FIŞA DE ÎNDEPLINIRE A STANDARDELOR MINIMALE

CADRUL DIDACTIC: Funcţia didactică: Conferenţiar univ. DATA:25.04.2026
Nume şi prenume: Pavel Florin SEMNĂTURA:

UNIVERSITATEA TEHNICĂ DE CONSTRUCŢII BUCUREŞTI		VERIFICAT /APROBAT:	NUME ŞI PRENUME	SEMNĂTURA
FACULTATEA:	Constructii Civile, Industriale şi Agricole	DECAN:	Ş.l. dr. ing. Valentina Manea	
DEPARTAMENTUL:	Constructii de Beton Armat	DIRECTOR DE DEPARTAMENT:	Ş.l. dr. ing. Eugen Lozincă	

Nr. crt.	Domeniul activitatilor	Tipul activitatilor	Categorii si restrictii		Subcategorii	Indicatori	Punctaj cadru didactic
0	1	2	3		4	5	6
1	Activitatea didactica si profesionala (A1)	1.1 Carti, cursuri universitare si capitole în carti de specialitate	1.1.1. Carti, cursuri universitare/capitole ca autor		1.1.1.1 internationale	nr. pagini/(2*nr. autori)	19.56
					1.1.1.2 nationale	nr. pagini/(5*nr. autori)	129,43
			1.1.2 Carti, cursuri universitare/capitole de carti ca editor/ coordonator		1.1.2.1 internationale	nr. pagini/(3*nr. autori)	-
					1.1.2.2 nationale	nr. pagini/(7*nr. autori)	13,82
		1.3. Coordonare de programe de studii, organizare si coordonare programe de formare continua si proiecte educationale (POS,Erasmus,Socrates,Leonardo,sa)	Punctaj unic, egal cu unitatea, pentru fiecare activitate (maxim 10 activitati pentru Profesor/CS I; maxim 5 activitati pentru Conferentiar/CSII)				-
TOTAL PUNCTAJ DOMENIUL A1						**-**	**162,81**
2	Activitatea de cercetare (A2)	2.1. Articole in reviste cotate ISI Thomson Reuters si in volume indexate ISI proceedings				(25+20*factor impact)/nr.de aut	2470,61
		2.2. Articole in reviste si volumele unor manifestari stiintifice indexate in alte baze de date internationale *				20/nr.de autori	188,19
			2.3.1. cotate ISI			50/nr.de autori	-

		2.3. Brevete de invenţie inregistrate la OSIM sau WIPO	2.3.2. internationale, necotate ISI		35/nr.de autori	-
			2.3.3. nationale		25/nr.de autori	-
		2.4. Granturi/ proiecte castigate prin competitiile ce finanteaza activitati de cercetare	2.4.1. Director (pentru institutia coordonatoare)/ responsabil (pentru institutia partenera)	2.4.1.1. internationale	20*ani de desfasurare	-
				2.4.1.2. nationale	10*ani de desfasurare	25
			2.4.2. Membru in echipa de implementare	2.4.2.1. internationale	10*ani de desfasurare	-
				2.4.2.2. nationale	5*ani de desfasurare	32.5
		2.5 Responsabil de proiecte de cercetare/consultantă			5/proiect	10
TOTAL PUNCTAJ DOMENIUL A2					-	**2726,31**
3	Recunoastere si impactul activitatii (A3)	3.1. Citări in reviste ISI si BDI si in volumele conferintelor ISI si BDI	3.1.1. Reviste ISI		10*FI /nr aut art.citat	3584,45
			3.1.2. Volume ISI/BDI		2.5/nr aut art.citat	14,01
			3.1.3. Reviste BDI		2.0/nr aut art.citat	11,23
		3.2. Prezentari invitate in plenul unor manifestari stiintifice nationale si internationale şi Profesor invitat (exclusiv ERASMUS)	3.2.1. internationale	Punctaj unic pentru fiecare activitate (maxim 10 activitati pentru Profesor/CS I)	10	-
			3.2.2. nationale		5	-
		3.3. Membru in colectivele de redactie sau comitete stiintifice al revistelor si manifestarilor stiintifice, organizator de manifestari stiintifice, Recenzor pentru reviste si manifestari stiintifice nationale si internationale	3.3.1. ISI	Punctaj unic pentru fiecare activitate	10	-
			3.3.2. BDI		6	-
			3.3.3. nationale si internationale neindexate		4	4
		3.4. Experienta de management	3.4.1. Functii de conducere (rector, prorector, cancelar, decan, prodecan, director departament, director scoala doctorala, director, director adj., sef sectie)		5* nr.ani	10
			3.4.2. Membru organisme conducere (senat, consiliu facultatii, cons. departament, cons. admin., cons. stiintific)		2* nr.ani	-
TOTAL PUNCTAJ DOMENIUL A3					-	**3623,69**
TOTAL PUNCTAJ CADRU DIDACTIC						**6512,82**

A1. Activitatea didactica si profesionala
Pondere: P =1
1.1 Carti si capitole în carti de specialitate – **162,81 p**
1.1.1. Carti, cursuri universitare/ capitole de cărți ca autor

1.1.1.1 Internaționale – **19,56 p**

1. Văcăreanu, R., Aldea, A., Lungu, D., Pavel, F., Neagu, C., Arion, C., Demetriu, S., Iancovici, M. (2016) Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for Romania. In: D'Amico, S. (ed.) Earthquakes and their impact on modern society. Springer, pp. 137-169, ISBN 978-3-319-21752-9, =33/(2*8) = **2,06 p** https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21753-6_5
2. Pavel, F., Popa, V., Văcăreanu, R. (2018). Impact of long-period ground motions on structural design: a case study for Bucharest, Romania. Springer International Publishing, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-73402-6, ISBN 978-3-319-73401-9, =87/(2*3) = **14,5 p** https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-21753-6_5

Bibliographic Information

Book Title Impact of Long-Period Ground Motions on Structural Design: A Case Study for Bucharest, Romania	**Authors** Florin Pavel, Viorel Popa, Radu Vacareanu	**Series Title** SpringerBriefs in Geotechnical and Earthquake Engineering
DOI https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73402-6	**Publisher** Springer Cham	**eBook Packages** Earth and Environmental Science, Earth and Environmental Science (R0)
Copyright Information The Author(s) 2018	**Softcover ISBN** 978-3-319-73401-9 Published: 29 January 2018	**eBook ISBN** 978-3-319-73402-6 Published: 20 January 2018
Series ISSN 2522-8781	**Series E-ISSN** 2522-8803	**Edition Number** 1
Number of Pages IX, 87	**Number of Illustrations** 44 b/w illustrations, 31 illustrations in colour	**Topics** Environmental Science and Engineering, Geoengineering, Foundations, Hydraulics, Natural Hazards, Earth System Sciences, Building Construction and Design

3. Pricopie, A., Pavel, F., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2021). Probabilistic performance analysis of modern RC frame structures subjected to earthquake loading. In: Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. et al. (eds.) Reliability-Based Analysis and Design of Structures and Infrastructure. CRC Press, pp. 227-244, =18/(2*3) = **3 p** https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.1201/9781003194613-16/probabilistic-performance-analysis-modern-rc-frame-structures-subjected-earthquake-loading-andrei-pricopie-florin-pavel-ehsan-noroozinejad-farsangi

1.1.1.2 Naționale – **129,43 p**

1. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Aldea, A. (2013) Îndrumător pentru evaluarea acțiunii vântului asupra construcțiilor conform CR 1-1-4/2012. Conspress, București. ISBN 978-973-100-279-9, =89/(5*3) = **5,93 p** https://utcb.ro/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Lista-cartilor-tiparite-2006-2023.pdf

Îndrumător pentru evaluarea acţiunii vântului asupra construcţiilor conform CR 1-1-4/2012

Tipul înregistrării:	Text tipărit: monografic
Autor:	Văcăreanu, Radu
Autor alternativ:	Pavel, Florin
Autor alternativ:	Aldea, Alexandru
Responsabilitate:	Radu Văcăreanu, Florin Pavel, Alexandru Aldea
Editura:	Conspress
Locul publicării:	Bucureşti
Anul Ediţiei:	2013
ISBN:	978-973-100-279-9
Descriere:	89 p. : fig.; 24 cm
Limba:	Română
Subiect:	viteză presiune dinamică clădire multietajată amplasament răspuns dinamic viteză critică desprindere vârtej
Subiect:	calculul structurilor
Subiect:	Cadre didactice
Subiect:	Cărţi româneşti
Subiect:	58
Subiect:	Cărţi tipărite în Editura Conspress
Subiect:	2013
Cota topografică:	624.042.41/V 11
Clasificare:	624.042.41
Note conţinut (cuprins):	viteză, presiune dinamică, clădire multietajată, amplasament, răspuns dinamic, viteză critică, desprindere, vârtej

2. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Aldea, A, Arion, C., Neagu, C. (2015) Elemente de analiză a hazardului seismic. Conspress, București. ISBN 978-973-100-386-3, =215/(5*5) **= 8,6 p**
https://utcb.ro/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Lista-cartilor-tiparite-2006-2023.pdf

Elemente de analiză a hazardului seismic

Tipul înregistrării:	Text tipărit: monografic
Autor:	Văcăreanu, Radu
Autor:	Pavel, Florin
Autor:	Aldea, Alexandru
Autor:	Arion, Cristian
Autor:	Neagu, Cristian
Responsabilitate:	Radu Văcăreanu, Florin Pavel, Alexandru Aldea,...
Editura:	Conspress
Locul publicării:	Bucureşti
Anul Ediţiei:	2015
ISBN:	978-973-100-386-3
Descriere:	215 p. : fig.; 25 cm
Limba:	Română
Subiect:	hazard seismicitate
Subiect:	seismologie cutremure
Subiect:	Cadre didactice
Subiect:	Cărţi româneşti
Subiect:	76
Subiect:	Cărţi tipărite în Editura Conspress
Subiect:	2015
Cota topografică:	550.34/E 36
Clasificare:	550.34:624.042.7
Clasificare:	550.34
Clasificare:	624.042.7
Note conţinut (cuprins):	hazard, seismicitate

3. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017). Elemente generale de hazard și risc seismic. MatrixRom, București, ISBN 978-606-25-0333-8, =316/(5*2) = **31,6 p**
https://matrixrom.ro/produs/elemente-generale-de-hazard-si-risc-seismic/?srsltid=AfmBOorU0dXSPkifeKYlafC_IjQ0dSa7ubiuL6OYQiv5uzcaivUe8oKh

Elemente generale de hazard si risc seismic



Autor(i): Florin Pavel , Radu Vacareanu

Editura: Editura Matrixrom

Anul apariției: 2017

Nr. pagini: 316 pagini

ISBN: 9786062503338

Stare: nefolosita (noua)

Categorii: Stiinta / Tehnica , Constructii / Sistematizari

4. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2018) Applications of probabilistic methods in structural reliability and risk assessment. Conspress, București. ISBN 978-973-100-472-3, =199/(5*2) = **19,9 p**
https://utcb.ro/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Lista-cartilor-tiparite-2006-2023.pdf

Applications of Probabilistic Methods in Structural Reliability and Risk Assessment : Lecture notes

Tipul înregistrării:	Text tipărit: monografic
Autor:	Pavel, Florin
Altele:	Văcăreanu, Radu
Responsabilitate:	Florin Pavel, Radu Văcăreanu
Editura:	Conspress
Locul publicării:	București
Anul Ediției:	2018
ISBN:	978-973-100-472-3
Descriere:	IV, 199 p. : fig.; 24 cm
Note:	Aplicații ale metodei probabilității în fiabilitatea structurală și evaluarea riscului : note de curs
Limba:	Engleză
Subiect:	calculul structurilor
Subiect:	fiabilitate structurală exemple numerice evaluarea riscului seismic
Subiect:	Cadre didactice
Subiect:	Titluri în limbă străină
Subiect:	76
Subiect:	Cărți tipărite în Editura Conspress
Subiect:	2018
Cota topografică:	624.042.7/P 46
Clasificare:	624.042.7:519.245
Clasificare:	624.042.7
Clasificare:	519.245
Note conținut (cuprins):	fiabilitate structurală, exemple numerice, evaluarea riscului seismic
Note conținut (cuprins):	Aplicații ale metodei probabilității în fiabilitatea structurală și evaluarea riscului : note de curs

5. Pavel, F., Savu, A. (2022) Handbook of design examples for reinforced concrete and prestressed concrete elements according to Eurocode 2 and FIB Model Code 2010 (2nd edition). MatrixRom, București, ISBN 978-606-25-0723-7, =267/(5*2) = **26,7 p**
https://matrixrom.ro/produs/handbook-of-design-examples-for-reinforced-concrete-and-prestressed-concrete-elements-according-to-eurocode-2-and-fib-model-code-2010-2nd-edition/?srsltid=AfmBOoqmYa3kg9yYCaviRWYLp1fLvBVj-s5wPtdPqi6CAPRDWttiHsY9

Table of Contents

i

ii

iii

iv

18.2 Cracking patterns of RC beams 243
18.3 Shear capacity of RC columns 244
18.4 Shear capacity of slabs with and without transverse reinforcement 246
18.4.1 Shear capacity of slabs with and without transversal reinforcement 246
18.4.2 Shear capacity of slabs with transverse reinforcement 247
19. Evaluation of reliability for RC and PC elements 249
19.1 RC beam 249
19.2 PC beam 251
19.3 RC column 252
20. Evaluation of the capacity of beam to column connections in precast concrete structures 254
20.1 Brief theoretical background 254
20.2 Design example 255
21. Displacement capacity of RC cantilever columns 257
22. Drift capacity of slab-column connections 260
Bibliography 264

v

v

Sigrist, V. et al., 2013. Background to the fib Model Code 2010 shear provisions - Part I: beams and slabs. *Structural Concrete,* 14(3), pp. 195-203.

Vintzeleou, E. & Tassios, T., 1986. Mathematical-models for dowel action under monotonic and cyclic conditions. *Magazine of Concrete Research,* Volume 38, pp. 13-22.

Vintzeleou, E. & Tassios, T., 1987. Behavior of dowels under cyclic deformations. *ACI Structural Journal,* Volume 84, pp. 18-30.

Wong, P. & Vecchio, F. T. H., 2012. *Vector2 and FormWorks user manual.,* Toronto: Department of Civil Engineering, University of Toronto.

Zhou, Y. & Hueste, M., 2017. Review of test data for interior slab-column with moment transfer. Dans: *FIB Bulletin 81: punching shear of structural concrete slabs. ACI-FIB Symposium Honoring Neil M. Hawkins*. s.l.:FIB, pp. 141-166.

P a g e | 267

6. Pavel, F., Ioan, P. (2024) Evaluarea riscului seismic pentru clădirile rezidențiale din București construite înainte de 1990. Ed. Nouă, ISBN: 978-606-596-171-5, =367/(5*2) = **36,7** https://carturesti.ro/carte/evaluarea-riscului-seismic-pentru-cladirile-rezidentiale-din-bucuresti-construite-inainte-de-1990-4168137813

1.1.2 Carti, cursuri universitare/capitole de carti ca editor/ coordonator – **13,82 p**

1.1.2.1 Internaționale

1.1.2.2 Naționale

1. Pavel, F., Radulian, M., Arion, C., Popa, M., Aldea, A. (2017). Proceedings of the 6th National Conference on Earthquake Engineering & 2nd National Conference on Earthquake Engineering and Seismology, Conspress, București, ISSN 2559-3943, =484/(7*5) = **13,82 p**
https://portal.issn.org/resource/ISSN/2559-3943



Table of contents

i

ii

iii

iv

the optimal conceptual design. The outcomes of the numerical analyses were used to develop and design the engineering solutions that are going to be tested in view of prequalification. A set of 14 BRBs, 10 "conventional" and 4 "dry", will be cyclically tested at CEMSIG laboratory. The testing procedure (stand, loading protocol and validation criteria) will be based on AISC 341-10 (2010) recommendations.

Table 1

Experimental program: BRB specimens

"Conventional" BRBs

N_{pl}	300 kN	700 kN	300 kN	700 kN	700 kN
N_{cr}/N_{pl}	3	3	3	3	1.5
t_c x w_c	14x60	20x99	30x30	45x45	20x99
Sp. ID	CR33-1	CR73-1	CS33-1	CS73-1	CR71-1
	CR33-2	CR73-2	CS33-2	CS73-2	CR71-2

"Dry" BRBs

N_{pl}	300 kN	700 kN
N_{cr}/N_{pl}	3	3
t_c x w_c	14x60	20x99
Sp. ID	CR33-1	CR73-1
	CR33-2	CR73-2

OPS – out of plane system;
A – actuator/s (apply load);
C – column;
RB – reaction beam;
BRB – brace to be tested.



Fig. 9 - Experimental test setup

Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received founding from the MEN-UEFISCDI grant Partnerships in priority areas PN II, contract no. 99/2004 IMSER: Implementation into Romanian seismic resistant design practice of buckling restrained braces." This support is gratefully acknowledged.

References

ABAQUS (2014) ABAQUS Documentation. Dassault Systèmes, Providence, RI, USA
ANSI/AISC 341-10 (2010) Seismic Provisions for Structural Steel Buildings. American Institute of Steel Construction, Inc. Chicago, Illinois, USA, 2010
Black C, Makris N, Aiken I (2002) Component Testing, Stability Analysis and Characterization of Buckling-Restrained Unbonded BracesTM. PEER Report 2002/08. Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, College of Engineering, University of California, Berkeley
CEN - European Committee for Standardization (2008) Eurocode 8: Design of structures for earthquake resistance. Part 1: General rules, seismic actions and rules for buildings. Eurocode 8-1/2008
CEN - European Committee for Standardization (2010) Anti-seismic devices. EN 15129:2010
Dubina D, Bordea S, Stratan A (2009): Performance based evaluation of a RC Frame strengthened with BRB steel braces, in Protection of historical buildings-PROHITECH 09, CRC Press Taylor@Fracis Group, Balkema, Vol. 2, 1741-1746
Dunai L, Zsarnóczay A, Kaltenbach L, Kálló M, Kachichian M, Halász A (2011) Type testing of Buckling Restrained Braces according to EN 15129 – EWC800 – Final report.
Kaufmann EJ, Metrovich B, Pense AW (2001) Characterization of Cyclic Inelastic strain behavior on properties of A572 Gr. 50 and A913 Gr. 50 Rolled Sections. ATLSS Report No. 01-13
P100-1/2013 (2013) National Seismic Design Code – Part I – Design Provisions for Buildings.
Watanabe A, Hitomi Y, Saeki E, Wada A, Fujimoto M (1988) Properties of brace encased in buckling restraining concrete and steel tube. Proc. 9th World Conf. Earthquake Eng., vol. 4, pp. 719-724
Xie Q (2005) State of the art of buckling-restrained braces in Asia. Journal of Constructional Steel Research 61, pp. 727-748.
Zub CI, Dogariu A, Stratan A, Dubina D (2017) Pre-test numerical simulations for development of prequalified buckling restrained braces. The 8th European Conf. on Steel and Composite Structures (in perss)

1.2. Coordonare de programe de studii, organizare si coordonare programe de formare continua si proiecte educationale (POS, Socrates, Leonardo, sa)

A2. Activitatea de cercetare – 2726,31 p
Pondere: P =1
2.1. Articole in reviste cotate ISI Thomson Reuters si in volume indexate ISI proceedings – **2470,61 p**



1. Pavel, F., Florescu, L.P. (2026) Impact of construction material properties variability on the seismic fragility assessment of RC structures in Bucharest. Buildings, 16(7), 1344, WOS: 001739432400001. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings16071344. (25+20*3,1)/2 = **43.5 p**
2. Pavel, F. (2026) Identifying soft-ground-story pre-1977 high-rise structures in Bucharest for updated seismic risk analysis. Applied Sciences, 16(7), 3360, WOS:001738521100001. https://doi.org/10.3390/app16073360. (25+20*2,5)/1 = **75 p**
3. Pavel, F. (2026) Seismic risk assessment at local scale. Case-study for a neighbourhood from Ploiesti, Romania. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 200(B), 109870. WOS:001596877100001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2025.109870. (25+20*4,6)/1 = **117 p**
4. Pavel, F., Aldea, A. (2025) I_{JMA}-based evaluation of ground motion recordings from Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 23, 4285–4303. WOS:001539463700001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-025-02220-y. (25+20*4,1)/2 = **53,5 p**
5. Pavel, F. (2025) Ground Motion Recording-Based Validation of Capacity Curves for High-Rise Reinforced Concrete Structures in Romania Constructed Before 1977. Buildings, 15(5), 459, WOS:001430515400001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15040549. (25+20*3,1)/1 = **87 p**
6. Pavel, F., Vladut, R., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2024) Correlation of soil conditions with seismic damage of structures in Craiova, Romania. Practice Periodical on Strucutral Design and Construction, 29(3), 05024003, WOS:001252127900010, https://doi.org/10.1061/PPSCFX.SCENG-1489. (25+20*1,6)/3 = **19 p**
7. Pavel, F., Nica, G. (2024) The seismic evaluation of existing buildings for energy renovation—a case study for the residential building stock in Bucharest (Romania). Buildings, 14(6), 1742, WOS:001254449200001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14061742. (25+20*3,1)/2 = **43,5 p**
8. Pavel, F. (2024) An updated perspective of the impact of the 1940 Vrancea earthquake on design and construction practices in Romania. Buildings, 14(4), 1152, WOS:001210546400001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14041152. (25+20*3,1)/1 = **87 p**
9. Arion, C., Vacareanu, R., Aldea, A., Pavel, F. (2024) Assessment of frost depth and frost heave in Romania. Applied Sciences, 14(7), 3086, WOS:001200941000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app14073086. (25+20*2,5)/4 = **18,75 p**
10. Pavel, F., Vacareanu, R., Aldea, A., Arion, C: (2024) Vertical elastic acceleration response spectra for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Buildings, 14(4), 906, WOS:001210603700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14040906. (25+20*3,1)/4 = **21,75 p**

