	Capacity of 3-story frame	85
4.3.2	Capacity of 6-story frame	87
4.3.3	Capacity of 9-story frame	89
4.4	Development of fragility curves	91
4.4.1	Derivation of Fragility Curve for 3-story frame	92
4.4.2	Derivation of fragility curves for 6 story frame	100
4.4.3	Derivation of fragility curves for 9 story frame	107
4.5	Peak Ground Acceleration for Malaysia	115
5	CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION	117
5.1	Conclusion	117
5.2	Recommendations	119
	REFERENCES	120

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Effects from earthquakes	10
2.2	Damage control and Building Performance Levels	28
3.1	Design Parameters	35
3.2	Low (L) seismic motion records	52
3.3	Medium (M) seismic motion records	53
3.4	High (H) seismic motion records	53
4.1	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 3 story under L records	73
4.2	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 3 story under M records	74
4.3	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 3 story under H records	75
4.4	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 6 story under L records	77
4.5	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 6 story under M records	78
4.6	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 6 story under H records	79
4.7	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 9 story under L records	80
4.8	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 9 story under M records	81
4.9	Maximum inter-story drift demand of 9 story under H records	82
4.10	Capacity of 3 story under L seismic records	85
4.11	Capacity of 3 story under M seismic records	85
4.12	Capacity of 3 story under H seismic records	86

4.13	Capacity of 6 story under L seismic records	87
4.14	Capacity of 6 story under M seismic records	88
4.15	Capacity of 6 story under H seismic records	88
4.16	Capacity of 9 story under L seismic records	89
4.17	Capacity of 9 story under M seismic records	89
4.18	Capacity of 9 story under H seismic records	90
4.19	Fragility curve calculation for 3 story frame L records	94
4.20	Fragility curve calculation for 3 story frame M records	95
4.21	Fragility curve calculation for 3 story frame H records	96
4.22	Fragility curve calculation for 6 story frame L records	102
4.23	Fragility curve calculation for 6 story frame M records	103
4.24	Fragility curve calculation for 6 story frame H records	104
4.25	Fragility curve calculation for 9 story frame L records	109
4.26	Fragility curve calculation for 9 story frame M records	110
4.27	Fragility curve calculation for 9 story frame H records	111

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Fault lines and subduction trench surrounding Malaysia	11
2.2.	Illustration of soft story building	15
2.3	Dispersed damage/beam-sway and column sway	16
2.4	Masonry infilled frame sub assemblages	17
2.5	Variation of seismic force with ductility demand	19
2.6	Plastic hinge rotation on structural elements	22
2.7	Components of analytical vulnerability assessment	23
2.8	Capacity curve of structures	24
2.9	Limit states of buildings in severe earthquake	28
3.1	Flow chart of research methodology	34
3.2	Plan view of studied building	36
3.3	Elevation view of 3-story RC frame model	36
3.4	Distribution of dead load imposed on 3 story frame	39
3.5	Distribution of live load imposed on 3 story frame	40
3.6	Lateral wind load imposed to 3-story frame	41
3.7	Lateral wind load imposed to 6-story frame	42
3.8	Lateral wind load imposed to 9-story frame	43
3.9	Longitudinal Steel Reinforcing of 3-story model	44