11. Pavel, F., Crowley, H., Romão, X. et al. (2024) Evolution of national codes for the design of RC structures in Romania. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 22, 911-949, WOS:001091421400001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-023-01791-y. (25+20*3,8)/6 = **16,83 p**
12. Pavel, F., Nica, G. (2023) Ground motion duration patterns for Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Geosciences, 13(10), 288, WOS:001090070800001, https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences13100288. (25+20*2,4)/2 = **36,5 p**
13. Pavel, F., Vladut, R. (2023) Assessment of liquefaction hazard for sites in Romania using empirical models. Infrastructures, 8(9), 133, OS:001078448000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures8090133. (25+20*2,6)/2 = **38,5 p**
14. Pavel, F., Yaghmaei-Sabegh, S (2023) Empirical evaluation of the control period T_C for intermediate-depth earthquakes: application for Romania. Natural Hazards, 118(3), 2609-2628, WOS:001041431700001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-023-06110-x. (25+20*3,3)/2 = **45,5 p**
15. Pavel, F., Vacareanu, R. (2023) Review of methodologies for displacement checks in modern seismic design codes. Buildings, 13(4), 940, WOS:000977767800001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13040940. (25+20*3,324)/2 = **45,74 p**
16. Nica, G., Pavel, F., Hojda, G. (2023) A fast nonlinear dynamic analysis automated approach to produce fragility curves for 3D RC frames. Engineering Structures, 281, 115695, WOS:000946886300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2023.115695. (25+20*5,58)/3 = **45,53 p**
17. Pavel, F. (2023) Seismic Design Codes—Key Elements for Seismic Risk Perception and Reduction in Europe. Buildings, 13(1), 158, WOS:000914288200001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13010158. (25+20*3,324)/1 = **91,48 p**
18. Aldea, A., Vacareanu, R., Lungu, D., Pavel, F., Arion, C. (2022). GMPEs for Romania's Vrancea Intermediate Depth Seismic Source. In: Vacareanu, R., Ionescu, C. (eds) Progresses in European Earthquake Engineering and Seismology. ECEES 2022. Springer Proceedings in Earth and Environmental Sciences. Springer, Cham. WOS:000886936300006, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15104-0_6, pp. 90-108, (25+20*0)/5 = **5 p**
19. Pavel, F., Vacareanu, R., Arion, C., Aldea, A. (2022). New Insights on the Seismic Exposure and Vulnerability of Structures in Romania. In: Vacareanu, R., Ionescu, C. (eds) Progresses in European Earthquake Engineering and Seismology. ECEES 2022. Springer Proceedings in Earth and Environmental Sciences. Springer, Cham. WOS:000886936300012, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15104-0_12, pp. 197-211, (25+20*0)/4 = **6.25 p**
20. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2022) Seismic risk assessment for elements of the electric network in Romania. Buildings, 12(2), 244, WOS:000774830600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12020244. (25+20*3.324)/2 = **45,74 p**
21. Iancovici, M., Ionică, G., Pavel, F., Moța, F., Nica, G. (2022) Nonlinear dynamic response analysis of buildings for wind loads. A new frontier in the structural wind engineering. Journal of Building Engineering, 47, 103708, WOS:000770575700001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2021.103708. (25+20*7,144)/5 = **33,58 p**
22. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K. (2022) Preliminary Evaluation of the Impact of Eurocode 8 Draft Revision on the Seismic Zonation of Romania. Applied Sciences, 12(2), 649, WOS:000758452400001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app12020649. (25+20*2,838)/3 = **27,25 p**
23. Yaghmaei-Sabegh, S., Pavel, F., Shahvar, M., Qadri Talha, S.M. (2022) Empirical frequency content models based on intermediate-depth earthquake ground-motions. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 155, 107173, WOS:000780364400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2022.107173. (25+20*4,25)/4 = **27,5 p**
24. Pavel, F., Duțu, A., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2022) Seismic loss estimation using experimental fragility and vulnerability functions: case study of Buzau county, Romania. Natural Hazards Review, 23(1), WOS:000730390300006, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000521. (25+20*1,8)/3 = **20,33 p**
25. Pavel, F., Scupin, A., Văcăreanu, R. (2022) Analysis of the seismic risk of low-code masonry and large panels structures in Romania. Iranian Journal of Science and Technology, Transactions of Civil Engineering, 46(3), 1915-1928, WOS:000698531800001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40996-021-00736-2. (25+20*1,465)/3 = **18,10 p**
26. Scupin, A., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F. (2021) Evaluation of invasive retrofitting interventions on an unreinforced masonry heritage building. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Structural Analysis of Historical Constructions (SAHC 2021), 3462-3473, WOS:000856026404020, https://www.scipedia.com/wd/images/e/ea/Draft_Content_875150560p563.pdf. (25+20*0)/3 = **8,33 p**
27. Pavel, F. (2021) Seismic risk assessment of on-ground circular reinforced concrete and prestressed concrete water tanks using stochastic ground motion simulations. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering,

19: 161-178, WOS:000580936000002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00982-1. (25+20*4,556)/1 = **116,12 p**

28. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Scupin, A. (2021) Seismic fragility assessment for post-1977 high-rise reinforced concrete structures in Romania. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 19:6521-6544, WOS:000593890900001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-01014-8. (25+20*4,556)/3 = **38,71 p**
29. Pavel, F. (2021) Analysis of pulse-like ground motion recordings from Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 25: 733-745, WOS:000617403200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-021-09988-x. (25+20*1,489)/1 = **54,78 p**
30. Pavel, F., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2021) Risk-based evaluation of economic feasibility for strengthening of low-code RC structures. Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, 26(1), WOS:000646829400031, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)SC.1943-5576.0000543, (25+20*0)/2 = **12,5 p**
31. Pavel, F. (2021) Evaluation of key PSHA assumptions-case-study for Romania. Geosciences, 11(2): 70, WOS:000622600100001, https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences11020070, (25+20*0)/1 = **25 p**
32. Pavel, F. (2021) Collapse rates of reinforced concrete structures during large magnitude earthquakes: case study for Romania. SN Applied Sciences, 3, article number 525, WOS:000636458900006, https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-021-04520-9. (25+20*0)/1 = **25 p**
33. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Marcu, D. (2021) Seismic performance assessment and rating for a flat-slab RC core wall structure in Bucharest, Romania. Structures, 31: 1006-1016, WOS:000640710800005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2021.02.036 .(25+20*4,01)/3 = **35,07 p**
34. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Scupin, A. (2021) Seismic risk assessment of lifelines in Bucharest. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 66, 102629, WOS:000711060300010, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102629. (25+20*4,842)/5 = **24,37 p**
35. Pavel, F. (2021) Variability of ground motion amplitudes recorded in Bucharest area during Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Shock and Vibration, 5189966. WOS:000719676800001, https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5189966. (25+20*1,543)/1 = **55,86 p**
36. Pavel, F., Panfilii, P., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2020) Estimation of displacement capacity of rectangular RC shear walls using experimental and analytical database. The Civil Engineering Journal, 3(2020): 399-41, WOS:000586009600012, https://doi.org/10.14311/CEJ.2020.03.0035. (25+20*0)/3 = **8,33 p**
37. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2020) Re-assessment of peak ground accelerations for large magnitude Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 24: 1271-1280, WOS:000567786300001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-020-09955-y. (25+20*1.325)/2 = **25,75 p**
38. Calofir, V., Nica, G.B., Pavel, F. (2020) A nonlinear model to analyze the structures pounding forces during earthquakes. Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering, 45(10): 8303-8314, WOS:000542504200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13369-020-04633-0. (25+20*1.711)/3 = **19,74 p**
39. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K., Anastasiadis, A. (2020) Investigation on site-specific seismic response analysis for Bucharest (Romania). Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000518844200004, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00789-0. (25+20*2.406)/4 = **18,28 p**
40. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K. (2019) Preliminary revision of the seismic zonation from the current Romanian seismic design code. În: Silvestri, F., Moraci, N. (ed.) Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering for Protection and Development of Environment and Constructions - Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering, pp. 4412-4419, WOS:000623514305022, https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.1201/9780429031274-489/preliminary-revision-seismic-zonation-current-romanian-seismic-design-code-pavel-vacareanu-pitilakis. (25+20*0)/3 = **8,33 p**
41. Pavel, F., Carale, G. (2019) Seismic assessment for typical soft-storey reinforced concrete structures in Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 41, 101332, WOS:000504924200040, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101332, (25+20*2.568)/2 = **38,18 p**
42. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2019) Analysis of exceedance probabilities for design spectral accelerations from crustal earthquakes in Romania. Journal of Seismology, 23: 1327-1345, WOS:000511489200009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-019-09869-4. (25+20*1.494)/2 = **27,44 p**
43. Pavel, F., Nica, G. (2019) Influence of rotating strong ground motions on the response of doubly symmetrical RC wall structures in Romania and its implication on code provisions. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 17(7): 969-979, WOS:000470334300002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-018-0346-4. (25+20*0.624)/2 = **18,74 p**

44. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K. (2019). Intensity-dependent site amplification factors for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 17(5): 2363-2380, WOS:000463779300003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-019-00563-x. (25+20*2.406)/3 = **24,37 p**
45. Pavel, F., Pricopie, A., Nica, G. (2019). Collapse assessment for a RC frame structure in Bucharest (Romania). International Journal of Civil Engineering, 17: 1373-1381, WOS:000477013900003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-019-00398-2. (25+20*0.624)/3 = **12,49 p**
46. Pavel, F. (2019) Simplified seismic collapse evaluation of code-conforming reinforced concrete structures in Bucharest, Romania. Iranian Journal of Science and Technology, Transactions of Civil Engineering, 43: 859-864, WOS:000510414800021, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40996-018-0225-x. (25+20*0.8)/1 = **41 p**
47. Pavel, F. (2018). Collapse assessment for code-conforming reinforced concrete frame structures in Romania. Frontiers in Built Environment Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000559226800001, https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2018.00050. (25+20*0)/1 = **25 p**
48. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Crăciun, I., Colibă, V., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Neagu, C. (2018) Risk-targeted maps for Romania. Journal of Seismology, 22(2): 407-417, WOS:000426087700003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-017-9713-x. (25+20*1,128)/7 = **6,79 p**
49. Pavel, F., Calotescu, I., Stănescu, D., Badiu, A. (2018) Life-cycle and seismic fragility assessment of code-conforming reinforced concrete and steel structures in Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science, 9(2):263-274, WOS:000435717300010, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-018-0169-6. (25+20*2,225)/4 = **17,38 p**
50. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2018) Investigation on regional attenuation of Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 17(3): 501-509, WOS:000438472400005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-018-0458-5. (25+20*0,847)/2 = **20,97 p**
51. Nica, G.B., Lupoae, M., Pavel, F., Baciu, C. (2018) Numerical analysis of RC column failure due to blast and collapse scenarios for an irregular RC-framed structure. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 16(9): 1125-1136, WOS:000442657100011, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-017-0265-9. (25+20*0,57)/4 = **9,1 p**
52. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Calotescu, I, Săndulescu, A.M. (2018) Assessment of seismic risk scenarios for Bucharest, Romania. Natural Hazards, 93(S1): 25-37, WOS:000444462100003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-2991-3. (25+20*1,9)/4 = **15,75 p**
53. Pavel, F. (2018) Investigation on the variability of simulated and observed ground motions for Bucharest area. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 22(10): 1737-1757, WOS:000452068300001, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2017.1297266. (25+20*1,763)/1 = **60,26 p**
54. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Spatial correlation of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 107(1): 489-494, WOS:000394004900038, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120160095, (25+20*2,343)/2 = **35,93 p**
55. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Ground motion simulations for seismic stations in southern and eastern Romania and seismic hazard assessment. Journal of Seismology, 21(5): 1023-1037, WOS:000407951900001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-017-9649-1. (25+20*1,128)/2 = **23,78 p**
56. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Calotescu, I., Săndulescu, A.M., Arion, C., Neagu, C. (2017) Impact of spatial correlation of ground motions on seismic damage for residential buildings in Bucharest, Romania. Natural Hazards, 87(2): 1167-1187, WOS:000401072600030, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-2814-6, (25+20*1,90)/6 = **10,5 p**
57. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Evaluation of the seismic hazard for 20 cities in Romania using Monte Carlo based simulations. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 16(3): 513-523, WOS:000405296800004, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-017-0400-2. (25+20*0,847)/2 = **20,97 p**
58. Pavel, F. (2017) Next future large earthquake in Romania: a disaster waiting to happen? Seismological Research Letters, 88(1): 1-3, WOS:000390785200001, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220160140. (25+20*3,734)/1 = **99,68 p**
59. Popa, M., Pavel, F: (2016) Overview of Part II: Seismicity of Romania. Seismic hazard assessment; Local soil conditions effects. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 131-134, WOS:000389508200009, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_9. 25/2=**12,5 p**

60. Pavel, F., Ciuiu, D., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Site-dependent seismic hazard assessment for Bucharest based on stochastic simulations. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 221-233 WOS:000389508200015, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_15. 25/3=**8,33 p**
61. Olteanu, P., Colibă, V., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Ciuiu, D. (2016) Analytical seismic fragility functions for dual RC structures in Bucharest. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 463-479 WOS:000389508200033, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_33. 25/5=**5,00 p**
62. Văcăreanu, R., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F. (2016) Selecting and scaling strong ground motion records based on conditional mean spectra. Case study for Iasi city in Romania. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 377-391 WOS:000389508200026, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_26. 25/3=**8,33 p**
63. Crăciun, I., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F. (2016) Spectral displacement demands for strong ground motions recorded in Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 169-188, WOS:000389508200012, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_12. 25/3=**8,33 p**
64. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scenario-based earthquake risk assessment for Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 20: 138-144, WOS:000398432600014, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.11.006. (25+20*1.603)/2 = **28,53 p**
65. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scaling of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Earthquakes and Structures, 11(3): 505-516., WOS:000384816100007, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2016.11.3.505. (25+20*0.97)/2 = **22.2 p**
66. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Douglas, J., Radulian, M., Cioflan, C.O., Bărbat, A. (2016) An updated probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for Romania and comparison with the approach and outcomes of the SHARE project. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 173(6): 1881-1905, WOS:000377722800003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1223-6. (25+20*1.591)/6 = **9.47 p**
67. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Investigation on site conditions for seismic stations in Romania using H/V spectral ratio. Earthquakes and Structures, 9(5): 983-997, WOS:000367909000003, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2015.9.5.983. (25+20*0.789)/2 = **20.39 p**
68. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Cioflan, C.O. (2015) Investigation on directional effects of Vrancea subcrustal earthquakes. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 14(3): 399-410, WOS:000360861700002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-015-0032-3. (25+20*0.814)/4 = **10.32 p**
69. Văcăreanu, R., Iancovici, M., Neagu, C., Pavel, F. (2015) Macroseismic intensity prediction equations for Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Natural Hazards, 79(3): 2005-2031, WOS:000365016300029, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1944-y. (25+20*1.746)/4 = **14.98 p**
70. Pavel, F., Pricopie, A. (2015) Prediction of engineering demand parameters for RC wall structures. Structural Engineering and Mechanics, 54(4): 741-754, WOS:000356243500008, https://doi.org/10.12989/sem.2015.54.4.741. (25+20*1.021)/2 = **22.71 p**
71. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Assessment of the ground motion levels for the Vrancea (Romania) November 1940 earthquake. Natural Hazards, 78(2): 1469-1480, WOS:000358328000035, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1767-x. (25+20*1.746)/2 = **29.96 p**
72. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Kappa and regional attenuation for Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 19(3): 791-799, WOS:000355694300009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-015-9490-3. (25+20*1.55)/2 = **28.0 p**
73. Pavel, F. (2015). Investigation on the stochastic simulation of strong round motions for Bucharest area. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering 69: 227-232, WOS:000347865500019, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2014.11.008. (25+20*1.481)/1 = **54.62 p**
74. Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F., Neagu, C. (2015). Fore-arc and back-arc ground motion prediction model for Vrancea intermediate depth seismic source. Journal of Earthquake

Engineering, WOS:000352298500008, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2014.990653. (25+20*0.922)/5 = **8.69 p**

75. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Cioflan C.O., Iancovici, M. (2014). Spectral characteristics of strong ground motions from intermediate-depth Vrancea seismic source. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 104(6): 2842-2850, WOS:000346136800015, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120130334. (25+20*2.322)/4 = **17.86 p**
76. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C., Iancovici, M., Şercăianu, M. (2014). Investigation of the variability of strong ground motions from Vrancea earthquakes. Natural Hazards, 74(3): 1707-1728, WOS:000345096800022, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-014-1273-6. (25+20*1.719)/5 = **11.88 p**
77. Văcăreanu, R., Mărmureanu, G., Pavel, F., Neagu, C., Ortanza, C.O., Aldea, A. (2014). Analysis of soil factor S using strong ground motions from Vrancea subcrustal seismic source. Romanian Reports in Physics, 66(3): 893-906, WOS:000342035600028, https://rrp.nipne.ro/2014_66_3/A28.pdf. (25+20*1.517)/6 = **9.22 p**
78. Văcăreanu, R., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F. (2014). Conditional mean spectrum for Bucharest. Earthquakes and Structures, 7(2): 141-157, WOS:000348042600002., https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2014.7.2.141. (25+20*0.693)/3 = **12.95 p**
79. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Neagu, C., Pricopie, A. (2014). Bi-normalized response spectra and seismic intensity in Bucharest for 1986 and 1990 Vrancea seismic events. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 13(1): 125-135, WOS:000333084000011, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-014-0217-1. (25+20*0.729)/4 = **9.90 p**
80. Văcăreanu, R., Demetriu, D., Lungu, D., Pavel, F., Arion, C., Iancovici, M., Aldea, A., Neagu, C. (2014). Empirical ground motion model for Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Earthquakes and Structures, An International Journal, 6(2): 141-161, WOS:000337304000002, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2014.6.2.141. (25+20*0.693)/8 = **4.86 p**
81. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, Lungu, D. (2014). Bi-normalized response spectra for various frequency content ground motions. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 18(2): 264-289, WOS:000330105000005, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2013.846283. (25+20*1.175)/3 = **16.17 p**
82. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Arion, C., Neagu, C. (2014). On the variability of strong ground motions recorded from Vrancea earthquakes. Earthquakes and Structures, An International Journal, 6(1): 1-18, WOS:000330968200001, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2014.6.1.001. (25+20*0.693)/4 = **9.72 p**
83. Demetriu, S., Văcăreanu, R., Lungu, D., Pavel, F., Arion, C., Iancovici, M., Aldea, A., Neagu, C. (2014). Ground motion prediction equations for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. In: Cunha, A., Caetano, E., Ribeiro, P., Müller, G. (eds.) Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Structural Dynamics EURODYN 2014, Porto, Portugal, pp. 435-442, WOS:000354786600055, https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc/full-record/WOS:000354786600055. 25/8=**3.13 p**
84. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Aldea, A. (2013). On the selection of GMPEs for Vrancea subcrustal seismic source. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 11(6): 1867-1884, WOS:000327322000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-013-9515-7. 25+20*1.368)/3 = **17.45 p**
85. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Aldea, A., Arion, C. (2013). Source Effects on the Spectral Characteristics of Strong Ground Motions Recorded in Bucharest Area During Vrancea Earthquakes of 1986 and 1990, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 17(8): 1192-1211, WOS:000325787700005, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2013.830997. (25+20*0.905)/4 = **10.78 p**
86. Pavel F, Lungu D. (2013). Correlations between frequency content indicators of strong ground motions and PGV, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 17(4): 543-559, WOS:000317824600004, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2012.762957. (25+20*0.905)/2 = **21.55 p**

2.2. Articole in reviste si volumele unor manifestari stiintifice indexate in alte baze de date internationale – **188,19 p**

1. Pavel, F. (2011). Effects of masonry infills on seismic response of RC frames. Technical University of Civil Engineering Bucharest - Scientific Journal – Series: Mathematical Modeling in Civil Engineering, 4: 198-206, ISSN 2066-6926, https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2011/modelling_nr4_2011.pdf. 20/1 = **20 p**

2. Pavel, F (2011). Strength and displacement demands of seismic ground motions. Technical University of Civil Engineering Bucharest - Scientific Journal – Series: Mathematical Modeling in Civil Engineering, 1-2: 249-258, ISSN 2066-6926. https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2011/modelling_nr1-2_2011.pdf. 20/1 = **20 p**
3. Pavel, F. (2012). Scaling of strong ground motions. Technical University of Civil Engineering Bucharest - Scientific Journal – Series: Mathematical Modeling in Civil Engineering, 3: 47-55, ISSN 2066-6926, https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2012/modelling_nr3_2012.pdf. 20/1 = **20 p**
4. Nica, G.B., Pavel, F. (2016). Numerical analysis on the collapse of a RC frame. Mathematical Modelling in Civil Engineering, 12(4): 22 – 35, https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2016/2016.issue4.paper_03.pdf. 20/2 = **10 p**
5. Calotescu, I., Pavel, F., Săndulescu, A.M., Sibişteanu, H., Văcăreanu, R. (2017). Population perspective on the social impact of a strong earthquake affecting Bucharest. Mathematical modelling in civil engineering, 13(3): 1-9, https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2017/2017.issue3.paper_1.pdf. 20/5 = **4 p**
6. Neagu, C., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Călăraşu, E.A., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F. (2018) Ground types for seismic design in Romania. În: Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - updated overview with emphasis on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 157-172, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_11. 20/6 = **3,33 p**
7. Crăciun, I., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Colibă, V. (2018) On the ground motions spatial correlation for Vrancea intermediated-depth earthquakes. În: Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 191-209, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_13. 20/4 = **5 p**
8. Arion, C., Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Neagu, C., Iancovici, M., Popa, V., Damian, I. (2018) Seismic risk assessment of Romania. În: Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - updated overview with emphasis on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 251-265, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_17. 20/7 = **2,86 p**
9. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Calotescu, I. (2018) Comparison of seismic risk results for Bucahrest, Romania. În: Văcăreanu, R., R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - updated overview with emphasis on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 267-279, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_18. 20/3 = **6,67 p**
10. Calotescu, I., Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2018) Earthquake risk awareness in Bucharest, Romania: public survey. În: Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - updated overview with emphasis on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 297-311, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_20. 20/3 = **6,67 p**
11. Pavel, F. (2020). Investigation on the seismic fragility of in-plane loaded low- and medium-rise rectangular RC structural walls. Asian Journal of Civil Engineering, 21, 775-783, https://doi.org/10.1007/s42107-020-00238-y. 20/1 = **20 p**.
12. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2020). Assessment of the seismic performance for a low-code RC shear walls structure in Bucharest (Romania). The Open Construction and Building Technology Journal, 14: 111-123. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874836802014010111. 20/2 = **10 p**.
13. Scupin, A., (2021) Seismic performance assessment based on displacement capacity of unreinforced masonry structure. IOP Conference Series, 664 012087. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/664/1/012087. 20/3 = **6,67 p**.
14. Aldea, A., Pavel, F., Bertrand, E., Lozincă, E. (2020) Experimental and numerical analysis of the RC minaret of Carol I royal mosque, Constanţa, Romania. Proceedings of 17 WCEE, Sendai, Japan, paper no. C002682. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/105027855075?origin=resultslist. 20/4 = **5 p**
15. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Scupin, A. (2020) Probabilistic seismic risk assessment for reinforced concrete buildings in Romania. Proceedings of 17 WCEE, Sendai, Japan, paper no. C001418. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/105027924028?origin=resultslist. 20/3 = **6.67 p**
16. Pavel, F., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E., Bizon, F. (2022) Development of empirical models for reinforced concrete flat-slab structures using experimental results. Journal of Building Pathology and Rehabilitation, 7(6), https://doi.org/10.1007/s41024-021-00144-z. 20/3 = **6,67 p**.