3.10	Cross section of 3 storey RC frame	45
3.11	Cross section of 6 story RC frame	46
3.12	Cross section of 9 story RC frame	47
3.13	Masonry infilled frame sub assemblages	48
3.14	Compressive diagonal struts used in studied building	49
3.15	Relationship of source distance and PGA/PGV	50
3.16	Relationship of source distance and magnitude	51
3.17	Hinges assigned to structural elements	54
3.18	Hinge property for masonry wall	55
3.19	Hinge property for columns	55
3.20	Hinge properties for beams	56
3.21	Load case data used in Etabs 2015	57
4.1	Formation of plastic hinges in 3 story frame L records	62
4.2	Formation of plastic hinges in 3 story frame M records	63
4.3	Formation of plastic hinges in 3 story frame H records	64
4.4	Formation of plastic hinges in 6 story frame L records	65
4.5	Formation of plastic hinges in 6 story frame M records	66
4.6	Formation of plastic hinges in 6 story frame H records	67
4.7	Formation of plastic hinges in 9 story frame L records	68
4.8	Formation of plastic hinges in 9 story frame M records	69
4.9	Formation of plastic hinges in 9 story frame H records	70
4.10	Median of inter-story drift demand for 3 story frame (L)	92
4.11	Median of inter-story drift demand for 3 story frame (M)	92
4.12	Median of inter-story drift demand for 3 story frame (H)	93
4.13	Fragility curve of 3-story partially infilled RC frame	97
4.14	Median of inter-story drift demand for 6 story frame (L)	100
4.15	Median of inter-story drift demand for 6 story frame (M)	101

4.16	Median of inter-story drift demand for 6 story frame (H)	101
4.17	Fragility curve of 6-story partially infilled RC frame	105
4.18	Median of inter-story drift demand for 9 story frame (L)	107
4.19	Median of inter-story drift demand for 9 story frame (M)	108
4.20	Median of inter-story drift demand for 9 story frame (H)	108
4.21	Fragility curve of 9 story partially infilled RC frame	112
4.22	PGA with 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years	115

LIST OF SYMBOLS

f_{ck}	-	Characteristic cube strength of concrete
f_{yk}	-	Characteristic strength of reinforcement
F_u	-	Ultimate stress of reinforcement
F_y	-	Yield stress of reinforcement
k	-	Stiffness
D	-	Damage
Φ	-	Standard normal cumulative distribution of PGA
μ	-	Mean
σ	-	Standard deviation
M_w	-	Moment magnitude scale
cm	-	centimetre
m	-	metre
km	-	kilometre
MPa	-	MegaPascal
kN	-	kiloNewton
Δ	-	deflection

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Background

In this study, the fragility functions developed for low ductile partially infilled Reinforced Concrete (RC) buildings are discussed. The seismic fragility analysis of structure is a requirement for seismic loss estimation and seismic risk management. The vulnerability of structures, seismically, is usually conveyed through functions of fragility, which denote the probability of exceeding or reaching limit state performance damage by seismic ground movements. Fragility curves are tremendously essential to estimate the total risk to the structural buildings from possible tremors and to forecast the effects of loss to the economy from forthcoming tremors. These fragility functions also can be handy in planning for disaster or emergency response by national authority, furthermore an advantage for the insurance companies to execute rough estimation on the total loss of the post-earthquake.

Additionally, fragility curves can also be utilized to outline the design retrofitting for damaged structures or that with inadequate strength to resist earthquake loadings. This is done by performing benefit and cost studies for different sorts of structural material and properties. Moreover, these fragility functions can be used to alleviate risk through the adjustment of seismic codes for the plan of new

structures; the potential losses are quantitatively compared with the additional cost in providing seismic resistance.

A large portion of the structures, additionally the buildings constructed without the consideration of seismic code may have adequate and sufficient lateral strength to withstand tremors of moderate size with a small degree of damage but not severe or extreme tremors. Studies on vulnerability are conducted preceding the earthquake events. The significance of the building, its utilization and the owner's necessities will decide whether the damage is acceptable or not.

The design of the buildings is based on the provisions of British Standard 8110-1997 in this study. The studied buildings are designed to resist wind loads and gravity loads only as most of the buildings in Malaysia did not imply seismic codes on the buildings due to its location outside earthquake prone areas. 45 ground motion records are imposed to estimate the vulnerability of the buildings. The variable considerations are the buildings heights that are the number of storeys and the seismic design level with regard to Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA). Extra consideration for the partially infilled frames is the quantity of infills (brick walls). In this study, three performance levels or limit states, namely immediate occupancy (IO), life safety (LS) and collapse prevention (CP) are considered to assess the structural performance denoting the inter-story demand. The damage scale or measure of interest is corresponded from the median value of the fragility functions.