17. Pavel, F., Nica, G., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2023) Seismic reliability assessment of existing RC chimneys in Romania. Journal of Building Pathology and Rehabilitation 8, 88, https://doi.org/10.1007/s41024-023-00333-y. 20/3 = **6,67 p**.
18. Arion, C., Văcăreanu, R., Aldea, A., Arion, A., Pavel, F. (2025) Assessment of Frost Depth in Romania. E3S Web Conf. 608, (05005), https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202560805006. 20/5 = **4 p**.
19. Arion, C., Văcăreanu, R., Aldea, A., Arion, A., Pavel, F. (2025) Assessment of Freeze-Thaw in Romania. E3S Web Conf. 608, (05006), https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202560805005. 20/5 = **4 p**.
20. Pavel, F. (2026). Historical Evolution of Wind Design for Tall RC Chimneys in Romania. În: Calotescu, I., Coșoiu, C.I. (ed.) Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Wind Engineering. NCWE 2024. Springer Proceedings in Earth and Environmental Sciences. Springer, Cham, pp,. 81-93 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-09671-5_7. 20/1 = **20 p.**

2.3. Brevete de inventie

2.4. Granturi/ proiecte castigate prin competitie

2.4.1. Director/ responsabil

2.4.1.1. Internationale

2.4.1.2. Nationale **– 25 p**

1. Proiect PN-II-RU-TE-2014-4-0697 (115/2015) - COBPEE (Community Based Performance Earthqauke Engineering) - finantat de catre Autoritatea Nationala de Cercetare Stiintifica in cadrul PNCDI II, Proiect de cercetare pentru stimularea constituirii de tinere echipe de cercetare independente - tip TE – director de proiect – 2015 - 2017 – 10*2 = **20 p**
2. Proiect GNaC-ARUT-2025-UTCB-3 – SeReAB (Seismic Resilience Analysis for Bucharest) – finanțat de către UTCB – director de proiect – 2025 – 2026 – 10*1*0.5 = **5 p**

2.4.2. Membru in echipa (sunt luate in considerare numai lunile in care a fost pontat pe proiect)

2.4.2.1. Internationale

2.4.2.2. Nationale **– 32.5 p**

1. Proiect 72/2012 - BIGSEES (BrIdging the Gap between Seismology and Earthquake Engineering: from the seismicity of Romania towards a refined implementation of Seismic action EN1998-1 in earthquake resistant design of buildings) - finantat de catre Autoritatea Nationala de Cercetare Stiintifica in cadrul PNCDI II, Programul 4 - Parteneriate in domenii prioritare – membru in echipa UTCB – 2012 - 2016 – 5*4 = **20 p**
2. Proiect 72/2012 - TRAROM (Revival of Romanian traditional houses with modern solutions and local, natural materials) - finantat de catre Autoritatea Nationala de Cercetare Stiintifica, proiect PN-III-P2-2.1-PED-2016-1073, membru in echipa UTCB – 2016 - 2018 – 5*1 = **5 p**
3. Proiect 336/390012 – SETTING Servicii tematice integrate în domeniul observarii Pământului - o platforma națională pentru inovare, finantat de catre Autoritatea Nationala de Cercetare Stiintifica, membru in echipa UTCB – 2021 – 5*1.5 = **7.5 p**

2.5. Proiecte de cercetare/ consultanta (valoare de minim 10 000 Euro echivalent)

2.5.1. Responsabil – **10 p**

1. Proiect Evaluarea Riscurilor de Dezastre la Nivel National (RO-RISK), cod SIPOCA 30 – responsabil UTCB – 2016 – **5 p**
2. Proiect UTCB-CDI-2021-002 – SRAL (Seismic risk assessment of lifelines in Bucharest) – 2021 = **5 p**

A3. Recunoastere si impactul activitatii – 3623,69 p

3.1. Citări –

3.1.1.Reviste ISI – **3584,45p**

Lucrare	Citare
1. Pavel F, Lungu D. (2013). Correlations between frequency content indicators of strong ground motions and PGV, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 17(4): 543-559,	1. Razeghi, H.R., Araei, A.A., Ghalandarzadeh, A., Tabatabaei, S.H. (2014). Rate-dependence of rockfill behavior on propagated near fault ground motions. *Scientia Iranica*, 21(4): 1263-1280, WOS:000343276100006,

WOS:000317824600004, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2012.762957 = 10*1.025/2=5.13 =10*1.492/2=7.46 =10*0.893/2=4.47 =10*1.545/2=7.73 =10*2.258/2=11.29 =10*2.021/2=10.11 =10*2.303/2=11.52 =10*1.763/2=8.82 =10*2.191/2=10.96 =10*4.364/2=21.82 =10*2.286/2=11.43 =10*1.515/2=7.58 =10*3.524/2=17.62 =10*3.646/2=18.23 =10*2.648/2=13.24 =10*3.761/2=18.81 =10*2.372/2=11.86 =10*4/2=20 =10*3.8/2=19 =10*1.6/2=8 =10*4.1/2=20.5 =10*2.4/5=4.8 =10*5.7/4=14.25 =10*4.6/3=15.33 **24 de citări, 299.92 p.**	https://scientiairanica.sharif.edu/article_1721_dbb4e42e4ed1a00a302ee03d72ac687d.pdf. 2. Guan, M., Du, H., Cui, J., Zeng, Q., Jiang, H. (2015). Optimal ground motion intensity measure for long-period structures. *Measurement Science and Technology*, 26: 105001, WOS:000366321900001, https://doi.org/10.1088/0957-0233/26/10/105001 3. Mortezaei, A., Motaghi, A. (2016) Seismic Assessment of the World's Tallest Pure-Brick Tower Including Soil-Structure Interaction. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 30(5), article no. 04016020, WOS:000384249700014, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0000861 4. Castaldo, P., Tubaldi, E. (2018) Influence of ground motion characteristics on the optimal single concave sliding bearing properties for base-isolated structures. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 104: 346-364, WOS:000418967400029, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2017.09.025. 5. Deng, P., Pei, S., Hartzell, S., Luco, N., Rezaeian, S. (2018) A response spectrum-based indicator for structural damage prediction. *Engineering Structures*, 166: 546-555, WOS:000433268500040, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2018.03.046. 6. Moon, D.S., Lee, Y.J., Lee, S. (2018). Fragility analysis of space reinforced concrete frame structures with structural irregularity in plan. *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Volume 144, Issue 8, 04018096, WOS:000433892300008, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.000209 7. Panaghi, K., Mahboubi, A., Mahdavian, A. (2018). The effect of earthquake motion characteristics on potentially liquefiable pile-pinned sloping ground. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 17(4), 1891-1917, WOS:000460891900005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-00529-5 8. Nabib, N., Hajirasouliha, I., Petkovski, M. (2019) Simplified method for optimal design of friction damper slip loads by considering near-field and far-field ground motions. *Journal of Earthquake Engineering*, 25(9), 1851-1875,WOS:000470563800001, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2019.1605316 9. Bafti, F.G., Mortezaei, A., Kheyroddin, A. (2019) The length of plastic hinge area in the flanged reinforced concrete shear walls subjected to earthquake ground motions. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics*, 69(6) : 651-665, WOS:000461756800006, https://doi.org/10.12989/sem.2019.69.6.651

	10. Durucan, C., Humeyra, S., Durucan, A.R. (2021) A new ground motion intensity measure for short period reinforced concrete structures subjected to near-fault pulse-like ground motions. *Mechanics Based Design of Structures and Machines*, 51(4), 2004-2019, WOS:000619363000001, https://doi.org/10.1080/15397734.2021.1886114
	11. Liu, Q., Zhu, S., Yu, W., Wu, X., Song, F., Ren, X. (2021) Ground motion frequency insensitivity of bearing-supported pedestrian bridge with viscous dampers. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, 25(7), 2662-2673, WOS:000641644500003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12205-021-2233-9
	12. Nahar, T., Rahman, M., Kim, D. (2021) Damage index based seismic risk generalization for concrete gravity dams considering FFDI. *Structural Engineering and Mechanics*, 78(1): 53-66, WOS:000637831800006, https://doi.org/10.12989/sem.2021.78.1.053
	13. Sharma, V., Shrimali, M.K., Bharti, S.D., Datta, T.K. (2021) Seismic fragility evaluation of semi-rigid frames subjected to near-field earthquakes. *Journal of Constructional Steel Research,* 176, 106384, WOS:000597320200006, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcsr.2020.106384
	14. Rahman, M.M., Nahar, T.T., Kim, D. (2021) Effect of frequency characteristics of ground motion on response of tuned mass damper controlled inelastic concrete frame. *Buildings*, 11(2): 74, WOS:000622276600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11020074
	15. Meisuh, B.K., Seo, J., Huh, J., Kim, J., Kim, J.-M. (2022). Seismic response of a container crane subjected to ground motions, *Applied Ocean Research*, 126, 103270, WOS:000862063900003, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apor.2022.103270
	16. Vern, S., Shrimali, M.K., Bharti, S.D., Datta, T.K. (2022). Optimum seismic control and safety measures in liquid storage tanks by the amalgamation of different passive control devices. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 36(3), WOS:000782632600009, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0001735
	17. Castaldo, P., Miceli, E. (2023) Optimal single concave sliding device properties for isolated multi-span continuous deck bridges depending on the ground motion characteristics. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 173, 108128, WOS:001045759200001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2023.108128
	18. Ghanem, A., Lee, Y.J., Moon, D.S.. (2024). Seismic Vulnerability of Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures: Obtaining Plan or Vertical Mass Irregularity from Structure Use Change. *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 150(3),

	WOS:001143816100009, https://doi.org/10.1061/JSENDH.STENG-1244
	19. Izhar, M.S., Ansari, M.I., Umair M. (2024) Energy based seismic vulnerability assessment tool for reinforced concrete bridges. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 22(10), 5259–5297, WOS:001264567200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-01969-y
	20. Kamgar, R., Salimian, M., Heidarzadeh, H., Alipour, R. (2025) Improving the Seismic Performance of Structures Based on Minimizing the Total Damage Index and the Uniform Distribution of Damage at the Height of Structures. Journal of Structural Design and Construction Practice, 30(1), WOS:001435517300041, https://doi.org/10.1061/JSDCCC.SCENG-1500
	21. Mohsenian, V., Di-Sarno, L. (2025) Seismic sensitivity assessment of concrete tunnel-form buildings to variations in ground motion characteristics using time scaling of earthquake record approach: a case study. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 23, 4187–4219. WOS:001518064500001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-025-02197-8
	22. Khan, M.B., Izhar, M.S., Mudassir, S.M. *et al.* (2026) Evaluating seismic reliability of RC bridge: MS-AS sequences in near & far field regions. Innov. Infrastruct. Solut. 11, 8. WOS:001631724600003. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-025-02411-1.
	23. Contreras, N., Zhang, X., Hao, H., Hernández, F. (2026) The Influence of artificial gaps in locally resonant elastic metamaterial under impact loading, International Journal of Impact Engineering, Volume 211, 105612. WOS:001651095800001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijimpeng.2025.105612.
	24. Qu, J., Lin,. J., Huo, L. (2026) Synthesis of composite seismic intensity measure based on Ridge Regression: Application to steel frame structures. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 205, 110227. WOS:001708352600001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2026.110227.
2. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Arion, C., Neagu, C. (2014). On the variability of strong ground motions recorded from Vrancea earthquakes. Earthquakes and Structures, An International Journal, 6(1): 1-18, WOS:000330968200001, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2014.6.1.001 =10*0.789/4=**1.97** **1 citare, 1.97 p.**	1. Farzampour, A., Kamali-Asl, A. (2015). Seismic hazard assessment for two cities in eastern Iran. Earthquakes and Structures, An International Journal, 8(3): 681-697, WOS:000353201200010, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2015.8.3.681
3. Văcăreanu, R., Demetriu, D., Lungu, D., Pavel, F., Arion, C., Iancovici, M., Aldea, A., Neagu, C. (2014). Empirical ground motion model for	1. Farzampour, A., Kamali-Asl, A. (2015). Seismic hazard assessment for two cities in eastern Iran. Earthquakes and Structures, An International

Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Earthquakes and Structures, An International Journal, 6(2): 141-161, WOS:000337304000002, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2014.6.2.141. =2*10*0.789/8=1.97 = 10*3.8/8=4.75 **3 citări, 6.72 p.**	Journal, 8(3): 681-697, WOS:000353201200010, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2015.8.3.681
	2. Mahmoudi, M., Shayanfar, M., Barkhordari, M.A., Jahani, E., (2016). New fuzzy method in choosing Ground Motion Prediction Equation (GMPE) in probabilistic seismic hazard analysis. Earthquakes and Structures, 10(2): 389-408, WOS:000373514000007, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2016.10.2.389
	3. Pajaro, C.A., Arteta, C.A., Mercado, V. et al. Partially non-ergodic ground motion model for the Bucaramanga seismic nest in Northern South America (NoSAm Nest GMM). Bulletin of Earthquake Engineerinr 22(8), 3677–3702 (2024), WOS:001205929800001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-01898-w
4. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Neagu, C., Pricopie, A. (2014). Bi-normalized response spectra and seismic intensity in Bucharest for 1986 and 1990 Vrancea seismic events. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 13(1): 125-135, WOS:000333084000011, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-014-0217-1 =10*0.922/4=2.31 =10*0.893/4=2.23 =10*1.05/4=2.63 =10*2.41/4=6.03 **4 citări, 13.19 p.**	1. Xu, L.J., Yhao, G.C., Chen, Z.B., Xie, L.L. (2016). A probabilistic methodology to determine elastic acceleration response spectra for pulse-type records through multi-resolution analyses. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 20(1): 129-155, WOS:000367899100007, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2015.1045104
	2. Mortezaei, A., Motaghi, A. (2016) Seismic Assessment of the World's Tallest Pure-Brick Tower Including Soil-Structure Interaction. Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 30(5), article no. 04016020, WOS:000384249700014 https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0000861
	3. Adhikary, S., Singh, Y. (2019) Effect of site amplification on inelastic seismic response. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration 18(3): 535-554, WOS:000475638800005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-019-0520-y
	4. Amirchoupani, P., Abdollahzadeh, G., Hamidi, H. (2020) Spectral acceleration matching procedure with respect to normalization approach. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18(11): 5165-5191, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00897-x
5. Văcăreanu, R., Mărmureanu, G., Pavel, F., Neagu, C., Ortanza, C.O., Aldea, A. (2014). Analysis of soil factor S using strong ground motions from Vrancea subcrustal seismic source. Romanian Reports in Physics, 66(3): 893-906, WOS:000342035600028, https://rrp.nipne.ro/2014_66_3/A28.pdf =10*1.398/6=2.33 =10*4.2/6=**7** **2 citări, 9.33 p.**	1. Constantin, A.P., Partheniu, R., Moldovan, I.A. (2016) Macroseismic intensity distribution of some recent Romanian earthquakes. Romanian Journal of Physics, 61(5-6): 1120-1132, WOS:000381898000031, https://rjp.nipne.ro/2016_61_5-6/RomJPhys.61.p1120.pdf
	2. Manea, E. F., Danciu, L., Cioflan, C. O., Toma-Danila, D., and Gerstenberger, M. C. (2025) Testing the 2020 European Seismic Hazard Model (ESHM20) against observations from Romania, Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 25, 1–12, WOS:001387566700001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-25-1-2025
6. Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F., Neagu, C. (2015). Fore-arc and back-arc ground motion prediction model for Vrancea	1. Lee, V.W., Trifunac, M.D., Bulajic, B.D., Manic, M. (2016) Preliminary empirical scaling of pseudo relative velocity spectra in Serbia from

intermediate depth seismic source. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000352298500008, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2014.990653 =10*2.067/5=4.13 =10*2.067/5=4.13 =10*2.519/5=5.04 =10*3.918/5=7.84 =10*2.005/5=4.01 =10*2.427/5=4.85 =10*3.131/5=6.26 =10*3.03/5=6.06 =10*3.897/5=7.79 =10*4.956/5=9.91 =10*3.9/5=7.8 =10*4.6/5=9.2 =10*3.8/5=7.6 =10*3.1/5=6.2 =10*1.9/5=3.8 15 citări, **94.63 p.**	the Vrancea earthquakes. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 86: 41-54, WOS:000377315000004, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2016.03.007
	2. Lee, V.W., Trifunac, M.D., Bulajic, B.D., Manic, M. (2016) A preliminary empirical model for frequency-dependent attenuation of Fourier amplitude spectra in Serbia from the Vrancea earthquakes. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 83: 167-179, WOS:000371937600014, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2015.12.004
	3. Khallas, C., Papazachos, C.B., Boore, D.M., Ventouzi, C., Margaris, B. (2018) Historical intermediate-depth earthquakes in the Southern Aegean Sea Benioff zone: modeling their anomalous macroseismic patterns with stochastic ground-motion simulations. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 16(11): 5121-5150, WOS:000447789600003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-0342-8
	4. Weatherhill, G.A., Danciu, L. (2018) Regional variation of spectral parameters for seismic design from broadband probabilistic seismic hazard analysis. Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, 47(12): 2447-2467, WOS:000443384600006, https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.3092
	5. Phung, V._B., Loh, C.H., Chao, S.H., Abrahamson, N.A. (2020) Ground motion prediction equation for Taiwan subduction zone earthquakes. Earthquake Spectra, 36(3): 1331-1358, WOS:000558761700014, https://doi.org/10.1177/875529302090682
	6. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Ionescu, C. (2020) Empirical relationships between macroseimic intensity and instrumental ground motion parameters for the intermediate-depth earthquakes of Vrancea region, Romania. Natural Hazards, 103(2): 2021-2043, WOS:000534867300002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-020-04070-0
	7. Marmureanu, A. et al. (2021) From National to Transnational Seismic Monitoring Products and Services in the Republic of Bulgaria, Republic of Moldova, Romania, and Ukraine. Seismological Research Letters, 92(3): 1685-1703, WOS:000644838900001, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220200393
	8. Manea, E.F., Cioflan, C.O., Danciu, L. (2021) Ground-motion models for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Earthquake Spectra, 38(1): 407-431, WOS:000751508100017, https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930211032985
	9. Özcebe, A.G.; Tiganescu, A.; Ozer, E.; Negulescu, C.; Galiana-Merino, J.J.; Tubaldi, E.; Toma-Danila, D.; Molina, S.; Kharazian, A.; Bozzoni, F.; Borzi, B.; Balan, S.F. Raspberry Shake-Based Rapid Structural Identification of

	Existing Buildings Subject to Earthquake Ground Motion: The Case Study of Bucharest. Sensors 2022, 22, 4787, WOS:000825611600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/s22134787
	10. Borleanu, F., Petrescu, L., Seghedi, I., Thomas, C., De Siena, L. (2023) The seismic attenuation signature of collisional orogens and sedimentary basins within the Carpathian Orogen. Global and Planetary Change, 104093, WOS:000962850100001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2023.104093
	11. Papatheodorou, K. et al. (2023) Rapid Earthquake Damage Assessment and Education to Improve Earthquake Response Efficiency and Community Resilience. Sustainability, 15(24), 16603, WOS:001130481300001, https://doi.org/10.3390/su152416603
	12. Weatherill, G., Kotha, S. R., Danciu, L., Vilanova, S., Cotton, F (2024) Modelling seismic ground motion and its uncertainty in different tectonic contexts: Challenges and application to the 2020 European Seismic Hazard Model (ESHM20), Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Sciences, 24(5): 1795-1834, WOS:001230598400001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-24-1795-2024
	13. Pajaro, C.A., Arteta, C.A., Mercado, V. et al. Partially non-ergodic ground motion model for the Bucaramanga seismic nest in Northern South America (NoSAm Nest GMM). Bulletin of Earthquake Engineerinr 22(8), 3677–3702 (2024), WOS:001205929800001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-01898-w
	14. Dupuis, M., Lee, R., Bradley, B. (2025) Hybrid broadband ground-motion simulation validation of small-magnitude subduction earthquakes in New Zealand. Earthquake Spectra 41(5) : 4046-4081. WOS:001632247800019. https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930251353816
	15. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Grecu, B. (2025) Scalar frequency content parameters of ground motion from Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Romanian Journal of Physics, 70(1-2), 801. WOS:001451894600009. https://doi.org/10.59277/RomJPhys.2025.70.801
7. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Cioflan C.O., Iancovici, M. (2014). Spectral characteristics of strong ground motions from intermediate-depth Vrancea seismic source. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 104(6): 2842-2850, WOS:000346136800015, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120130334.	1. Lee, V.W., Trifunac, M.D., Bulajic, B.D., Manic, M. (2016) A preliminary empirical model for frequency-dependent attenuation of Fourier amplitude spectra in Serbia from the Vrancea earthquakes. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 83: 167-179, WOS:000371937600014, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2015.12.004
=10*1.481/4=**3.70** =10*0.736/4=**1.84** =10*4.6/4=**11.5** =10*2.9/4=**7.25**	2. Guan, M., Du, H., Cui, J., Zeng, Q., Jiang, H. (2016) Adjustment of minimum seismic shear coefficient considering site effects for long-period structures. Journal of Geophysics and

4 citări, 24.29 p.	Engineering, 13(3): 304-312, WOS:000377559100009, https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-2132/13/3/304
	3. Zou, Y.H., et al. (2026) Normalized response spectrum of near-fault pulse-like ground motions (PLGMs) based on PGA and PGD attenuation. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 203, WOS:001663901400004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2026.110109
	4. Nassar, M.; Mouri, F.; Abo El Ezz, A. Assessment of Community Risk from Seismic-Induced Damage to Hazardous Materials Storage Tanks in Marine Ports. *Infrastructures* 2026, *11*, 49. WOS:001700361900001. https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures11020049.
8. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Aldea, A. (2013). On the selection of GMPEs for Vrancea subcrustal seismic source. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 11(6): 1867-1884, WOS:000327322000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-013-9515-7 =10*2.311/3=7.70 =10*3.275/3=10.92 =10*2.807/3=9.36 =10*2.077/3=6.92 =10*3.03/3=10.10 =10*3.50/3=11.67 =10*4.5/3=15 =10*4.25/3=14.17 =10*4.842/3=16.14 =10*4.1/3=13.67 =10*4.0/3=13.33 **11 citări, 128.97 p.**	1. Mak, S., Clements, A., Schorlemmer, D. (2017) Empirical evaluation of hierarchical ground-motion models: score uncertainty and model weighting. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 107(2): 949-965, WOS:000402373000032, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120160232
	2. Mak, S., Cotton, F., Schorlemmer, D. (2017) Measuring the performance of ground-motion models: the importance of being independent. Seismological Research Letters, 88(5): 1212-1217, WOS:000416129000002, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220170097
	3. Weatherhill, G.A., Danciu, L. (2018) Regional variation of spectral parameters for seismic design from broadband probabilistic seismic hazard analysis. Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, 47(12): 2447-2467, WOS:000443384600006, https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.3092
	4. Kowsari, M., Haldorsson, B., Hrafnkelsson, B., Jónsson, S. (2019) Selection of earthquake ground motion models using the deviance information criterion. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 117: 288-299, WOS:000456220700025, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2018.11.014
	5. Manea, E.F., Cioflan, C.O., Danciu, L. (2021) Ground-motion models for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Earthquake Spectra, 38(1): 407-431, WOS:000751508100017, https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930211032985
	6. Zuccolo, E., Cremen, G., Galasso, C. (2021) Comparing the Performance of Regional Earthquake Early Warning Algorithms in Europe. Frontiers in Earth Sciences, Geohazards and Georisks, 9, 686672, WOS:000673426300001, https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2021.686272
	7. Albulescu, A.C., Grozavu, A., Larion, D., Burghiu, G. (2022) Assessing the earthquake systemic vulnerability of the urban centres in the South-East region of Romania. The tale of Galați and Brăila Cities, Romania. Geomatics, Natural

	Hazards and Risk, 13(1), 1106-1133, WOS:000784007700001, https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2022.2065219
	8. Sotiriadis, D., Margaris, B. (2023) Evaluation of the predictive performance of regional and global ground motion predictive equations against Greek strong motion data. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 165, 107656, WOS:000900248400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2022.107656
	9. Mărgărint, M.C., Kovačić, S., Albulescu, A.-C., Miljković, D. (2023) Natural multi-hazard risk perception and educational insights among Geography and Tourism students and graduates amid the Covid-19 pandemic, International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 86, 103549, WOS:000926243900001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2023.103549
	10. Caglar, N.M., Limongelli, M.P. Impact of ground motion model selection on the benefit from monitoring data. *Bull Earthquake Eng* (2026). WOS:001691221500001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-026-02393-0
	11. Dobre, D., Armaş, I. & Albulescu, AC. Examining the Risk Perception-Disaster Preparedness Behavior Nexus in the Seismic Context of Bucharest. *Int J Disaster Risk Sci* **16**, 724–741 (2025). WOS:001530177500001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-025-00651-4
9. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Aldea, A., Arion, C. (2013). Source Effects on the Spectral Characteristics of Strong Ground Motions Recorded in Bucharest Area During Vrancea Earthquakes of 1986 and 1990, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 17(8): 1192-1211, WOS:000325787700005, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2013.830997 =10*2.565/4=6.41 **1 citare, 6.41 p.**	1. Armas, I., Ionescu, R., Gavris, A, Toma-Danila, D. (2016) Identifying seismic vulnerability hotspots in Bucharest. Applied Geography, 77: 49-63, WOS:000389098900005, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2016.10.001
10. Văcăreanu, R., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F. (2014). Conditional mean spectrum for Bucharest. Earthquakes and Structures, 7(2): 141-157, WOS:000348042600002., https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2014.7.2.141 =10*0.789/3=2.63 =10*1.044/3=3.48 =10*1.309/3=4.36 =10*1.309/3=4.36 =10*3.8/3=4.36 **5 citări, 27.50 p.**	1. Kaveh, A., Mahdavi, V.R. (2017) Modification of ground motions using wavelet transform and VPS algorithm. Earthquakes and Structures, 12(4): 389-395, WOS:000402480100001, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2017.12.4.389
	2. Kozak, D.L., Luo, J., Olson, S.M., LaFave, J.M., Fahnestock, L.A. (2017) Modification of ground motions for use in Central North America. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 23(8): 1385-1406, WOS:000483847500007, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2017.1387190
	3. Osei, J.B, Adao-Asamoah, M. (2018) Average spectral acceleration: Ground motion duration evaluation. Earthquakes and Structures, 14(6): 577-587, WOS:000435958900007, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2018.14.6.577
	4. Abdollahzadeh, G., Sazjini, M. (2018) Sufficiency of the spectral shape in predicting peak and cumulative structural earthquake responses. Earthquakes and Structures, 15(6):

	629-637, WOS:000454435500005, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2018.15.6.629
	5. Du, K., Gao, J., Ji, K. et al. (2024) A modal conditional mean spectrum for nonlinear structural response time-history analysis of tall buildings to consider higher mode effects. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 22, 1187–1216, WOS:001120651100001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-023-01804-w
11. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scenario-based earthquake risk assessment for Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 20: 138-144, WOS:000398432600014, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.11.006 =10*1.222/2=6.11 =10*2,883/2=14.42 =10*2.239/2=11.20 =10*7.246/2=36.23 =10*3.251/2=16.26 =10*4.2/2=21 =10*2.7/2=13.5 =10*3.8/2=19 =10*4.2/2=21 =10*3.8/2=19 =10*4.4/2=22 =10*2/2=10 **12 citări, 209.71 p.**	1. Armas, I., Toma-Danila, D., Ionescu, R., Gavris, A. (2017) Vulnerability to Earthquake Hazard: Bucharest Case Study, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Sciences, 8: 182-195, WOS:000404615100009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-017-0132-y 2. Toma-Danila, D., Armas, I., Tiganescu, A. (2020) Network-risk: an open GIS toolbox for estimating the implications of transportation network damage due to natural hazards, tested for Bucharest, Romania. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, WOS:000537449100001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-20-1421-2020 3. Kamranzad, F., Memarian, H., Zare, M. (2020) Earthquake risk assessment for Tehran, Iran. *International Journal of Geo-Information*, 9(7), 430, WOS:000557033900001, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi9070430 4. Xiaobing, Y., Xianrui, Y., Chenliang, L., Zhonghui, J. (2020) Information diffusion-based risk assessment of natural disasters along the Silk Road Economic Belt in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 244, 118744, WOS:000503172600080, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118744 5. Babič, A., Dolšek, M., Žižmond, J. (2021) Simulating Historical Earthquakes in Existing Cities for Fostering Design of Resilient and Sustainable Communities: The Ljubljana Case. *Sustainability,* 13(14), 7624, WOS:000677012500001, https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147624 6. Ahmed, T., Rehman, K., Shafique, M. et al. (2024) Local-scale integrated seismic risk assessment using satellite data and field information in Northern Pakistan. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 38(5): 1897-1918, WOS:001153236600001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-024-02661-y 7. Yu, F., Fan, B., Qin, C., Yao, C. (2023) A Scenario-Driven Fault-Control Decision Support Model for Disaster Preparedness Using Case-Based Reasoning, *Natural Hazards Review*, 24(4), 04023040, WOS:001068552200009, https://doi.org/10.1061/NHREFO.NHENG-1722

	8. Fikri, R., Gerstenberger, M. & Ingham, J. (2024) Seismic risk assessment for commercial masonry infill buildings within the Auckland region of New Zealand. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 22(14), 7149–7177, WOS:001335879700001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-02033-5 9. Bouzi Bellalem, Sergio Molina, James Daniell, Said Maouche, Abdelhak Talbi, Mourad Mobarki, Hayet Ymmel, Hamou Djellit (2024) Seismic risk assessment for the downtown of the city of Blida, Algeria. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction,Volume 103, 104314, WOS:001200173200001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.104314 10. Pujades, L.G., Vargas-Alzate, Y.F., Lantada, N. *et al.* (2025) Probabilistic parametric analysis of capacity, fragility and expected seismic damage of framed reinforced concrete buildings. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 23(4): 1591-1637, WOS:001407571000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-02066-w 11. Li J, Yao Y, Tang L, Hu W, Wen H and Chang X (2026) Seismic hazard analysis of the southeastern Pamir Frontal Thrust: implications for regional seismic risk patterns. Front. Earth Sci. 13:1702847. WOS:001681198400001. DOI: 10.3389/feart.2025.1702847. 12. Wu, M., Guo, X., Zhao, Y. (2025) Cascading social risks: A cross-spatial vulnerability analysis of atypical power system failures in China. Utilities Policy, 96, 102011. WOS:001554452300001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2025.102011
12. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Douglas, J., Radulian, M., Cioflan, C.O., Bărbat, A. (2016) An updated probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for Romania and comparison with the approach and outcomes of the SHARE project. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 173(6): 1881-1905, WOS:000377722800003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1223-6. =10*1,222/6=2.04 =10*1.899/6=3.17 =10*2.807/6=4.68 =10*1.345/6=2.24 =10*2.578/6=4.30 =10*3.548/6=5.91 =10*3.827/6=6.38 =10*3.03/6=5.05 =10*3.827/6=6.38 =10*3.897/6=6.50 =10*1.606/6=2.61 =10*4.6/6=7.67 =10*3.6/6=6.16 =10*2.1/6=3.5 =10*4.2/6=3.5	1. Armas, I., Toma-Danila, D., Ionescu, R., Gavris, A. (2017) Vulnerability to Earthquake Hazard: Bucharest Case Study, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Sciences, 8: 182-195, WOS:000404615100009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-017-0132-y 2. Cauzzi, C., Faccioli, E. (2017) Anatomy of sigma of a global predictive model for ground motions and response spectra. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 16(5): 1887-1905, WOS:000430837800009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-017-0278-4 3. Weatherhill, G.A., Danciu, L. (2018) Regional variation of spectral parameters for seismic design from broadband probabilistic seismic hazard analysis. Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, 47(12): 2447-2467, WOS:000443384600006, https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.3092 4. Despotaki, V., Silva, V., Lagomarsino, S., Pavlova, I., Torres, J. (2018) Evaluation of seismic risk on UNESCO Cultural Heritage sites in Europe. *International Journal of Architectural Heritage*, 12(7-8), 1231-1244, WOS:000446110900011, https://doi.org/10.1080/15583058.2018.1503374

=10*2.1/6=3.5 =10*2.9/6=4.83 =10*1.9/6=3.17 =10*4/6=6.67 **19 citări, 91.64 p.**	5. Asim, M.K., Moustafa, S.S.R., Niaz, I.A., Elawadi, E.A., Iqbal, T., Martinez-Alvarez, F. (2020) Seismicity analysis and machine learning models for short-term low magnitude seismic activity predictions in Cyprus. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 130, 105932, WOS:000512483200005, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2019.105932
	6. Parisse, F., Poletti, E., Dutu, A., Rodrigues, H. (2021) Numerical modeling of the seismic performance of Romanian timber-framed masonry walls. *Engineering Structures*, 112272, WOS:000657382000004, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2021.112272
	7. Kharazian, A., Molina, S., Galiana-Merino, J.J., Agea-Medina, N. (2021) Risk-targeted hazard maps for Spain. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 19(13): 5369-5389, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-021-01189-8
	8. Manea, E.F., Cioflan, C.O., Danciu, L. (2021) Ground-motion models for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Earthquake Spectra, 38(1): 407-431, WOS:000751508100017, https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930211032985
	9. Dragojević, D., Šalić Makreska, R., Milutinović, Z. (2022) Analysis of exponent K based on “SHARE” project data and its implications on importance factors of EN 1998–1. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 20(5): 2683-2694, WOS:000752759900002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-022-01333-y
	10. Özcebe, A.G.; Tiganescu, A.; Ozer, E.; Negulescu, C.; Galiana-Merino, J.J.; Tubaldi, E.; Toma-Danila, D.; Molina, S.; Kharazian, A.; Bozzoni, F.; Borzi, B.; Balan, S.F. Raspberry Shake-Based Rapid Structural Identification of Existing Buildings Subject to Earthquake Ground Motion: The Case Study of Bucharest. Sensors 2022, 22, 4787, WOS:000825611600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/s22134787
	11. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Placinta, A.O. et al. (2022) On the seismic wave attenuation at the bend of the Southeastern Carpathians. Journal of Seismology, 27(1): 233-240, WOS:000888674300001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-022-10125-5
	12. Weatherill, G., Kotha, S. R., Danciu, L., Vilanova, S., Cotton, F (2024) Modelling seismic ground motion and its uncertainty in different tectonic contexts: Challenges and application to the 2020 European Seismic Hazard Model (ESHM20), Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Sciences, 24(5): 1795-1834, WOS:001230598400001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-24-1795-2024

	13. Solakov, D., Simeonova, S., Trifonova, P. *et al.* (2023) Earthquake scenarios and population exposure for the city of Plovdiv. *Natural Hazards* 118, 2153–2171, WOS:001037156700002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-023-06087-7
	14. Mihia, M., Radulian, M., Poa, M., Grecu, B. (2022) Improving location parameters for earthquakes in Romania using joint hypocenter determination Method (JHD). Romanian Reports in Physics, 75(4), 708, WOS:001110490400001, https://doi.org/10.59277/RomRepPhys.2023.75.708
	15. Danciu, L., Giardini, D., Weatherill, G., Basili, R., Nandan, S., Rovida, A., Beauval, C., Bard, P.-Y., Pagani, M., Reyes, C. G., Sesetyan, K., Vilanova, S., Cotton, F., and Wiemer, S. (2024) The 2020 European Seismic Hazard Model: overview and results. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 24(9): 3049–3073, WOS:001310725200001 https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-24-3049-2024
	16. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C. (2024) Effects of the seismic attenuation pattern at the bend of the southeastern Carpathians on the peak ground motions from local crustal earthquakes. Romanian Reports in Physics 76(3), 707, WOS:001280770500010, https://doi.org/10.59277/romrepphys.2024.76.707
	17. Petrescu, L., Enescu, B. (2025) Seismicity of a relic slab: space–time cluster analysis in the Vrancea Seismic Zone. Earth Planets Space 77(1), 6, WOS:001400897000001, https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-025-02136-6
	18. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Grecu, B. (2025) Scalar frequency content parameters of ground motion from Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Romanian Journal of Physics, 70(1-2), 801. WOS:001451894600009. https://doi.org/10.59277/RomJPhys.2025.70.801
	19. Solakov, D., Simeonova, S. & Raykova, P. Ground motion scenarios for Blagoevgrad city (Bulgaria). *Geoenviron Disasters* 13, 7 (2026). WOS:001664855400002. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40677-025-00360-6.
13. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Spatial correlation of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 107(1): 489-494, WOS:000394004900038, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120160095, =10*1.089/2=**5.45** =10*1.128/2=**5.56** =10*5.715/2=**25.13** =10*1.531/2=**7.66**	1. Garakaninezhad, A., Bastami, M., Reza Soghrat, M. (2017) Spatial correlation for horizontal and vertical components of acceleration from northern Iran seismic events. Journal of Seismology, 21(6): 1505-1516, WOS:000415835000013, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-017-9679-8
	2. Garakaninezhad, A., Bastami, M. (2019) Intra-event spatial correlation model for the vertical component of response spectral accelerations. *Journal of Seismology*, 23(4): 853-867, WOS:000475692300013, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-019-09838-x

=10*3.030/2=**15.15** =10*4.2/2=**21** =10*3.8/2=**19** =10*2.6/2=**13** =10*2.1/2=**10.5** =10*1.9/2=**9.5** **10 citări, 135.47 p.**	3. Wu, Q., Wu, J., Gao, M. (2020) Correlation analysis of earthquake impacts on a nuclear power plant cluster in Fujian Province, China. Environmental Research, 187, 109689, WOS:000541251900069, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.109689
	4. Zafarani, H., Mahdi Ghafoori, S.M., Reza Soghrat, M., Shafiee, M. (2020) Spatial correlation of peak ground motions and pseudo-spectral acceleration based on the Sarpol-e-Zahab Mw 7.3, 2017 earthquake data. *Annals of Geophysics,* 63, 4, SE438, WOS:000556576500006, https://doi.org/10.4401/ag-8349
	5. Gibson, E.M., Bensi, M.T. (2021) Spatial correlation in ground motion prediction errors in Central and Eastern North America. Earthquake Spectra 38(1): 543-578, WOS:000751508100022, https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930211034
	6. Mahdi Rahmani-Qeranqayeh, Morteza Bastami, Afshin Fallah, Vahid Majed, Morteza Abbasnejadfard (2024) Rapid earthquake impact prediction using non-ignorable missing data from non-expert observers. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 115,105043, WOS:001403290100001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.105043
	7. Nafeh, A.B., O'Reilly, G.J. (2024) Fragility functions for non-ductile infilled reinforced concrete buildings using next-generation intensity measures based on analytical models and empirical data from past earthquakes. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 22(10), 4983–5021, WOS:001251510200001 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-01955-4
	8. Pan Wen, Baofeng Zhou, Guoliang Shao (2024) A New Spatial Variation Model for Ground-Motion Intensities Combined with Correlation and Coherency. Seismological Research Letters, 95 (4): 2239–2250, WOS:001268340800001, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220230249
	9. Wen, P., Bi, X. (2025) Spatial variation analysis for ground motions based on regional site conditions and separation distance. Journal of Earthquake and Tsunami, https://doi.org/10.1142/S1793431125500034
	10. Zafarani, H., Khalaj, A., Ghafoori, S.M.M. *et al.* Spatial Correlation of Peak Ground Motions (PGA and PGV) and Spectral Accelerations Based on the Iranian Earthquake Data. *Pure Appl. Geophys.* **182**, 2023–2038 (2025). WOS:001462728800001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-025-03713-2
14. Pavel, F., Pricopie, A. (2015) Prediction of engineering demand parameters for RC wall structures. Structural Engineering and Mechanics, 54(4): 741-754, WOS:000356243500008, https://doi.org/10.12989/sem.2015.54.4.741.	1. Qin, Y., Lu, J.-Y., Xi Huang, L.-C., Cao, S. (2017) Flexural behavior of anchor horizontal boundary element in steel plate shear wall. International Journal of Steel Structures, 17(3):