Hence, in this study, fragility curves are used as the main tool for preparations of seismic risk map. As mentioned before, fragility analysis plays an important role in seismic risk assessment to estimate the vulnerability of a structure reaching or exceeding limit state performance damage by seismic ground movements. This vulnerability assessment method can be categorized into four categories, that are, empirical, hybrid, judgemental and analytical. The classification relies on upon the damage data used in their generation which are established mainly from observed post-tremor study, analytical simulation, expert judgement or combination of both. (Kwon & Elnashai, 2006) The Malaysian Meteorological Department reports that only limited data of strong ground motions have been recorded. In view of that, the curves are developed using analytical simulation.

Moreover, these curves are particularly handy in vulnerability assessment, post tremor assessment and retrofit prioritization from potential seismic tremors. (Jeong & Elnashai, 2007) Additionally, these curves are more critical and vital in the loss estimation of economy, life and occupancy that many happen as an aftereffect of future seismic tremors. (Tan & Abdul Razak, 2010) Therefore, this project report highlights the development of fragility curves to assess the vulnerability of buildings under seismic ground motions.

1.2 Problem Statement

Earthquakes are one of the most disastrous events that could happen in human history and are frequently exciting highly populated cities. Earthquakes impose damages to structures and infrastructures, subsequently cause casualties and fatalities. Malaysia is categorized under low seismicity group as it is located tectonically within the comparatively steady Sunda Shelf. Except for Sabah, where it is categorized under moderate seismicity group. Since Malaysia's geology is far from earthquake prone area, the buildings have been designed according to BS8110-1997 to resist gravity and wind loads effects only. A large portion of present and existing Malaysian's structures have not been designed for earthquake thus never designed to take seismic excitation effect. Having experienced with local and distant seismic motions, Malaysia has come to realize that the danger of earthquake is real and has the risk to public safety and welfare.

Therefore, there has been effort to reduce seismic induced damages. One way to decrease seismic induced damages is to retrofit buildings which have not been designed for seismic actions. There are several methods available, namely, reinforcement jacketing, steel jacketing and Fibre-Reinforced Polymer (FRP) installation that have been proposed to mitigate or reduce structural damages under seismic actions. In order to retrofit our structures, we need to allocate enough budgets and the government should have estimation on total cost for retrofitting and

rehabilitating the structures. Therefore, one way to estimate seismic induced damages and the cost for retrofit of buildings is by preparing seismic risk map.

Hence, in this study, fragility curves are used as the main tool for preparations of seismic risk map. For Malaysia, there has been no comprehensive study on the preparation of fragility curves. Based on the research carried out by (Saruddin & Mohamed Nazri, 2015), they developed fragility curves for material of moment resisting concrete frame (MRCF) and steel frame (MRSF). It was found that the steel frame has better performance than moment resisting concrete frame. (Tan, et al., 2014) developed fragility curves for three story reinforced concrete frame. From their study, the results indicate that the fragility curves are affected by both the number of stories in the building and soil conditions.

Based on the affirmation studies, there has been no fragility curves developed for low ductile partially infilled RC frame in Malaysia. There is also no fragility curves developed for partially infilled RC frame that takes into consideration near- and far-field effects of earthquakes in Malaysia. Therefore, in this study fragility curves for low ductile partially infilled RC frame considering near-field and far-field seismic ground motions are developed in contributing to the shortcomings of previous studies.

1.3 Objectives of Research

Therefore, this study embarks on the following objectives:

1. To study failure mechanism of low ductile partially infilled RC frames subjected to ground motions.
2. To investigate inter-storey drift demand of low ductile partially infilled RC frames subjected to ground motions.
3. To develop seismic fragility curves for low ductile partially infilled RC frames subjected to ground motions.