=10*0.609/2=3.05 =10*1.118/2=5.59 =10*2.984/2=14.92 **3 citări, 23.56 p.**	1073-1086, WOS:000410848300017, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13296-017-9017-6
	2. Zhang, H.Z., Liu, X., Yi, W.J., Deng, Y.H. (2018) Performance comparison of shear walls with openings designed using elastic stress and genetic evolutionary structural optimization methods. Structural Engineering and Mechanics, 65(3): 303-314, WOS:000429345900009, https://doi.org/10.12989/sem.2018.65.3.303
	3. Amini, A., Kia, M., Bayat, M. (2021) Seismic vulnerability macrozonation map of SMRFs located in Tehran via reliability framework. Structural Engineering and Mechanics, 78(3): 351-368, WOS:000696898200001, https://doi.org/10.12989/sem.2021.78.3.351
15. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Evaluation of the seismic hazard for 20 cities in Romania using Monte Carlo based simulations. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 16(3): 513-523, WOS:000405296800004, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-017-0400-2 =10*1.899/2=9.50 =10*2.319/2=11.60 =10*1.642/2=8.21 =10*1.642/2=8.21 =10*1.325/2=6.63 =10*1.483/2=7.42 **6 citări, 51.55**	1. Cauzzi, C., Faccioli, E. (2017) Anatomy of sigma of a global predictive model for ground motions and response spectra. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 16(5): 1887-1905, WOS:000430837800009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-017-0278-4
	2. Yaghmaei-Sabegh, S., Ebrahimi-Aghabagher, M. (2019) Quantification of source-to-site distance uncertainty in ground motion models. Natural Hazards, 99(1): 287-306, WOS:000489750300013, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-019-03739-5
	3. Yuen, K.-V., Yang, X.-H. (2020) Bayesian Rayleigh wave inversion with an unknown number of layers. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 19: 875-886, WOS:000581065100005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-020-0601-y
	4. Yang, X.-H., Yuen, K.-V. (2021) All-parameters Rayleigh wave inversion. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 20: 517-534, WOS:000640036400018, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-021-2036-5
	5. Karaca, H. (2021) Generation of synthetic catalog by using Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation and inverse Poisson distribution. Journal of Seismology, 25(4): 1103-1114, WOS:000659792500001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-021-10018-z
	6. Karaca, H. (2021) Seismicity Simulation and a Forecast Model Based on Monte Carlo Simulation Techniques and Performance of Distribution Models. Journal of Earthquake and Tsunami, 15(5), 2150025, WOS:000656613600001, https://doi.org/10.1142/S1793431121500251

16. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Kappa and regional attenuation for Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 19(3): 791-799, WOS:000355694300009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-015-9490-3 =10*1.899/2=9.50 =10*2.146/2=10.73 =10*1.710/2=8.55 =10*4.2/2=21 =10*4.6/2=23 **5 citări, 72.78 p.**	1. Khallas, C., Papazachos, C.B., Boore, D.M., Ventouzi, C., Margaris, B. (2018) Historical intermediate-depth earthquakes in the Southern Aegean Sea Benioff zone: modeling their anomalous macroseismic patterns with stochastic ground-motion simulations. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 16(11): 5121-5150, WOS:000447789600003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-0342-8
	2. Khallas, C., Papazachos, C.B., Margaris, B.N., Boore, D.M., Ventouzi, C., Skarlatoudis, A. (2018) Stochastic Strong Ground Motion Simulation of the Southern Aegean Sea Benioff Zone Intermediate-Depth Earthquakes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 108(2): 946-965, WOS:000429116300025, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120170047
	3. Kumar, S., Kumar, D., Rastogi, B.K., Singh, A.P. (2018) Kappa (κ) model for Kachchh region of Western India. Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk, 9(1): 442-455, WOS:000429987900001, https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2018.1447025
	4. Abhishek, B.S., Himanshu M., Manisha, S. (2025) Investigating the influence of high-frequency spectral decay factor kappa (κ) within Delhi and its surrounding regions, India. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 190 (109174), WOS:001394901800001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2024.109174.
	5. Abhishek, B.S., Himanshu M., Manisha S. (2025)Investigating the influence of high-frequency spectral decay factor kappa (κ) within Delhi and its surrounding regions, India. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 190, 109174, WOS:001394901800001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2024.109174
17. Văcăreanu, R., Iancovici, M., Neagu, C., Pavel, F. (2015) Macroseismic intensity prediction equations for Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Natural Hazards, 79(3): 2005-2031, WOS:000365016300029, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1944-y. =10*0.706/4=1.77 =10*0.917/4=2.29 =10*2.602/4=6.51 =10*1.325/4=3.31 =10*2.427/4=6.07 =10*2.1/4=5.25 =10*4.2/4=10.5 **7 citări, 35.69 p.**	1. Yaghmaei-Sabegh, S. (2018) Macroseismic intensity attenuation in Iran. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 17: 139-148, WOS:000419951600011, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-018-0430-4
	2. Bayrak, M., Nas, M., Bayrak, Y. (2019) New macroseismic intensity predictive models for Turkey. Acta Geophysica, 67(6): 1483-1513, WOS:000509331200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11600-019-00357-4
	3. Nievas, C.I., Bommer, J.J., Crowley, H., Eck, J. (2019) Global occurrence and impact of small-to-medium magnitude earthquakes: a statistical analysis. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18(1): 1-35, WOS:000511757400001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-019-00718-w
	4. Ahmadzadeh, S., Javan Doloei G, Zafarani H (2019) New Intensity Prediction Equation for Iran. Journal of Seismology, 24(1): 23-35, WOS:000493264000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-019-09882-7

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3"></td><td>5. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Ionescu, C. (2020) Empirical relationships between macroseimic intensity and instrumental ground motion parameters for the intermediate-depth earthquakes of Vrancea region, Romania. Natural Hazards, 103(2): 2021-2043, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-020-04070-0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C. (2024) Effects of the seismic attenuation pattern at the bend of the southeastern Carpathians on the peak ground motions from local crustal earthquakes. Romanian Reports in Physics 76(3), 707, WOS:001280770500010, https://doi.org/10.59277/romrepphys.2024.76.707</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. Manea, E. F., Danciu, L., Cioflan, C. O., Toma-Danila, D., and Gerstenberger, M. C. (2025) Testing the 2020 European Seismic Hazard Model (ESHM20) against observations from Romania, Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 25, 1–12, WOS:001387566700001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-25-1-2025</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">18. Nica, G.B., Lupoae, M., Pavel, F., Baciu, C. (2018) Numerical analysis of RC column failure due to blast and collapse scenarios for an irregular RC-framed structure. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 16(9): 1125-1136, WOS:000442657100011, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-017-0265-9.

=10*0.624/4=1.56
=10*0.593/4=1.48
=10*1.298/4=3.25
=10*1.446/4=3.62
=10*0.734/4=1.84
=10*1.465/4=3.66
=10*1.648/4=4.12

7 citări, 19.52 p.</td><td>1. Le, L., Gao, X., Wang, W. (2018) Study on explosion effects of a spherical reticulated shell under internal explosions. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 16(12A): 1713-1724, WOS:000447667800005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-018-0323-y</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Bucur, F., Trana, R., Rotariu, A. (2019) Numerical and Experimental Study on the Locally Blast Loaded Polyurea Coated Steel Plates. Materiale Plastice, 56(3): 492-499, WOS:000487764000005, https://doi.org/10.37358/MP.19.3.5216</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Cui, Y., Song, M., Qu, Z., Sun, S., Zhao, J. (2020) Research on Damage Assessment of Concrete-Filled Steel Tubular Column Subjected to Near-Field Blast Loading. Shock and Vibration, 8883711, WOS:000598343600004, https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8883711</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Tsai, M.-H., Zhuang, W.-B. (2020) An Analytical Approach for the Flexural Robustness of Seismically Designed RC Building Frames Against Progressive Collapse. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 18: 1025-1037. WOS:000537391900002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-020-00528-1</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Sari, A., Sayin, B. (2021) Risk-based explosion hazard analysis and building upgrades in industrial facilities to prevent blast failures. Process Safety Progress, 41(1): 14-24, WOS:000658816000001, , https://doi.org/10.1002/prs.12278</td></tr>
</table>

	6. Naghavi, F., Tavakoli, H.R. (2021) Probabilistic Prediction of Failure in Columns of a Steel Structure Under Progressive Collapse Using Response Surface and Artificial Neural Network Methods. Iranian Journal of Science and Technology, Transactions of Civil Engineering, 46(2): 801-817, WOS:000620409600002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40996-021-00593-z
	7. Nouri, G., Avandari, A.Y., Barmah, J. (2021) Evaluation of RC Beam-Column Retrofitting Methods against Near-Field Blast Loading. Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, 35(2), WOS:000641764400008, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.000156
19. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Assessment of the ground motion levels for the Vrancea (Romania) November 1940 earthquake. Natural Hazards, 78(2): 1469-1480, WOS:000358328000035, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1767-x. =10*2.281/2=11.41 **1 citare, 11.41 p.**	1. Merciu, C., Ianos, I., Merciu, G.L., Jones, R., Pomeroy, G. (2018) Mapping accessibility for earthquake hazard response in the historic urban centre of Bucharest. Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Sciences, 18: 2011-2026, WOS:000439938200001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-2011-2018
20. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C., Iancovici, M., Şercăianu, M. (2014). Investigation of the variability of strong ground motions from Vrancea earthquakes. Natural Hazards, 74(3): 1707-1728, WOS:000345096800022, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-014-1273-6. =10*1.901/5=3.80 **1 citare, 3.80 p.**	1. Merciu, C., Ianos, I., Merciu, G.L., Jones, R., Pomeroy, G. (2018) Mapping accessibility for earthquake hazard response in the historic urban centre of Bucharest. Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Sciences, 18: 2011-2026, WOS:000439938200001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-2011-2018
21. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Crăciun, I., Colibă, V., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Neagu, C. (2018) Risk-targeted maps for Romania. Journal of Seismology, 22(2): 407-417, WOS:000426087700003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-017-9713-x =10*2.303/7=3.29 =10*1.325/7=1.89 =10*2.602/7=3.44 =10*2.637/7=3.77 =10*2.637/7=3.77 =10*3.827/7=5.47 =10*4.25/7=6.07 =10*4.33/7=6.19 =10*4.6/7=6.57 =10*4.6/7=6.57 =10*4/7=5.71 =10*4.5/7=6.43 =10*4/7=5.71 =10*3.9/7=5.57 =10*2.5/7=3.57 =10*2.6/7=3.71 =10*3.8/7=5.43	1. He, Z., An, N., Zhang, Y. (2019). The 50-year expectations of structural residual seismic capacity ratios based on uniform collapse probabilities. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 17(5): 2459-2484, WOS:000463779300008, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-00551-7
	2. Taherian, A.R., Kalantari, A. (2019) Risk-targeted seismic design maps for Iran. Journal of Seismology, 23(6): 1299-1311, WOS:000511489200007, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-019-09867-6
	3. Tsang, H.H., Daniell, J.E., Wenzel, F., Wilson, J.L. (2020) A universal approach for evaluating earthquake safety level based on societal fatality risk. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18: 273-296, WOS:000489438000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-019-00727-9
	4. Zarrineghbal, A., Zafarani, H., Rahimian, M. (2020) Towards an Iranian national risk-targeted model for seismic hazard mapping. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 141, 106495, WOS:000607211800002, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2020.106495

=10*5/7=7.14 =10*4.6/7=6.57 =10*4.5/7=6.43 **20 citări, 103.59 p.**	5. Talebi, M., Zare, M., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E., Reza Soghrat, M., Maleki, V., Esmaeili, S. (2020) Development of risk-targeted seismic hazard maps for the Iranian plateau. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 106506, WOS:000607213900001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2020.106506
	6. Kharazian, A., Molina, S., Galiana-Merino, J.J., Agea-Medina, N. (2021) Risk-targeted hazard maps for Spain. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 19(13): 5369-5389, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-021-01189-8
	7. Talebi, M. et al. (2022) Development of probabilistic seismic hazard microzonation maps at the surface level for central-east Iran (Kerman region), using a hybrid site condition model. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 159, 107354, WOS:000808550300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2022.107354
	8. Horspool N, Hulsey A, Elwood K, Gerstenberger M. (2023) Risk-targeted hazard for seismic design in New Zealand considering individual and societal risk targets. Earthquake Spectra, 39(2): 1007-1036, WOS:000985249100012, https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930231115694
	9. Monti, G., Demartino, C. & Gardoni, P. (2023) Towards risk-targeted seismic hazard models for Europe. Scientific Reports 13(1), 10717, WOS:001023060100014, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-36947-y
	10. Hosseini Varzandeh, S.S., Mahsuli, M. (2023) Probabilistic framework for robust optimal code calibration through minimization of the lifecycle cost and its uncertainty. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 22(4): 1719-1747, WOS:001117711400001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-023-01816-6
	11. Wang, C., Lu, D.-G. (2023) Exploring risk-targeted ground motions and seismic design spectra for mainland China. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 104, 108194, WOS:001070674200001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2023.108194
	12. Clemett, N., Rapps, C., Guendel, M. (2023) Evaluation of typology-specific fragility curves used for risk-targeted seismic demand maps in regions of low seismicity: A German case-study. Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, WOS:000983903200001, https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.3911
	13. Wang, C., Lu, D.-G., Quek, S.T. (2024) Development of risk-targeted hazard maps with second-order hazard approximation for mainland China. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 178, 108489, WOS:001175291600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2024.108489

	14. Morteza K. Mansoori, M., Hosseini, M., Bavandi, M. (2024) Time-dependent risk-targeted seismic design of RC moment-resisting frames under corrosive environment. Structures, 62, 106214, WOS:001220202800001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2024.106214
	15. Zarrineghbal, A., Zafarani, H., Rahimian, M., Jalalalhosseini, S. M., & Khanmohammadi, M. (2024). Risk-Targeted Seismic Design Maps with Aleatory and Epistemic Uncertainty in Tehran and Surrounding Areas. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 28(14), 3925–3953. WOS:001261752000001, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2024.2368179
	16. Cong Wang, Da-Gang Lu (2024) Risk-Targeted Design Spectra for Uniform Risk Seismic Design. Seismological Research Letters, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220230277
	17. Lian, Q., Zhuo, W., Dang, X. et al. (2025) Bridge seismic design method incorporating seismic importance adjustment factor and uniform traffic loss risk. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 23(4): 1797-1827, WOS:001406579100001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-025-02107-y
	18. R.Sandoval and M.Ordaz, "Risk-Targeted Seismic Design Maps for Mexico." Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics55, no. 2 (2026): 336–349. WOS:001611315500001. https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.70089
	19. Zhang, M., Pan, H., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Towards national risk-targeted seismic hazard maps for mainland China. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, *16*(1). WOS:001441702900001. https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2025.2475880.
	20. Karafagka, S. et al. (2026) A risk-based hierarchical framework for seismic upgrading of critical buildings at large scale. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 132, 105972, WOS:001645770600001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2025.105972.
22. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Colibă, V., Crăciun, I. (2017) Risk-targeted seismic design maps for Romania. În: Pavel, F., Radulian, M., Arion, C., Popa, M., Aldea, A. (ed.) Proceedings of the 6th National Conference on Earthquake Engineering and 2nd National Conference on Earthquake Engineering and Seismology, Bucharest, Romania, pp. 453-460, ISSN 2559-3943. =10*2.303/4=5.76 **1 citare, 5.76 p.**	1. He, Z., An, N., Zhang, Y. (2019). The 50-year expectations of structural residual seismic capacity ratios based on uniform collapse probabilities. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 17(5): 2459-2484, WOS:000463779300008, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-00551-7

23. Colibă, V., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Crăciun, I. (2017) Uniform risk-targeted seismic design maps for Romania. În: Pavel, F., Radulian, M., Arion, C., Popa, M., Aldea, A. (ed.) Proceedings of the 6th National Conference on Earthquake Engineering and 2nd National Conference on Earthquake Engineering and Seismology, București, România, pp. 249-256, ISSN 2559-3943. =10*2.303/4=5.76 **1 citare, 5.76 p.**	1. He, Z., An, N., Zhang, Y. (2019). The 50-year expectations of structural residual seismic capacity ratios based on uniform collapse probabilities. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 17(5): 2459-2484, WOS:000463779300008, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-018-00551-7
24. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, Lungu, D. (2014). Bi-normalized response spectra for various frequency content ground motions. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 18(2): 264-289, WOS:000330105000005, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2013.846283.. =10*0.893/3=2.98 =10*0.922/3=3.07 =10*2.077/3=6.92 =10*1.050/3=3.50 =10*2.406/3=8.02 =10*2.602/3=8.67 **6 citări, 33.17 p.**	1. Mortezaei, A., Motaghi, A. (2016) Seismic Assessment of the World's Tallest Pure-Brick Tower Including Soil-Structure Interaction. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 30(5), article no. 04016020, WOS:000384249700014, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0000861 2. Xu, L.J., Yhao, G.C., Chen, Z.B., Xie, L.L. (2016). A probabilistic methodology to determine elastic acceleration response spectra for pulse-type records through multi-resolution analyses. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 20(1): 129-155, WOS:000367899100007, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2015.1045104 3. Zhao, G., Xu, L., Gardoni, P., Xie, L. (2019) A new method of deriving the acceleration and displacement design spectra of pulse-like ground motions based on the wavelet multi-resolution analysis. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 119: 1-10, WOS:000459364300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2019.01.008 4. Adhikary, S., Singh, Y. (2019) Effect of site amplification on inelastic seismic response. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration 18(3): 535-554, WOS:000475638800005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-019-0520-y 5. Lu, Y., Li, B., Xong, F., Dai, K., Lu, Y., Mei, Z. (2019) Bi-normalized Newmark–Hall spectra for seismic design and assessment. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 17(11): 5791-5807, WOS:000498670500001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-019-00712-2 6. Amirchoupani, P., Abdollahzadeh, G., Hamidi, H. (2020) Spectral acceleration matching procedure with respect to normalization approach. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18(11): 5165-5191, WOS:000544844400001, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00897-x
25. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2018) Investigation on regional attenuation of Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Earthquake	1. Wang, H., Ren, Y., Wen, R., Xu, P. (2019) Breakdown of Earthquake Self-Similar Scaling and Source Rupture Directivity in the 2016–2017

Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 17(3): 501-509, WOS:000438472400005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-018-0458-5. =10*3.59/2=17.95 =10*0.924/2=4.62 =10*1.606/2=8.03 =10*3.9/2=19.5 **4 citări, 50.1 p.**	Central Italy Seismic Sequence. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 124(4): 3898-3917, WOS:000468912000036, DOI: 10.1029/2018JB016543, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JB016543
	2. Wang, H., Wen, R. (2020) Earthquake Source Characteristics and S-Wave Propagation Attenuation in the Junction of the Northwest Tarim Basin and Kepingtage Fold-and-Thrust Zone. Frontiers in Earth Sciences, 8, 567939, WOS:000604593200001, https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2020.567939
	3. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Placinta, A.O., Coman, A. (2022) On the seismic wave attenuation at the bend of the Southeastern Carpathians. Journal of Seismology, 27(1): 233-240, WOS:000888674300001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-022-10125-5
	4. Micu, M., Micu, D., Havenith, H.-B. (2023) Earthquake-induced landslide hazard assessment in the Vrancea Seismic Region (Eastern Carpathians, Romania): Constraints and perspectives. Geomorphology, 427, 108635, WOS:000946862400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2023.108635
26. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scaling of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Earthquakes and Structures, 11(3): 505-516., WOS:000384816100007, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2016.11.3.505. =10*1.309/2=6.55 =10*3.03/2=15.15 =10*1.476/2=7.38 **3 citări, 29.08 p.**	1. Behnamfar, F., Velni, M.T. (2019) A rapid screening method for selection and modification of ground motions for time history analysis. *Earthquakes and Structures*, 16(1): 29-39, WOS:000456825100003, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2019.16.1.029
	2. Manea, E.F., Cioflan, C.O., Danciu, L. (2021) Ground-motion models for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Earthquake Spectra, 38(1): 407-431, WOS:000751508100017, https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930211032985
	3. Ertürk, E., Altunişik, A.C., Genç, A.F. (2021) Effect of Ground Motion Scaling Methods on Seismic Response of Masonry Clock Towers. Iranian Journal of Science and Technology Transactions of Civil Engineering. 46(4): 3001-3014, WOS:000721669200003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40996-021-00772-y
27. Pavel, F. (2015). Investigation on the stochastic simulation of strong round motions for Bucharest area. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering 69: 227-232, WOS:000347865500019, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2014.11.008. =10*1.325/1=13.25 =10*2.602/1=26.02 =10*1.586/1=15.86 **3 citări, 55.13 p.**	1. Cotovanu, A., Vacareanu, R. (2019) Local site conditions modeling in stochastic simulation of ground motions generated by Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth seismic source. Journal of Seismology, 24(1): 229-241, WOS:000512025700014, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-019-09892-5
	2. Cotovanu, A., Vacareanu, R. (2020) Modeling energy release parameters in stochastic simulation of ground motions generated by Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 18(6): 2557-2580, WOS:000516255900002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00805-3

	3. Cotovanu, A., Vacareanu, R. (2021) Recommended path durations for stochastic simulations of ground motions generated by Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 178(8): 3039-3055, WOS:000661374700007, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-021-02782-3
28. Pavel, F. (2018) Investigation on the variability of simulated and observed ground motions for Bucharest area. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 22(10): 1737-1757, WOS:000452068300001, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2017.1297266 =10*1.325/1=13.25 =10*2.602/1=26.02 =10*1.586/1=15.86 **3 citări, 55.13 p**	1. Cotovanu, A., Vacareanu, R. (2019) Local site conditions modeling in stochastic simulation of ground motions generated by Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth seismic source. Journal of Seismology, 24(1): 229-241, WOS:000512025700014, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-019-09892-5
	2. Cotovanu, A., Vacareanu, R. (2020) Modeling energy release parameters in stochastic simulation of ground motions generated by Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 18(6): 2557-2580, WOS:000516255900002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00805-3
	3. Cotovanu, A., Vacareanu, R. (2021) Recommended path durations for stochastic simulations of ground motions generated by Vrancea intermediate-depth seismic source. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 178(8): 3039-3055, WOS:000661374700007, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-021-02782-3
29. Pavel, F., Calotescu, I., Stănescu, D., Badiu, A. (2018) Life-cycle and seismic fragility assessment of code-conforming reinforced concrete and steel structures in Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Science, 9(2):263-274, WOS:000435717300010, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-018-0169-6. =10*2.406/4=6.01 =10*0.878/4=2.19 =10*3.847/4=9.62 =10*3.748/4=9.37 =10*7.144/4=17.86 =10*4.1/4=10.05 =10*2.3/4=15.75 **7 citări, 61.81 p.**	1. Ugalde, D., Lopez-Garcia, D., Parra, P (2020) Fragility-based analysis of the influence of effective stiffness of reinforced concrete members in shear wall buildings. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18(5): 2061-2082, WOS:000518844200010, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00786-3
	2. Fatimah, S., Wong, J. (2021) Sensitivity of the Fragility Curve on Type of Analysis Methods, Applied Ground Motions and Their Selection Techniques. International Journal of Steel Structures, 21(4): 1292-1304, WOS:000666827800001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13296-021-00503-z
	3. Özcebe, A.G.; Tiganescu, A.; Ozer, E.; Negulescu, C.; Galiana-Merino, J.J.; Tubaldi, E.; Toma-Danila, D.; Molina, S.; Kharazian, A.; Bozzoni, F.; Borzi, B.; Balan, S.F. Raspberry Shake-Based Rapid Structural Identification of Existing Buildings Subject to Earthquake Ground Motion: The Case Study of Bucharest. Sensors 2022, 22, 4787, WOS:000825611600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/s22134787
	4. Alarcón, C., López, Á., Vielma, J.C. (2023) Performance of Medium-Rise Buildings with Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls Designed for High Seismic Hazard. Materials, 16(5):1859, WOS:000947810800001, https://doi.org/10.3390/ma16051859