1.4 Scopes of Research

This project focuses on the following scopes:

1. Seismic fragility of low ductile partially reinforced concrete frames in Malaysia subjected to seismic ground motions.
2. Seismic risk analysis using fragility curves for three-, six- and nine storeys of RC frame buildings are selected as studied buildings
3. All of the buildings are regular in both plan and elevation configuration.
4. Each frame of three-, six- and nine-story has four 6m bays and typical story height of 3m except for the ground story having height of 4m. The total height of building is 10m, 19m and 28m respectively.

5. Compressive strength of concrete: 20 MPa
6. Yield stress of reinforcement, F_y : 300 MPa
7. Ultimate stress of reinforcement, F_u : 420 MPa
8. Live load applied is 6 kN/m^2
9. Dead load applied is 25.5 kN/m except for the top floor (without walls) i.e. 15.54 kN/m
10. 45 earthquake records will be used to perform Incremental Dynamic Collapse Analysis (IDA)
11. The structures are designed in compliance with the BS 8110-1997 code specification
12. Preliminary design of these 3 models is performed by using ETABS 2015 software. This finite element simulation and design of buildings are according to common practice in Malaysia.

REFERENCES

- Adnan, A., Hendriyawan, Marto, A. & Irsyam, M., 2005. Seismic hazard assessment for Peninsular Malaysia using Gumbel Distribution Method. *Jurnal Teknologi*, pp. 57-73.
- Adnan, A., Hendriyawan, Marto, A. & Irsyam, M., 2005. Seismic Hazard Assessment for Peninsular Malaysia Using Gumbel Distribution Method. *Jurnal Teknologi*, pp. 57-73.
- Asamoah, M. A. & Ankamah, N. O., March 2016. Effect of Design Ductility on the Progressive Collapse Potential of RC Frame Structures Designed to Eurocode 8. *American Journal of Civil Engineering*, 4(2), pp. 40-49.
- Aslam Faqeer Mohamad, M. F. R. G. E. S., 2016. Seismic performance of older R/C frame structures accounting for infills-induced shear failure of columns. *Engineering Structures*, pp. 1-13.
- Asteris, P. G., Chrysostomou, C. Z., Giannopoulos, I. P. & Smyrou, E., 2011. *Masonry Infilled Reinforced Concrete Frames with Openings*. Greece, s.n.
- Bolt, B. A., 2003. *Earthquakes*. Berkeley: W. H. Freeman.
- Bozorgnia, Y. & Bertero, V., 2004. Non-linear dynamic analysis. *Earthquake engineering: from engineering seismology to performance-based design*, pp. 1-17.
- Calvi, G. M. et al., 2006. DEVELOPMENT OF SEISMIC VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES OVER THE PAST 30 YEARS. *ISET Journal of Earthquake Technology*, pp. 75-104.
- Cornell, C. A. & Krawinkler, H., 2000. *Progress and Challenges in Seismic Performance Assessment*. [Online]
Available at: <http://peer.berkeley.edu/news/2000spring/performance.html>