	5. Li, H., Zhou, W. (2023) Seismic fragility assessment of multistory precast concrete parking structures. Journal of Building Engineering, 106366, WOS:001054051000001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2023.106366
	6. Ren, Y., Ma, D., Wang, W. (2023) Revised vulnerability analysis of group buildings based on the SPO model of equivalent individual structure. Structures, 57, 105327, WOS:001092215800001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2023.105327.
	7. Ren, Y., Ma, D., Wang, W., Guo, X., Wang, Z., Chen, D., … Zhao, X. (2023). Application of SPO2IDA in Seismic Performance Evaluation of Ancient Timber Structures. International Journal of Architectural Heritage, 18(8), 1308–1322, WOS:000999020700001, https://doi.org/10.1080/15583058.2023.2221215
30. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Ground motion simulations for seismic stations in southern and eastern Romania and seismic hazard assessment. Journal of Seismology, 21(5): 1023-1037, WOS:000407951900001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-017-9649-1 =10*2.427/2=12.14 =10*1.714/2=8.57 =10*2.085/2=10.43 **3 citări, 31.13 p.**	1. Yaghmaei-Sabegh, S. (2020) Frequency-content parameters of the ground motions from the 2017 Mw 7.3 Ezgeleh earthquake in Iran. Natural Hazards, 101(2): 349-365, WOS:000516072000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-020-03876-2
	2. Balan, S.F., Tiganescu, A., Apostol, B.F., Danet, A. (2019) Post-earthquake warning for Vrancea seismic source based on code spectral acceleration exceedance. Earthquakes and Structures, 17(4): 365-372. WOS:000497953700003, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2019.17.4.365
	3. Apostol, B.F., Cioflan, C.O., Mărmureanu, A. (2022). Spectral characteristics of the seismic response from local recordings. Application to urban areas. Romanian Reports in Physics, 74, 708, WOS:000854074700012, http://www.rrp.infim.ro/2022/AN74708.pdf
31. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K., Anastasiadis, A. (2020) Investigation on site-specific seismic response analysis for Bucharest (Romania). Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000518844200004, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00789-0 =10*2.602/4=6.51 = 10*1.446/4=3.62 = 10*2,838/4=7,10 = 10*4/4=10 = 10*1.4/4=3.5 =10*4.2/5=8.4 =10*4.6/5=11.5 **7 citări, 52.72 p.**	1. Deoda, V.R., Adhikary, S. (2020) A preliminary proposal towards the revision of Indian seismic code considering site classification scheme, amplification factors and response spectra. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18(6): 2843-2889, WOS:000516029900001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00806-2
	2. Deoda, V.R., Adhikary, S. (2020) Use of conditional mean spectra for seismic evaluation of RC building considering soil effects. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 18(11A): 1267-1280, WOS:000546190800002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-020-00536-1
	3. Köber, D., Weber, F., Lozincă, E.,Popa, V. (2023) Base Isolation Compared to Capacity Design for Long Corner Periods and Pulse-Type Seismic Records. Applied Sciences 13, 1217, WOS:000914360200001. https://doi.org/10.3390/app13021217
	4. Lo Monaco, A. et al. (2023) Seismic assessment of Romanian Orthodox masonry churches in the Banat area through a multi-level analysis framework. Engineering Failure Analysis, 153,

	107539, WOS:001067708800001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfailanal.2023.107539
	5. Soltani, N., Bagheripour, M.H. (2023) A frequency domain approach to evaluate 2D seismic site response: application to the real case. Acta Geodaetica et Geophysica 58(2), 197–216, WOS:000978045000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40328-023-00411-0
	6. Falak Zahoor, K. Seshagiri Rao, Faizan Ul Haq Mir, Neelima Satyam (2025) Intensity-dependent site amplification factors using non-linear ground response analysis for Greater Srinagar Metropolitan in the deep sedimentary basin of Kashmir, Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 190 (109120), WOS:001386286500001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2024.109120.
	7. Zahoor, F., Rao, K.S., Haq Mir, F.U.L., Satyam, N. (2026) Intensity-dependent site amplification factors using non-linear ground response analysis for Greater Srinagar Metropolitan in the deep sedimentary basin of Kashmir. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 190, 109120. WOS:001386286500001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2024.109120
32. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K. (2019). Intensity-dependent site amplification factors for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 17(5): 2363-2380, WOS:000463779300003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-019-00563-x. =10*2.602/3=8.67 =10*1.446/3=4.82 =10*3.169/3=10.56 =10*3.9/3=13.0 =10*4.956/3=16.52 =10*4.6/3=15.33 **6 citări, 68.91 p.**	1. Deoda, V.R., Adhikary, S. (2020) A preliminary proposal towards the revision of Indian seismic code considering site classification scheme, amplification factors and response spectra. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 18(6): 2843-2889, WOS:000516029900001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00806-2
	2. Deoda, V.R., Adhikary, S. (2020) Use of conditional mean spectra for seismic evaluation of RC building considering soil effects. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 18(11A): 1267-1280, WOS:000546190800002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-020-00536-1
	3. Deoda, V.R., Adhikary, S. (2020) Revision of IS 1893: Proposal for an Alternative Soil Classification Scheme and Associated Intensity-Dependent Spectral Amplification Factors. Natural Hazards Review, 23(2), WOS:000769062200002 https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.00005
	4. Micu, M., Micu, D., Havenith, H.-B. (2023) Earthquake-induced landslide hazard assessment in the Vrancea Seismic Region (Eastern Carpathians, Romania): Constraints and perspectives. Geomorphology, 427, 108635, WOS:000946862400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2023.108635
	5. Borleanu, F., Petrescu, L., Seghedi, I., Thomas, C., De Siena, L. (2023) The seismic attenuation signature of collisional orogens and sedimentary basins within the Carpathian Orogen. Global and Planetary Change, 104093,

	WOS:000962850100001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2023.104093
	6. Alpyürür, M. (2026) Seismic microzonation study on nonlinear site-specific ground response of Burdur soils (SW Türkiye). Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 200(A), 109758, WOS:001568193300003, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2025.109758.
33. Pavel, F. (2017) Next future large earthquake in Romania: a disaster waiting to happen? Seismological Research Letters, 88(1): 1-3, WOS:000390785200001, https://doi.org/10.1785/0220160140 =10*3.102=31.02 =10*3.519=35.19 =10*2.5=25 **3 citări, 91.21 p.**	1. Toma-Danila, D., Armas, I., Tiganescu, A. (2020) Network-risk: an open GIS toolbox for estimating the implications of transportation network damage due to natural hazards, tested for Bucharest, Romania. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, WOS:000537449100001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-20-1421-2020
	2. Cojocaru, C., Cojocaru, P., Barbu, R.M. et al. (2022) Health risks in association with indoor radon exposure in Northeastern Romania. International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology. 20(6): 5937-5944, WOS:000833455600005, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13762-022-04398-z
	3. Ghita, C., Enescu, B., Marinus, A. *et al.* Aftershock analysis and forecasting for the crustal seismicity in Romania. *Earth Planets Space* **77**, 48 (2025). WOS:001463787100001. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-025-02174-0.
34. Neagu, C., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Călărașu, E.A., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F. (2018) Ground types for seismic design in Romania. În: Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - updated overview with emphasis on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 157-172, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_11 =10*3.102/6=6.20 =10*3.9/6=6.50 **2 citări, 12.70 p.**	1. Toma-Danila, D., Armas, I., Tiganescu, A. (2020) Network-risk: an open GIS toolbox for estimating the implications of transportation network damage due to natural hazards, tested for Bucharest, Romania. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, WOS:000537449100001, https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-20-1421-2020
	2. Micu, M., Micu, D., Havenith, H.-B. (2023) Earthquake-induced landslide hazard assessment in the Vrancea Seismic Region (Eastern Carpathians, Romania): Constraints and perspectives. Geomorphology, 427, 108635, WOS:000946862400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2023.108635
35. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Investigation on site conditions for seismic stations in Romania using H/V spectral ratio. Earthquakes and Structures, 9(5): 983-997, WOS:000367909000003, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2015.9.5.983 =10*1.586/2=7.93 =10*1.714/2=8.57 =10*2.018/2=10.09 =10*3.102/2=15.51 =10*4.6/2=23 **5 citări, 65.10 p.**	1. Manea, E.F., Cioflan, C.O., Coman, A., Michel, C., Fäh, D. (2020) Estimating geophysical bedrock depth using single station analysis and geophysical data in the extra-Carpathian area of Romania. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 177(10): 4829-4844, WOS:000550611200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-020-02548-3
	2. Balan, S.F., Tiganescu, A., Apostol, B.F., Danet, A. (2019) Post-earthquake warning for Vrancea seismic source based on code spectral acceleration exceedance. Earthquakes and Structures, 17(4): 365-372. WOS:000497953700003, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2019.17.4.365

	3. Abdialim, S., Hakimov, F., Kim, J., Ku, T., Moon, S.-W. (2021) Seismic site classification from HVSR data using the Rayleigh wave ellipticity inversion: A case study in Singapore. Earthquakes and Structures, 21(3): 231-238, WOS:000705302300002, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2021.21.3.231
	4. Çavdar, Ö. (2022) Seismic performance of a high-rise building by using linear and nonlinear methods. Natural Hazards, 112(2): 1359-1378, WOS:000751576100002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-022-05231-z
	5. Abdialim, S. et al. (2026) Comparative assessment of surface and body wave methods for shear wave velocity profiling in Almaty basin. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 200(A), 109765, WOS:001584501400006, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2025.109765.
36. Văcăreanu, R., Aldea, A., Lungu, D., Pavel, F., Neagu, C., Arion, C., Demetriu, S., Iancovici, M. (2016) Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for Romania. In: D'Amico, S. (ed.) Earthquakes and their impact on modern society. Springer, pp. 137-169, ISBN 978-3-319-21752, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21753-6_5 =10*2.335/8=**2.92** =10*3.9/8=**4.88** **2 citări, 7.79 p.**	1. Ghorbani, A., Eslami, A. (2021) Probabilistic Seismic Hazard and Deaggregation Analysis of Guilan Region, South of Caspian Sea, Iran. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 178(10): 3793-3816, WOS:000706564300001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-021-02873-1 2. Micu, M., Micu, D., Havenith, H.-B. (2023) Earthquake-induced landslide hazard assessment in the Vrancea Seismic Region (Eastern Carpathians, Romania): Constraints and perspectives. Geomorphology, 427, 108635, WOS:000946862400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2023.108635
37. Pavel, F., Carale, G. (2019) Seismic assessment for typical soft-storey reinforced concrete structures in Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 41, 101332, WOS:000504924200040, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101332 =10*1.90/2=9.50 =10*3.324/2=16.62 =10*2.3/2=11.5 **3 citări, 37.62 p.**	1. Yon, B. (2020) Seismic vulnerability assessment of RC buildings according to the 2007 and 2018 Turkish seismic codes. Earthquakes and Structures, 18(6): 709-718, WOS:000548162100004, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2020.18.6.709 2. Xia, Y. et al. (2022) Experimental Study of Frame-Supported Shear Wall Structure of High-Rise Buildings with Transfer Slab in Metro Depot. Buildings, 12(11), 1940, WOS:000884503200001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12111940 3. Kurmi, P.L., Haldar, P. (2024) Comparative study of the code-prescribed design interventions for open ground storey buildings in India. Innovative Infrastructure Solutions, 9(4), 98, WOS:001181447600003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-024-01399-4

38. Pavel, F., Lungu, D. (2012). Frequency content indicators of strong ground motions. Proceedings of the 15th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Lisbon, Portugal. paper no. 2372. =10*2.983/2=**14.92** =10*2.018/2=**10.09** **2 citări, 25.01 p.**	1. Taleshian, H.A., Roshan, A.M., Amiri, J.V. (2022) Seismic pounding mitigation of asymmetric-plan buildings by using viscoelastic links. Structures, 36: 189-214, WOS:000782577500002, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2021.11.036 2. Verki, A.M., Preciado, A. (2022) Nonlinear incremental dynamic analysis and fragility curves of tall steel buildings with buckling restrained braces and tuned mass dampers. Earthquakes and Structures, 22(2), 169-184, WOS:000760233700006, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2022.22.2.169
39. Pavel, F., Nica, G. (2019) Influence of rotating strong ground motions on the response of doubly symmetrical RC wall structures in Romania and its implication on code provisions. International Journal of Civil Engineering, 17(7): 969-979, WOS:000470334300002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-018-0346-4. =10*2.679/2=13.40 =10*4.430/2=22.15 =10*3.711/2=18.56 =10*3.1/2=15.5 **4 citări, 69.60 p.**	1. Morfidis, K., Kostinakis, K. (2021) Rapid Prediction of Seismic Incident Angle's Influence on the Damage Level of RC Buildings Using Artificial Neural Networks. Applied Sciences, 12(3), 1055. WOS:000759024700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app12031055 2. Naskar, S., Das, S. (2021) Bi-directional ground motions: Stochastic simulation and frequency-dependent modal combination rule. Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics, 50(14), 3872-3893. WOS:000686585000001, https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.3537 3. Es-Haghi, M., Sadegh Barkhordari, M., Hunag, Z., Ye, J. (2022) Multicriteria Decision-Making Methods in Selecting Seismic Upgrading Strategy of High-Rise RC Wall Buildings. Journal of Structural Engineering, 148(4), 04022015, WOS:000756668600021, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.000330 4. Cantagallo, C.; Terrenzi, M.; Camata, G.; Spacone, E. (2024) Historical Evolution of the Impact of Seismic Incident Angles on the Safety Assessment of Various Building Construction Typologies. Buildings, 14(6), 1490, WOS:001254442300001 https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14061490
40. Nica, G.B., Pavel, F. (2016). Numerical analysis on the collapse of a RC frame. Mathematical Modelling in Civil Engineering, 12(4): 22 – 35, https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2016/2016.issue4.paper_03.pdf. =10*0.599/2=3.00 **1 citare, 3.0 p.**	1. Čokić, M., Folić, R. (2021) Fragility and robustness analysis of a multistorey RC building. Građevinar, 73(1), 27-44, WOS:000629004600003, https://doi.org/10.14256/JCE.3036.2020
41. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Calotescu, I, Săndulescu, A.M. (2018) Assessment of seismic risk scenarios for Bucharest, Romania. Natural Hazards, 93(S1): 25-37, WOS:000444462100003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-2991-3	1. Toma-Danilă, D., Tiganescu, A., D'Ayala, D., Armas, I., Sun, L. (2022) Time-Dependent Framework for Analyzing Emergency Intervention Travel Times and Risk Implications due to Earthquakes. Bucharest Case Study. Frontiers in Earth Sciences, 10, 834052, WOS:000761426700001, https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2022.834052

=10*3.498/4=8.75 =10*2.7/4=6.75 =10*2.7/4=6.75 **3 citări, 22.25 p.**	2. Ansari, A., Rao, K.S., Jain, A.K. (2023) Seismic Microzonation of the Himalayan Region Considering Site Characterization: Application toward Seismic Risk Assessment for Sustainable Tunneling Projects. Natural Hazards Review, 25(1), WOS:001126397200001, https://doi.org/10.1061/NHREFO.NHENG-1815
	3. Paunescu, M.; Luca, O.; Stanescu, A.A.; Gaman, F. (2025) Digital Mapping and Resilience Indicators, as Pillars of Bucharest's Seismic Resilience Strategy. Infrastructures 10(2), 39, WOS:001430120700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures10020039
42. Pavel, F., Popa, V., Văcăreanu, R. (2018). Impact of long-period ground motions on structural design: a case study for Bucharest, Romania. Springer International Publishing, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73402-6, ISBN 978-3-319-73401-9 =10*2.679/3=8.93 =10*3.9/3=13.0 **2 citări, 21.93 p.**	1. Munteanu, R., Moța, F., Calofir, V., Baciu, C: (2022) New Approach to Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis of Reinforced Concrete 3D Frames; An Accurate and Computational Efficient Mathematical Model. Applied Sciences, 12(3), 1692, WOS:000755602000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app12031692
	2. Micu, M., Micu, D., Havenith, H.-B. (2023) Earthquake-induced landslide hazard assessment in the Vrancea Seismic Region (Eastern Carpathians, Romania): Constraints and perspectives. Geomorphology, 427, 108635, WOS:000946862400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2023.108635
43. Pavel, F. (2021) Analysis of pulse-like ground motion recordings from Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 25: 733-745, WOS:000617403200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-021-09988-x =10*4.25/1=42.50 =10*1.606/1=16.06 =10*7.5/1=75 =10*2.7/1=27 **4 citări, 160.56 p.**	1. Tang, Y,, Wu, C., Wang, J. (2022) A hybrid characterization framework for structure-significant pulse-like features in ground motions. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 160, 107325, WOS:000808542300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2022.107325
	2. Ghanbari, B., Fathi, M. (2022) Extraction of velocity pulses of pulse-like ground motions using empirical Fourier decomposition. Journal of Seismology, 26, 967–986, WOS:000863196300001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-022-10106-8
	3. Gokhan, Ozkaya, S. et al. (2023) Most complicated lock pattern-based seismological signal framework for automated earthquake detection. International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 118, 103297, WOS:000985112300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2023.103297
	4. Craifaleanu I-G (2025) An in-depth investigation of ground jerk characteristics for the four strongest Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes in the past half-century. Front. Built Environ. 11:1569201. WOS:001474152900001. DOI : 10.3389/fbuil.2025.1569201
44. Iancovici, M., Ionică, G., Pavel, F., Moța, F., Nica, G. (2022) Nonlinear dynamic response analysis of buildings for wind loads. A new frontier in the structural wind engineering. Journal of Building Engineering, 47, 103708,	1. Fitas, R., Das Neves Carneiro, G., Conceicao Antonio, C. (2022) An elitist multi-objective particle swarm optimization algorithm for composite structures design. Composite Structures, 300, 116158, WOS:000877376900007, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruct.2022.116158

WOS:000770575700001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2021.103708 =10*6.603/5=13.21 =10*5.881/5=11.76 =10*7.144/5=14.29 =10*2.7/5=5.4 =10*4.7/5=9.4 =10*6.8/5=13.6 =10*3/5=6 =10*3.1/5=6.2 =10*4.3/5=8.6 =10*3.7/5=8.6 =10*1.8/5=3.6 =10*4.4/5=8.8 =10*6.5/5=13 =10*6.7/5=13.4 =10*3.1/5=6.2 =10*3.1/5=6.2 =10*6.8/5=13.6 =10*4.3/5=8.6 =10*6.6/5=13.2 =10*6.4/5=12.8 **20 citări. 192.426 p.**	2. Li, X., Wang, Y., Chu, Q., Xue, S., He, Y. (2022) Wind-induced response monitoring of large-span air-supported membrane structure coal-shed under the influence of typhoons. Thin-Walled Structures, 181, 109951, WOS:000848400500002 ,https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2022.109951.
	3. Abdelwahab, M., Ghazal, T., Nadeem, K., Aboshosha, H., Elshaer, A. (2023) Performance-based wind design for tall buildings: Review and comparative study, Journal of Building Engineering, 106103, WOS:001041770600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2023.106103.
	4. Aly, A.M. (2023) Breaking Boundaries in Wind Engineering: LSU WISE Open-Jet Facility Revolutionizes Solar Panel and Building Design. Applied Sciences, 13(23), 12546, WOS:001116232700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app132312546
	5. Peng, Y., Sun, P. (2024) Reliability-based design optimization of tuned mass-damper-inerter for mitigating structural vibration. Journal of Sound and Vibration, 572, 118166, WOS:001122387500001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2023.118166
	6. Munteanu, R.I., Enache, R., Baciu, C., Calofir, V. (2023) A new perspective into torsional inelastic response of actively controlled irregular multistorey buildings. Alexandria Engineering Journal, 71, 691-706, WOS:000979770600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2023.03.094
	7. Liu, J., Zheng, S., Li, T., Sun, Q. (2024) Experimental Study on the Damping Performance of High-Strength Concrete Columns with Different Section Sizes. International Journal of Structural Stability and Dynamics 24(14), 2450155, WOS:001089695200001, https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219455424501554
	8. Conceição, R.S.; Evangelista Junior, F. (2024) Wind-Induced Dynamic Critical Response in Buildings Using Machine Learning Techniques. Buildings, 14(10), 3286, WOS:001343286600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14103286
	9. Yongbo Peng, Peifang Sun (2024) Reliability-based design optimization of tuned mass-damper-inerter for mitigating structural vibration. Journal of Sound and Vibration, Volume 572,118166, WOS:001122387500001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsv.2023.118166
	10. Alinejad, H., Ahn, B., Kang, T.K. (2024) Performance-Based Wind Design of Tall Buildings Considering Corner Modification and Inelastic Behavior. Journal of Structural Engineering. 150(7), WOS:001223160300017, https://doi.org/10.1061/JSENDH.STENG-1310
	11. Patlán, C.M., Hernández-Barrios, H., Gomez, R. (2025) Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis Using the

	Force Analogy Method and the Ibarra–Medina–Krawinkler Model. The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings, 34(1), WOS:001354197000001, https://doi.org/10.1002/tal.2197
	12. Patlán,, H., Hugo, H.B., Huergo, I., Mota,F.D. (2025) Time integration scheme for nonlinear structural dynamics, FAM, including structural vibration control. Computers & Structures, 308, 107645, WOS:001405712700001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruc.2025.107645
	13. Parichatprecha, R., Rodsin, K., Suthasupradit, S., Mehmood, T., Nawaz, A. (2025) Collapse prevention of pre-stressed electric transmission poles using glass fiber reinforced polymers. Case Studies in Construction Materials, 22, e04110, WOS:001388748800001 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cscm.2024.e04110.
	14. Hamidreza, A., Ahn, B., Jeong, S.Y., Kang, T.H.K. (2025) Experimental and incremental dynamic analysis on the efficiency effects of aerodynamic modification and inelastic wind design, Journal of Building Engineering, 100, 111781, WOS:001397475700001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2025.111781
	15. Patlán Manjarrez, C.M.; Hernández Barrios, H.; Pérez Rodríguez, D. (2025) The Reduction of Embodied Carbon in Steel Structures Through the Implementation of Control Systems. Buildings 15(3), 482. WOS:001419291000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15030482
	16. Hernández Barrios, H.; Patlán Manjarrez, C.M.; Gómez Martínez, R. (2025) The Passive Control of Nonlinear Dynamic Response Using the Force Analogy Method in a Chimney Located in a Wind- and Seismic-Prone Region in Mexico. Buildings, 15(3), 459, WOS:001419374700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15030459
	17. Calofir, V. et al. (2025) Machine learning-based estimation of seismic structural damage via an accessible web application. Alexandria Engineering Journal, 127: 848-862. WOS:001529584500002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2025.06.056
	18. Calvi, P.M. et al. (2026) Implementation of active mass damping for wind-induced vibration mitigation: The Genoa Control Tower. Structures, 83, 110871, WOS:001640463600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2025.110871.
	19. Alanani, M., Allam, M., Elshaer, A. (2026) Data-driven machine learning surrogate models for estimating the wind response of tall buildings. Applied Soft Computing, 191, 114638, WOS:001675335300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2026.114638.
	20. Bilabari, M. et al. (2026) Nonlinear dynamic wind response of tall reinforced concrete shear-wall buildings: A practical modeling approach. Engineerign Structures, 357, 122560, WOS:

	001728401600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2026.122560.
45. Yaghmaei-Sabegh, S., Pavel, F., Shahvar, M., Qadri Talha, S.M. (2022) Empirical frequency content models based on intermediate-depth earthquake ground-motions. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 155, 107173, WOS:000780364400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2022.107173. =10*3.889/4=9.73 =10*4.25/4=10.63 =10*4/4=10 =10*2.5/4=6.25 =10*1.9/4=4.75 **5 citări, 41.35 p.**	1. Lemenkova, P.; Debeir, O. (2022) Seismotectonics of Shallow-Focus Earthquakes in Venezuela with Links to Gravity Anomalies and Geologic Heterogeneity Mapped by a GMT Scripting Language. Sustainability, 14(23), 15966, WOS:000896088900001 https://doi.org/10.3390/su142315966 2. Tan, J., Hu, J. (2022) Offshore ground motion characteristics on the horizontal PGA, spectral acceleration, frequency content and significant duration from the 2021 Mw 7.1 and 2022 Mw 7.4 offshore earthquakes near the Japan Trench area. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 164, 107646, WOS:000900250500004, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2022.107646 3. Ramos-Cruz, J.M., Ruiz-Garcia, J. (2024) Mean period prediction models for Mexican interplate and intermediate-depth intraslab earthquake ground motions. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 178, 108448, WOS:001164132500001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2023.108448 4. Hu, J., Cui, X., & Tan, J. (2024). Empirical Frequency Content Models for Offshore Ground Motions in the Japan Trench Area. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 28(9), 2464–2489, WOS:001162157500001, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2024.2317340 5. Ardeleanu, L., Neagoe, C., Grecu, B. (2025) Scalar frequency content parameters of ground motion from Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Romanian Journal of Physics, 70(1-2), 801. WOS:001451894600009. https://doi.org/10.59277/RomJPhys.2025.70.801
46. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Marcu, D. (2021) Seismic performance assessment and rating for a flat-slab RC core wall structure in Bucharest, Romania. Structures, 31: 1006-1016, WOS:000640710800005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2021.02.036 =10*3.324/3=11.08 =10*4.01/3=13.37 =10*2,1/3=7 **3 citări, 31.45 p.**	1. Zhao, X.-Y.; Fang, X.-D.; Wang, F.; Zhou, J. Shaking Table Tests of a Novel Flat Slab-Flanged Wall (FSFW) Coupled System with Embedded Concrete-Filled-Steel-Tubes in Wall Piers. Buildings 2022, 12(9), 1441 WOS:000858154900001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12091441 2. Lei, X., Komarizadehasl, S., Sun, L. (2022) Condition level deteriorations modeling of RC beam bridges with U-Net convolutional neural networks. Structures, 43, 333-342, WOS:000814379300002, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2022.06.013 3. Xu, B. et al. (2025) The Construction Techniques and Seismic Performance of Old Dwellings Retrofitted with an Additional Elevator Shaft: A Comprehensive Review. Journal of Structural Design and Construction Practice, 31(1), WOS:001714096600005, https://doi.org/10.1061/JSDCCC.SCENG-1827
47. Seismic risk assessment for elements of the electric network in Romania. Buildings, 12(2),	1. Li, S.; Cheng, Y.; Lu, Z.; Lam, N.; Xue, Y.; Wang, H. (2022) Full-Scale Testing on Seismic Performance of Surge Arrester with Retrofitted

244, WOS:000774830600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12020244. =10*3.324/2=16.62 =10*3.3/2=16.5 =10*2.5/2=12.5 =10*2.0/2=10 =10*11/2=55 **5 citări, 110.62 p.**	Composite Insulators. Buildings, 12, 1720. WOS:000872702300001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12101720
	2. Huang, Z.; Deng, X.; Lei, C.; Cheng, Y.; Zhang, C.; Sun, Q. (2024) Probabilistic Seismic Risk Assessment of Metro Tunnels in Soft Soils. Sustainability 16(18), 8218, WOS:001323013500001, https://doi.org/10.3390/su16188218
	3. Lifshitz Sherzer, G.; Urlainis, A.; Moyal, S.; Shohet, I.M. Seismic Resilience in Critical Infrastructures: A Power Station Preparedness Case Study. *Appl. Sci.* **2024**, *14*, 3835. WOS:001219875300001https://doi.org/10.3390/app14093835.
	4. Camayang, J.P.; Dela Cruz, O.; Grutas, R. Integrating Building- and Site-Specific and Generic Fragility Curves into Seismic Risk Assessment: A PRISMA-Based Analysis of Methodologies and Applications. *CivilEng* **2024**, *5*, 1011-1041. WOS:001383782100001https://doi.org/10.3390/civileng5040050
	5. Liang, H., Moya, B., Chinesta, F., Chatzi, E. (2026) A multi-model probabilistic framework for seismic risk assessment and retrofit planning of electric power networks. Reliability Engineering & System Safety, 268, 112001, WOS:001630539600003, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2025.112001
48. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Scupin, A. (2021) Seismic risk assessment of lifelines in Bucharest. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 66, 102629, WOS:000711060300010, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102629 =10*3.9/5=7.8 =10*3.9/5=7.8 =10*4.2/5=8.4 =10*4.5/5=9 =10*3.3/5=6.6 =10*4.2/5=8.4 =10*5/5=10 =10*1.7/5=3.4 =10*2.8/5=5.6 **9 citări, 63.0 p.**	1. Micu, M., Micu, D., Havenith, H.-B. (2023) Earthquake-induced landslide hazard assessment in the Vrancea Seismic Region (Eastern Carpathians, Romania): Constraints and perspectives. Geomorphology, 427, 108635, WOS:000946862400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2023.108635
	2. Liu, X., Xie, Q., Zhu, W. (2024) Rapid assessment of substation earthquake risk based on minimal cut sets, Electric Power Systems Research, 229, 110175, WOS:001170897400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsr.2024.110175
	3. Rui Xiao, Tarek Zayed, Mohamed A. Meguid, Laxmi Sushama (2024). Dynamic risk assessment of natural gas transmission pipelines with LSTM networks and historical failure data. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, Volume 112, 104771, WOS:001301594700001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.104771
	4. Wu, M., Liu, R., Zhang, Z., Liu, J., & Yu, T. (2024). Seismic vulnerability evaluation of power grids in mainland China. Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk, 15(1),2436541, WOS:001375767600001, https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2024.2436541
	5. Xiao Liu, Qiang Xie, Wang Zhu (2024) Rapid assessment of substation earthquake risk based on minimal cut sets. Electric Power Systems Research, Volume 229, 110175,

	WOS:001170897400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsr.2024.110175.
	6. Hosseinpour, V., Saeidi, A., Nastev, M., Marie-Nollet, M.J. (2025) Development of a damage simulator for probabilistic seismic vulnerability assessment of electrical installations, International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, Volume 116, 105133, WOS:001400243300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.105133
	7. Ide, K., Kobayashi, R., Tanaka, T., Hirabayashi, Y. (2025) Modeling post-earthquake water recovery periods and application to central Tokyo. Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies, 59, 102417. WOS:001484536400001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2025.102417.
	8. Xu, T., Wang, Y., Qin, G., Qin, J. (2025) Probabilistic Performance Evaluation of Buried Onshore and Offshore Pipelines Subjected to Earthquakes: Perspectives on Uncertainties. ournal of Pipeline Systems Engineering and Practice, 16(3). WOS:001509489400006. https://doi.org/10.1061/JPSEA2.PSENG-1880
	9. Karabulut, A.İ., Yeşilnacar, M.İ. Investigation of asbestos-related environmental risks using GIS and remote sensing in Southeastern Anatolia, Türkiye. *Environ Earth Sci* **84**, 497 (2025). WOS:001554057200001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-025-12489-6.
49. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Pitilakis, K. (2022) Preliminary Evaluation of the Impact of Eurocode 8 Draft Revision on the Seismic Zonation of Romania. Applied Sciences, 12(2), 649, WOS:000758452400001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app12020649 =10*4/3=13.33 **1 citare, 13.33 p.**	1. Lo Monaco, A. et al. (2023) Seismic assessment of Romanian Orthodox masonry churches in the Banat area through a multi-level analysis framework. Engineering Failure Analysis, 153, 107539, WOS:001067708800001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engfailanal.2023.107539
50. Pavel, F. (2023) Seismic Design Codes—Key Elements for Seismic Risk Perception and Reduction in Europe. Buildings, 13(1), 158, WOS:000914288200001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13010158. =10*3.8/1=38 =10*3.1/1=31 **2 citări, 69 p.**	1. Hussain, H., Kim, D.-K. (2023) Advancements and Future Prospects of Buckling Restrained Braces for Corrosive-Environments: A Comprehensive Literature Review. Buildings, 13(9), 2156, WOS:001073270600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13092156 2. Amro, S.O.A.; Naimi, S. Symmetry-Based Structural Optimization of 50 Dutch Buildings: Quantitative Framework for Material and Carbon Reduction. *Buildings* **2025**, *15*, 3962. WOS:001612756400001. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15213962.
51. Nica, G., Pavel, F., Hojda, G. (2023) A fast nonlinear dynamic analysis automated approach to produce fragility curves for 3D RC frames. Engineering Structures, 281, 115695, WOS:000946886300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2023.115695.	1. Munteanu, R.I., Enache, R., Baciu, C., Calofir, V. (2023) A new perspective into torsional inelastic response of actively controlled irregular multistorey buildings. Alexandria Engineering Journal, 71, 691-706, WOS:000979770600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2023.03.094 2. Ma, S., Tan, S., Pan, Y., Gu, Y. (2024) Experimental study on fiber-reinforced ceramsite

=10*6.8/3=22.67 =10*4.1/3=13.67 =10*2.4/3=8 =10*6/3=20 =10*3.9/3=13 =10*3.1/3=10.33 =10*4.5/3=15 =10*6.8/3=22.67 =10*7.4/3=24.67 =10*7.4/3=24.67 =10*1.4/3=4.67 =10*2.7/3=9 **11 citări, 163.67 p.**	concrete composite wall panel and correction of seismic damage model. Structures, 59, 105805, WOS:001165349400001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2023.105805
	3. Zain, Muhammad, Prasittisopin, Lapyote, Mehmood, Tahir, Ngamkhanong, Chayut, Keawsawasvong, Suraparb and Thongchom, Chanachai (2024). A novel framework for effective structural vulnerability assessment of tubular structures using machine learning algorithms (GA and ANN) for hybrid simulations. Nonlinear Engineering, 13(1), 20220365. WOS:001159526100001, https://doi.org/10.1515/nleng-2022-0365
	4. Calofir, V., Munteanu, R.-I., Simoiu, M.-S., Lemnaru, K.-C. (2024) Innovative approach to estimate structural damage using linear regression and K-nearest neighbors machine learning algorithms. Results in Engineering, Volume 22, 102250, WOS:001300897200001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.102250
	5. Keyvan Jafari, Hamed Hamidi, Reza Soleimani (2024) A new global damage index for steel moment resisting frames based on two steps pushover analyses, Structures, 62,106212, WOS:001219307600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2024.106212
	6. Munteanu, R.I.; Calofir, V.; Lemnaru, K.-C.; Ponta, C. Advanced Investigation into Active Control Force Requirements for Seismic Damage Mitigation of Inelastic Structures. *Buildings* **2025**, *15*, 1402. WOS:001486530700001. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15091402.
	7. Ulza, A., Idris, Y., Ramadhan, M.A., Syamsidik, Amalia, Z. (2025)Automated Seismic Fragility and Vulnerability Assessment for Buildings (ASFRAVA-B): Integrating probabilistic seismic design into performance-based engineering practices. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 127, 105679. WOS:001526790600001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2025.105679.
	8. Calofir, V. et al. (2025) Machine learning-based estimation of seismic structural damage via an accessible web application. Alexandria Engineering Journal, 127: 848-862. WOS:001529584500002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2025.06.056
	9. Dadashi, R., Nasseradi, K., Ahmadi, J., Tafakori, E. (2025) A novel probabilistic approach for efficient estimation of 3D structures' fragility curves utilizing 2D fragility. Journal of Building Engineering, 114, 114444, WOS:001608942700008, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2025.114444.
	10. Kaveh, A., Ilchi Ghazaan, M., Mohammadi, A. "Seismic Response Prediction of 3D Reinforcement Concrete Frames Using Machine Learning Methods", Periodica Polytechnica

	Civil Engineering, 2026. WOS:001679143800001. https://doi.org/10.3311/PPci.42282.
	11. Mokhtar, M., Du, K., & Luo, H. (2026). A Damage-Dependent Hysteresis Model with Dynamic Pinching for Efficient and Accurate Simulation of RC Beam-Column Joint Shear. *Journal of Earthquake Engineering*, 1–38. WOS:001711870000001. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2026.2640426.
52. Pavel, F., Vacareanu, R. (2023) Review of methodologies for displacement checks in modern seismic design codes. Buildings, 13(4), 940, WOS:000977767800001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13040940. =10*3.8/2=19 **1 citare, 19 p.**	1. Judd, J., Niedens, J. (2023) Peak Inelastic Displacement of Bilinear Systems in Support of Performance-Based Wind Design. Buildings, 13(7), 1766, WOS:001035112000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13071766
53. Pavel, F. (2021) Variability of ground motion amplitudes recorded in Bucharest area during Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Shock and Vibration, 5189966. WOS:000719676800001, https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5189966. =10*1.4/1=14 =10*2.5/1=25 **2 citări, 39 p.**	1. Bala, A., Toma-Danila, D., Ciugudean-Toma, V. (2023) 3D geological model and geotechnical data for Bucharest: necessary input for assessing local seismic hazard of a densely populated area. Acta Geod Geophys 58(2), 175–196, WOS:000999728600001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40328-023-00412-z
	2. Rosca, C.-M.; Stancu, A. (2024) Earthquake Prediction and Alert System Using IoT Infrastructure and Cloud-Based Environmental Data Analysis. Applied Sciences, 14(22), 10169, WOS:001366831400001, https://doi.org/10.3390/app142210169
54. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Scupin, A. (2021) Seismic fragility assessment for post-1977 high-rise reinforced concrete structures in Romania. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 19:6521-6544, WOS:000593890900001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-01014-8 =10*4.1/3=13.67 =10*4/3=13.33 =10*3.6/3=12 **3 citări, 39 p.**	1. Yaghoubi, E., Emami, A.R., Birzhandi, M.S. (2023) Seismic reliability analysis of plan-asymmetric reinforced concrete buildings with dual special frame-wall lateral force-resisting system. Structures, 56, 104999, WOS:001069780200001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2023.104999
	2. Massumi, A., Sadeghi, K., Ghojoghi, O., Soureshjani, O.K. (2024) Effect of aftershock characteristics on the fragility curve of post-mainshock RC frames. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 178, 108451, WOS:001164403100001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2024.108451
	3. Yaghoubi, E., Emami, A.R., Birzhandi, M.S. (2023) IDA-Based Collapse Safety Assessment of Torsional-Irregular Buildings, Considering Ductility and Damage, International Journal of Structural Stability and Dynamics, 23(20), 2350200, WOS:001022859800006, https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219455423502000.
55. Pavel, F. (2021) Seismic risk assessment of on-ground circular reinforced concrete and prestressed concrete water tanks using stochastic ground motion simulations. Bulletin of Earthquake	1. Khosravi, S., Goudarzi, M.A. (2023) Seismic risk assessment of on-ground concrete cylindrical water tanks. Innovative Infrastructure Solution. 8(1), 68, WOS:000912391500001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-022-01002-8

Engineering, 19: 161-178, WOS:000580936000002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-020-00982-1 =10*2.3/1=23 =10*2.6/1=26 =10*4.6/1=46 **3 citări, 95 p.**	2. Barik, J.R., Biswal, K.C. (2024) Seismic evaluation of frequency influence and resonant behavior for lead rubber bearing isolated rigid rectangular liquid tanks. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration 23, 973–994, WOS:001327794000004, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-024-2283-3 3. K. Volikos, Konstandakopoulou, F., Asteris, P., Hatzigeorgiou, G. (2025) Recent advancements in seismic analysis and design of liquid storage tanks. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 198, 109309, WOS:001509826900001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2025.109309.
56. Pavel, F., Pricopie, A., Nica, G. (2019). Collapse assessment for a RC frame structure in Bucharest (Romania). International Journal of Civil Engineering, 17: 1373-1381, WOS:000477013900003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-019-00398-2 =10*2/3=6.67 **1 citare, 6.67 p.**	1. Hakamian, I., Manouchehri, N., Mahdi Memarpour, M. (2023) Soil-structure interaction effects on collapse probability of the RC buildings subjected to far and near-field ground motions. Earthquakes and Structures, 25(2), 99-112, WOS:001066586100003, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2023.25.2.099
57. Văcăreanu, R., Lungu, D., Mărmureanu, G., Cioflan, C., Aldea, A., Arion, C., Neagu, C., Demetriu, S., Pavel, F. (2013). Statistics of seismicity for Vrancea subcrustal source. Proceedings of the International Conference on Earthquake Engineering SE-50 EEE, Skopje, Macedonia, paper no. 138, https://infp.infp.ro/bigsees/New/Docs/Statistics%20of%20seismicity%20for%20Vrancea%20subcrustal%20seismic%20source.pdf =10*4.5/9=5 =10*4.2/9=5 **2 citări, 9.67 p.**	1. Albulescu, A.C., Grozavu, A., Larion, D., Burghiu, G. (2022) Assessing the earthquake systemic vulnerability of the urban centres in the South-East region of Romania. The tale of Galați and Brăila Cities, Romania. Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk, 13(1), 1106-1133, WOS:000784007700001, https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2022.2065219 2. Albulescu, A.-C.(2023) Open Source Data-Based Solutions for Identifying Patterns of Urban Earthquake Systemic Vulnerability in High-Seismicity Areas. Remote Sens. 15(5), 1453, WOS:000948643500001, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15051453
58. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Cioflan, C.O. (2015) Investigation on directional effects of Vrancea subcrustal earthquakes. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 14(3): 399-410, WOS:000360861700002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-015-0032-3 =10*3.1/4=7.75 **1 citare, 7.75 p.**	1. Bratu, P.; Dragomir, C.-S.; Dobre, D. (2024) Assessment of the Compound Damping of a System with Parallelly Coupled Anti-Seismic Devices. Buildings 14,(8) 2422, WOS:001305488900001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14082422
59. Olteanu, P., Colibă, V., Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Ciuiu, D. (2016) Analytical seismic fragility functions for dual RC structures in Bucharest. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 463-479	1. Nafeh, A.B., O'Reilly, G.J. (2024) Fragility functions for non-ductile infilled reinforced concrete buildings using next-generation intensity measures based on analytical models and empirical data from past earthquakes. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 22(10),