- DeVall, R. H., 2003. Background information for some of the proposed earthquake design provisions for the 2005 edition of the National Building Code of Canada. *Can. J. Civil Eng.* 30, pp. 279-286.
- Dolsek, M. & Fajfar, P., 2008. The effect of masonry infills on the seismic response of a four-storey reinforced concrete frame- a deterministic assessment. *Engineering Structures*, pp. 1991-2001.
- Dolsek, M. & Fajfar, P., 2008. The effect of masonry infills on the seismic response of a four-storey reinforced concrete frame-a deterministic assessment. *Engineering Structures* 30, pp. 1991-2001.
- Dumova-Jovanoska, E., 2004. *Fragility Curves for RC Structures in Skopje Region*. Vancouver, Canada, s.n., p. Paper No. 3.
- Elghazouli, A., 2009. *Seismic Design of Buildings to Eurocode 8*. London, United Kingdom, Spon Press.
- FEMA 356, 2000. *Prestandard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Buildings*. Washington, DC: Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- FEMA P-58-1, 2012. *Seismic Performance Assessment of Buildings Volume 1 – Methodology*. Washington, DC: Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Filiatrault, A. et al., 2013. *Elements of Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*. Canada: Presses Internationales Polytechnique.
- Ghobarah, A., 2001. Performance based design in earthquake engineering:state of development. *Journal of Engineering Structures* 23, pp. 878-884.
- Gill, J., Shariff, N. S., Omar, K. & Amin, Z. M., 2015. *Tectonic Motion of Malaysia : Analysis from Years 2001 to 2013*. Kuala Lumpur, ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, pp. 1-8.
- Guevara-Perez, L. T., 2012. "Soft Story" and "Weak Story" in Earthquake Resistant Design: A Multidisciplinary Approach. *15 WCEE*.
- Hejazil, F. et al., 2011. Effect of Soft Story on Structural Response of High Rise Buildings. *IOP Conf. Series: Material sScience and Engineering*, pp. 1-13.
- Hetland, E. A. & Hager, B. H., 2006. Interseismic strain accumuluation: Spin-up, cycle invariance, and irregular rupture sequences. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, p. 7(5).
- Heydari, M. & Mousavi, M., 2015. The Comparison of Seismic Effects of Near-Field and Far-Field Earthquakes on Relative Displacements on Seven-storey Concrete Building with Shear Wall. *Special Issue of Curr World Environment*.

Holmes, M., 1961. *Steel frames with brickwork and concrete infilling*. London, s.n., pp. 473-478.

Ibrahim, Y. & El-Shami, M., 2011. Seismic Fragility Curves for Mid-Rise Reinforced Concrete Frames in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *The IES Journal Part A: Civil & Structural Engineering*, pp. 213-223.

Jeong, S. H. & Elnashai, A. S., 2007. Probabilistic Fragility Analysis Parameterized by Fundamental Response Quantities. *Engineering Structures* 29(6), pp. 1238-1251.

Kalantari, A., 2012. Seismic Risk of Structures and the Economic Issues of Earthquakes. In: *Earthquake Engineering*. s.l.:Intech.

Kwon, O. S. & Elnashai, A., 2006. The Effect of Material and Ground Motion Uncertainty on the Seismic Vulnerability Curves of RC Structure. *Engineering Structures* 28(2), pp. 289-303.

Liau, T.-C. & Kwan, K.-H., 1984. Nonlinear behaviour of non-integral infilled frames. *Computers & Structures*, pp. 551-560.

Mat Said, S. N., 2010-2011. *SEISMIC HAZARDS AND RISKS IN MALAYSIA*, Petaling Jaya: MMD.

MMD, 2016. *Seismicity in Malaysia and around the Region*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.met.gov.my/web/metmalaysia/education/earthquakeandtsunami/seismicityinmalaysiaandaroundtheregion> [Accessed 14 November 2016].

Moniri, H., 2014. *Evaluation of Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Using Incremental Dynamic Analysis (IDA) for Near-Field Earthquakes*. Gazimagusa: Eastern Mediterranean University.

Monish, S. & Karuna, S., 2015. A Study On Seismic Performance Of High Rise Irregular Rc Framed Buildings. *IJRET: International Journal of Research in Engineering and Technology*.

Mwafy, A., 2012. Analytically derived fragility relationships for modern high-rise buildings in the UAE. *The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings*, pp. 824-843.

Mwafy, A. M., 2010. Analytically derived fragility relationships for modern high-rise buildings in UAE. *The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings*, 21(11), pp. 824-843.

Nazri, F. & Alexander, N., 2012. Predicting the Collapse Potential of Structures in Earthquake. *University of Bristol*.

Paulay, T. & Priestley, M. J. N., 1992. *Seismic design of reinforced concrete and masonry buildings*. New York: Wiley Interscience Publication.

Paul, J. et al., 2012. Andaman postseismic deformation observations: Still slipping after all these years?. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, pp. 343-351.

Polyakov, S. V., 1960. On the interaction between masonry filler walls and enclosing frame when loaded in the plane of the wall. *Translation in Earthquake Engineering*, pp. 36-42.

Ravikumar, C. M., Babu, N. K. S., Sujith, B. V. & Venkat, R. D., 2012. Effect of Irregular Configurations on Seismic. *Journal of Architecture Research* 2(3), pp. 20-26.

Repapis, C. C., 2016. Seismic Performance Evaluation of Existing RC Buildings Without Seismic Details. Comparison of Nonlinear Static Methods and IDA. *The Open Construction & Building Technology Journal*, pp. 158-179.

Rossetto, T. & Elnashai, A., 2003. Derivation of vulnerability functions for European-type RC structures based on observational data. *Engineering Structures*, pp. 1241-1263.

Saruddin, S. N. A. & Mohamed Nazri, F., 2015. Fragility curves for low-rise and mid-rise buildings in Malaysia. *Procedia Engineering*, pp. 873-878.

Sawada, T., Hirao, K., Yamamoto, H. & Tsujihara, O., 1992. *Relation between maximum amplitude ratio and spectral parameters of earthquake ground motion*. s.l., s.n., pp. vol. 2. 617-22.

SEAOC, 1995. Vision 2000: Performance-Based Seismic Engineering of Buildings. Sacramento, CA. *Structural Engineers Association of California*.

Seifi, M., Noorzaei, J., Jaafar, M. S. & Panah, E. Y., 2008. Nonlinear Static Pushover Analysis in Earthquake Engineering: State of Development. *ICCBT*.

Seifi, M., Noorzaie, J., Jaafar, M. S. & Yazdan Panah, E., 2008. *Nonlinear Static Pushover Analysis in Earthquake Engineering: State of Development*. Kuala Lumpur, s.n., pp. 69-80.

Simons, W. J. F. et al., 2007. A decade of GPS in Southeast Asia: Resolving Sundaland motion and boundaries. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, p. 112(B6).

Sun, J. & Pan, T.-C., 1995. Seismic characteristics of Sumatra and its relevance to Peninsular Malaysia and Singapore. *Journal of Southeast Asian Earth Sciences*, pp. 105-111.

Tan, K. & Abdul Razak, H., 2010. Seismic Hazard Assessment of School Buildings In Peninsular Malaysia. *SE Asian Appl. Geol.*, pp. 232-241.

- Tan, K., Abdul Razak, H., Suhatri, M. & Lu, D., 2014. Fragility curves of a RC frame building subjected to seismic ground motions. *Civil Engineering research*, pp. 159-163.
- Tso, W. K., Zhu, T. J. & Heidebrecht, A. C., 1992. Engineering implication of ground motion A/V ratio. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 11(3), pp. 133-144.
- Tso, W., Zhu, T. & Heidebrecht, A., 1992. Engineering implication of ground motion A/V ratio.. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, pp. 133-144.
- UBC, 1997. Whittier, California, Uniform Building Code.
- Vamvatsikos, D. & Cornell, C. A., 2002. Incremental Dynamic Analysis. *Earthquake Engineering Structure Dyn.*, p. 23.
- Vamvatsikos, D. & Cornell, C. A., 2002. Incremental Dynamic Analysis. *Earthquake Engineering Structure Dynamics*.
- Vamvatsikos, D. & Cornell, C. A., 2005. Direct estimation of the seismic demand and capacity of multi-degree-of-freedom systems through incremental dynamic analysis of single degree of freedom approximation. *Structure Engineering*, pp. 589-599.
- Vigny, C. et al., 2005. Insight into the 2004 Sumatra-Andaman earthquake from GPS measurements in Southeast Asia. *Nature*, pp. 201-206.
- Villaverde, R., 2007. Methods to assess the seismic collapse capacity of building structures : State of the art. *Structure Engineering*, pp. 57-66.