WOS:000389508200033, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_33 =10*3.8/5=7.6 **1 citare, 7.6 p.**	4983–5021, WOS:001251510200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-024-01955-4
60. Pavel, F., Duțu, A., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2022) Seismic loss estimation using experimental fragility and vulnerability functions: case study of Buzau county, Romania. Natural Hazards Review, 23(1), WOS:000730390300006, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000521 =10*2.6/3= 8.67 **1 citare, 8.67 p.**	1. Li, S. Q., Liu, H. B., Farsangi, E. N., & Du, K. (2023). Seismic fragility estimation considering field inspection of reinforced concrete girder bridges. Structure and Infrastructure Engineering, 21(2), 302–318, WOS:000982902800001, https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2023.2208565
61. Pavel, F. (2024) An updated perspective of the impact of the 1940 Vrancea earthquake on design and construction practices in Romania. Buildings, 14(4), 1152, WOS:001210546400001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14041152 =10*3.1/1= 31 **1 citare, 31.0 p.**	1. Bratu, P.; Dragomir, C.-S.; Dobre, D. (2024) Assessment of the Compound Damping of a System with Parallelly Coupled Anti-Seismic Devices. Buildings 14,(8) 2422, WOS:001305488900001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14082422
62. Pavel, F., Vladut, R. (2023) Assessment of liquefaction hazard for sites in Romania using empirical models. Infrastructures, 8(9), 133, OS:001078448000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/infrastructures8090133. 10*3.7/2= 18.5 **1 citare, 18.5 p.**	1. Liu, Q., Zhao, Q., Lan, Q. et al. (2024) Regional dynamic hazard assessment of rainfall–induced landslide guided by geographic similarity. Bull Eng Geol Environ 83(12), 501, WOS:001361582600002 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10064-024-04001-4
63. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2020) Re-assessment of peak ground accelerations for large magnitude Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 24: 1271-1280, WOS:000567786300001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-020-09955-y. 10*2.7/2= 13.5 10*4.0/2= 20 **2 citări, 33.5 p.**	1. Petrescu, L., Popa, M., Radulian, M. (2023). Shallow seismic structure around the Vrancea Seismic Zone from joint inversion of ambient noise H/V ratios and surface wave dispersion. Tectonophysics, 859, 229897, WOS:001002033300001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2023.229897 2. Li, M. et al. (2025) Response of carbonate rock weathering carbon sink to seismic peak ground acceleration in China. Global and Planetary Change, 246, 104729, WOS:001423336700001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2025.104729
64. Pavel, F. (2018). Collapse assessment for code-conforming reinforced concrete frame structures in Romania. Frontiers in Built Environment Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000559226800001, https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2018.00050.	1. Mohsen Zaker Esteghamati, Madeleine M. Flint, Do all roads lead to Rome? A comparison of knowledge-based, data-driven, and physics-based surrogate models for performance-based early design, Engineering Structures,

10*5.6/1= 56 **1 citare, 56.0 p.**	286,116098, WOS:000984493000001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2023.116098.
65. Calotescu, I., Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2018) Earthquake risk awareness in Bucharest, Romania: public survey. În: Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.) Seismic Hazard and Risk Assessment - updated overview with emphasis on Romania, Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 297-311, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74724-8_20 10*3.2/3= 10.67 **1 citare, 10.67 p.**	1. Grădinaru, A.P.; Badea, A.-C.; Dragomir, P.I.; Badea, G. (2023) Integrating Cadastral Data with Seismic Risk Data in an Online Building Database for the Historical Centre of Bucharest City. Land 12(8), 1594. WOS:001056284600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/land12081594
66. Calofir, V., Nica, G.B., Pavel, F. (2020) A nonlinear model to analyze the structures pounding forces during earthquakes. Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering, 45(10): 8303-8314, WOS:000542504200001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13369-020-04633-0. . =10*1.8/3=6.0 =10*3.1/3=10.33 =10*3.1/3=10.33 =10*3.9/3=10.33 **4 citări, 39.67 p.**	1. Patlán, C.M., Hernández-Barrios, H., Gomez, R. (2025) Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis Using the Force Analogy Method and the Ibarra–Medina–Krawinkler Model. The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings, 34(1), WOS:001354197000001, https://doi.org/10.1002/tal.2197
	2. Patlán Manjarrez, C.M.; Hernández Barrios, H.; Pérez Rodríguez, D. (2025) The Reduction of Embodied Carbon in Steel Structures Through the Implementation of Control Systems. Buildings 15(3), 482. WOS:001419291000001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15030482
	3. Hernández Barrios, H.; Patlán Manjarrez, C.M.; Gómez Martínez, R. (2025) The Passive Control of Nonlinear Dynamic Response Using the Force Analogy Method in a Chimney Located in a Wind- and Seismic-Prone Region in Mexico. Buildings, 15(3), 459, WOS:001419374700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15030459
	4. Borekci, M., Dag, B., Eroglu, A. (2024) Seismic behaviour of reinforced concrete buildings: Impact of inter-story pounding with adjacent structures on one and both sides. Structures, 70 107815, WOS:001358679200001, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2024.107815
67. Pavel, F. (2026) Seismic risk assessment at local scale. Case-study for a neighbourhood from Ploiesti, Romania. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 200(B), 109870. WOS:001596877100001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2025.109870 =10*2.7/1=27 **1 citare, 27 p.**	1. Brzev, S., Petrović, M., & Milićević, I. (2026). Seismic Behavior of Precast Reinforced Concrete Large Panel Buildings: A Case of Jugomont System. *Journal of Earthquake Engineering*, 1–37. WOS:001711874000001. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2026.2632821
68. Pavel, F., Aldea, A. (2025) I_{JMA}-based evaluation of ground motion recordings from Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of	1. Li, Si-Q (2026) Comparison of the seismic fragility of reinforced concrete continuous girder bridges considering near-field and far-field earthquake sequences. *Structures,* 85, 111282.

Earthquake Engineering, 23, 4285–4303. WOS:001539463700001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-025-02220-y =10*4.3/2=21.5 =10*4.1/2=20.5 **2 citări, 42 p.**	WOS:001684381200004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2026.111282 2. Li, SQ., Zheng, LL. Seismic risk analysis of building portfolios affected by dual mainshock sequences in high-altitude regions. *Bull Earthquake Eng* (2026). WOS:001727586800001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-026-02436-6.
69. Pavel, F., Vladut, R., Noroozinejad Farsangi, E. (2024) Correlation of soil conditions with seismic damage of structures in Craiova, Romania. Practice Periodical on Strucutral Design and Construction, 29(3), 05024003, WOS:001252127900010, https://doi.org/10.1061/PPSCFX.SCENG-1489 =10*3.3/3=11 **1 citare, 11 p.**	1. Ecemiş Kılıç, S.; Efe Güney, M.; Ayhan Selçuk, İ.; Alğın Demir, K.; Gür, G. An Example of Vulnerability Analysis According to Disasters: Neighborhoods in the Southern Region of Izmir. *Sustainability* **2025**, *17*, 8358. WOS:001581124400001. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17188358
70. Pavel, F., Nica, G. (2024) The seismic evaluation of existing buildings for energy renovation—a case study for the residential building stock in Bucharest (Romania). Buildings, 14(6), 1742, WOS:001254449200001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14061742. =10*3.2/2=16 **1 citare, 16 p.**	1. Gao, H.; Han, Y.; Zhang, J.; Song, Y.; Zhang, T.; Tang, F.; Sun, S. A Supply–Demand-Driven Framework for Evaluating Service Effectiveness of University Campus Emergency Shelter: Evidence from Central Tianjin Under Earthquake Scenarios. *Land* **2025**, *14*, 1411. WOS:001535954700001 https://doi.org/10.3390/land14071411.
71. Pavel, F., Vacareanu, R., Aldea, A., Arion, C: (2024) Vertical elastic acceleration response spectra for Vrancea intermediate-depth earthquakes. Buildings, 14(4), 906, WOS:001210603700001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14040906 =10*1.9/4=4.75 =10*4.1/4=10.25 =10*2.8/4=7 **3 citări, 22 p.**	1. Yaghfoori A, Mahmoudzadeh Kani I, Yousefi H (2026), "Seismic performance and optimization of deep soil mixing (DSM) for response mitigation at power plant sites". *Engineering Computations*, Vol. 43 No. 2 pp. 521–562, WOS:001613565400001. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/EC-05-2025-0508 2. Laouami, N. Vertical elastic response spectra for low and high seismicity regions. *Bull Earthquake Eng* **23**, 5259–5273 (2025). WOS:001539593100001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-025-02241-7. 3. Shamsher, S.; Won, M.-S.; Park, Y.-C.; Park, Y.-H.; Sayed, M.A. Effect of Nonlinear Constitutive Models on Seismic Site Response of Soft Reclaimed Soil Deposits. *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.* **2025**, *13*, 1333. WOS:001535461700001 https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse13071333.
72. Pavel, F. (2021) Evaluation of key PSHA assumptions-case-study for Romania. Geosciences, 11(2): 70, WOS:000622600100001, https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences11020070 =10*2.0/1=20 **1 citare, 20 p.**	1. Azak, T.E. Sensitivity of Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Results to Epistemic Uncertainties Related to Seismic Source Characterization. *Int J Civ Eng* **23**, 2095–2126 (2025). WOS:001545550100001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40999-025-01119-8

3.1.2. Volume ISI – **14,01 p**

Lucrare	Citare
1. Văcăreanu, R., Mărmureanu, G., Pavel, F., Neagu, C., Ortanza, C.O., Aldea, A. (2014). Analysis of soil factor S using strong ground motions from Vrancea subcrustal seismic source. Romanian Reports in Physics, 66(3): 893-906, WOS:000342035600028, https://rrp.nipne.ro/2014_66_3/A28.pdf =2.5/6=0.41 =2.5/6=0.41 **2 citări, 0.82 p.**	1. Toma-Danila, D., Cioflan, C.O., Balan, S.F., Apostol, B.F. (2015). The assessment of seismic networks distribution from a risk analysis perspective. Romania case study. Proceedings of the 15th International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference SGEM 2015, ISBN 978-619-7105-33-9 / ISSN 1314-2704, June 18-24, 2015, Book1 Vol. 3, 1035-1042, WOS:000371661600134 .
	2. Erteleva, O.O., Aptikaev, F.F. (2019) Application of Similarity and Dimensional Theory for Seismic Treatment. Seismic Instruments, 55(1): 101-110, WOS:000468101300011, https://doi.org/10.3103/S0747923919010055
1. Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F., Neagu, C. (2015). Fore-arc and back-arc ground motion prediction model for Vrancea intermediate depth seismic source. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000352298500008, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2014.990653 =3*2.5/5=1.50 **3 citări, 1.50 puncte**	1. Toma-Danila, D., Armas, I., Cioflan, C.O. (2016) Conceptual framework for the seismic risk evaluation of transportation networks in Romania. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 481-496, WOS:000389508200034, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_34 .
	2. Cioflan, C.O., Toma-Danila, D., Manea, E.F. (2016) Seismic loss estimates for scenarios of the 1940 Vrancea earthquake. În Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 425-439, WOS:000389508200030, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_30
	3. Theodoulidis, N.; Margaris, B.; Sotiriadis, D.; Zulfikar, C.; Okuyan Akcan, S.; Cioflan, C.O.; Manea, E.F.; Toma-Danila, D. (2024) Rapid Earthquake Damage Assessment System in the Black Sea Basin: Selection/Adoption of Ground Motion Prediction Equations with Emphasis in the Cross-Border Areas. GeoHazards 5, 255-270, WOS:001192929500001, https://doi.org/10.3390/geohazards5010013
3. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Cioflan, C.O. (2015) Investigation on directional effects of Vrancea subcrustal earthquakes. Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, 14(3): 399-410, WOS:000360861700002, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11803-015-0032-3 =2.5/4=0.63 **1 citare, 0.63 p.**	1. Cioflan, C.O., Toma-Danila, D., Manea, E.F. (2016) Seismic loss estimates for scenarios of the 1940 Vrancea earthquake. In Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 425-439, WOS:000389508200030, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_30
4. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Aldea, A. (2013). On the selection of GMPEs for Vrancea subcrustal seismic source. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 11(6): 1867-1884,	1. Iancovici, M., Vezeanu, G. (2016) A Time-Domain Approach for the Performance-Based Analysis of Tall Buildings in Bucharest. In Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940

WOS:000327322000001, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10518-013-9515-7 =2.5/3=0.83 **1 citare, 0.83 p**.	Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 333-350, WOS:000389508200023, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_23
5. Văcăreanu, R., Lungu, D., Mărmureanu, G., Cioflan, C., Aldea, A., Arion, C., Neagu, C., Demetriu, S., Pavel, F. (2013). Statistics of seismicity for Vrancea subcrustal source. Proceedings of the International Conference on Earthquake Engineering SE-50 EEE, Skopje, Macedonia, paper no. 138, https://infp.infp.ro/bigsees/New/Docs/Statistics%20of%20seismicity%20for%20Vrancea%20subcrustal%20seismic%20source.pdf =2.5/9=0.28 **1 citare, 0.28 p.**	1. Iancovici, M., Vezeanu, G. (2016) A Time-Domain Approach for the Performance-Based Analysis of Tall Buildings in Bucharest. In Văcăreanu, R., Ionescu, C. (ed.): The 1940 Vrancea earthquake. Issues, insights and lessons learnt. Springer Natural Hazards, pp. 333-350, WOS:000389508200023, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29844-3_23
6. Pavel F, Lungu D. (2013). Correlations between frequency content indicators of strong ground motions and PGV, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 17(4): 543-559, WOS:000317824600004, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2012.762957 =2.5/2=1.25 **1 citare, 1.25 p.**	1. Afzali, A., Mortezaei, A., Kheyroddin, A. (2017) Seismic performance of high-rise RC shear wall buildings subjected to ground motions with various frequency contents. Civil Engineering Journal, 3(8), 568-584, WOS:000410927100004, 10.28991/cej-2017-00000113.
7. Văcăreanu, R., Pavel, F., Crăciun, I., Colibă, V., Arion, C., Aldea, A., Neagu, C. (2018) Risk-targeted maps for Romania. Journal of Seismology, 22(2): 407-417, WOS:000426087700003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-017-9713-x =2.5/7=0.36 **1 citare, 0.36 p.**	1. Tsang, H.H., Wilson, J.L., Gad, E.F. (2020) Collapse probability of soft-storey building in Australia and implications for risk-based seismic design. *Australian Journal of Structural Engineering*, 21(4): 307-319, WOS:000619166100003, https://doi.org/10.1080/13287982.2020.1835157.
8. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scaling of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Earthquakes and Structures, 11(3): 505-516., WOS:000384816100007, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2016.11.3.505. =2.5/2=1.25 =2.5/2=1.25 **2 citări, 2.50 p.**	1. Atmaca, B., Ergun, M., Ates, S. (2018) The most appropriate earthquake record groups for dynamic analysis of a building. Sigma Journal of Engineering and Natural Sciences, 36(4): 1047-1079, WOS:000454526700010. https://sigma.yildiz.edu.tr/storage/upload/pdfs/1635753581-en.pdf 2. Hanindya, K.A., Makrup, L., Paulus, W.R. (2023) Deterministic Seismic Hazard Analysis to Determine Liquefaction Potential Due to Earthquake. Civil Engineering Journal, 9(5), 1203-1216, WOS:001007699800012, https://doi.org/10.28991/CEJ-2023-09-05-012

9. Pavel, F. (2015). Investigation on the stochastic simulation of strong round motions for Bucharest area. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering 69: 227-232, WOS:000347865500019, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2014.11.008. =2.5/1=2.5 **1 citare, 2.50 p.**	1. Mohamed, A.A., Moustafa, S.S.R., Al-Arifi, N.S., Abd El-Aal, A.E.A.K. (2016) Near-Field Broadband Ground-Motion Simulation Using a Hybrid Approach. Electronic Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 21(1): 253-267, WOS:000459416900019.
10. Nica, G.B., Pavel, F. (2016). Numerical analysis on the collapse of a RC frame. Mathematical Modelling in Civil Engineering, 12(4): 22 – 35, https://mcee.utcb.ro/images/doc/2016/2016.issue4.paper_03.pdf. =2.5/2=1.25 **1 citare, 1.25 p.**	1. El-Mahdy, O., El-Kasabi, E.S., Abusafa, H., El-Gamal, E. (2017) Progressive collapse analysis of 2-d rc frames using AEM. Civil Engineering Journal – Stavebni Obzor, 26(4): 418-440, WOS:000424522300007, https://doi.org/10.14311/CEJ.2017.04.0035
11. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scenario-based earthquake risk assessment for Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 20: 138-144, WOS:000398432600014, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.11.006 =2.5/2=1.25 **1 citare, 1.25 p.**	1. Tadjer, K., Bensaibi, M., Benkaci, N. *et al.* Revisiting seismic scenario based on damage curves of Algerian structures implemented in Blida city. *J Infrastruct Preserv Resil* **6**, 34 (2025). WOS:001606615000001. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43065-025-00153-z.
12. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Marcu, D. (2021) Seismic performance assessment and rating for a flat-slab RC core wall structure in Bucharest, Romania. Structures, 31: 1006-1016, WOS:000640710800005. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2021.02.036 =2.5/3=0.83 **1 citare, 0.83 p.**	1. Alluqmani, A.E., Naqash, M.T., Islam, A. B. M.S. (2026) Seismic performance evaluation and SWOT analysis of retrofitted reinforced concrete building. International Journal of Masonry Research and Innovation, 11(2): 190-216, WOS:001714849800004, https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMRI.2026.152247.

3.1.3. Reviste BDI – **11,23 p**

1. Spectral characteristics of strong ground motions from intermediate-depth Vrancea seismic source. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 104(6): 2842-2850, WOS:000346136800015, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120130334. =2/4=0.50 **1 citare, 0.50 p.**	1. Minsheng, G., Hongbiao, D., Qingli, Z., Wei, C., Jie, C. (2017) Seismic base shear coefficients of long-period structures subjected to far-field ground motions. Journal of Shenzhen University Science and Engineering, 5: 488-494, https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85034577586&origin=inward&txGid=b566bb2ffde608cfd476b07396c586a7 .
2. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scaling of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Earthquakes and Structures, 11(3): 505-516., WOS:000384816100007, https://doi.org/10.12989/eas.2016.11.3.505. =2/2=1.00	1. Makrup, L. (2018) Change the frequency characteristics of the earthquake acceleration wave by Fourier analysis. International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology, 8(12): 1045-1055, https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJCIET/VOLUME_8_ISSUE_12/IJCIET_08_12_113.pdf

1 citare, 1.00 p.	
3. Văcăreanu, R., Radulian, M., Iancovici, M., Pavel, F., Neagu, C. (2015). Fore-arc and back-arc ground motion prediction model for Vrancea intermediate depth seismic source. Journal of Earthquake Engineering, WOS:000352298500008, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2014.990653 =2/5=0.40 **1 citare, 0.40 puncte**	1. Gaina, A.A., Stanciu, A., Nicuta, A., Lungu, I. (2018) Ground response analysis of Bahlui Clay as a foundation layer. Special Issue: XVI DECGE 2018 Proceedings of the 16th Danube - European Conference on Geotechnical Engineering. Volume 2 (2-3), 633-638, https://doi.org/10.1002/cepa.741
4. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2016) Scenario-based earthquake risk assessment for Bucharest, Romania. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 20: 138-144, WOS:000398432600014, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.11.006 =2/2=1.00 **1 citare, 1.00 puncte**	1. Chaudhary B.S. et al. (2019) Interactive Approach for Earthquake Scenario Development and Hazards Resource Estimation. In: Kumar P., Rani M., Chandra Pandey P., Sajjad H., Chaudhary B. (eds) Applications and Challenges of Geospatial Technology. Springer, Cham, pp. 121-139, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99882-4_8
5. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R., Douglas, J., Radulian, M., Cioflan, C.O., Bărbat, A. (2016) An updated probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for Romania and comparison with the approach and outcomes of the SHARE project. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 173(6): 1881-1905, WOS:000377722800003, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1223-6. =2/6=0.33 **1 citare, 0.33 puncte**	1. Chaudhary B.S. et al. (2019) Interactive Approach for Earthquake Scenario Development and Hazards Resource Estimation. In: Kumar P., Rani M., Chandra Pandey P., Sajjad H., Chaudhary B. (eds) Applications and Challenges of Geospatial Technology. Springer, Cham, pp. 121-139, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99882-4_8
6. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2015) Kappa and regional attenuation for Vrancea (Romania) earthquakes. Journal of Seismology, 19(3): 791-799, WOS:000355694300009, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10950-015-9490-3 =2/2=1.00 **1 citare, 1 p.**	1. Gicev, V., Trifunac, M. (2022) High-frequency decay of Fourier spectra of strong motion acceleration and nonlinear site response. Earthquake Engineering and Resilience, 1(3), 302-316. https://doi.org/10.1002/eer2.28
7. Seismic risk assessment for elements of the electric network in Romania. Buildings, 12(2), 244, WOS:000774830600001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12020244.	1. Huang, Z., Pitilakis, K., Zhang, D., Tsinidis, G., Argyroudis, S. (2022) On the effects of salient parameters for an efficient probabilistic seismic loss assessment of tunnels in alluvial soils. Resilient Cities and Structures, 1(3), 24-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcns.2022.10.006.

=2/2=1.00 =2/2=1.00 **2 citări, 2.0 p.**	2. Camayang, J.P.; Dela Cruz, O.; Grutas, R. (2024) Integrating Building- and Site-Specific and Generic Fragility Curves into Seismic Risk Assessment: A PRISMA-Based Analysis of Methodologies and Applications. CivilEng 5, 1011-1041. https://doi.org/10.3390/civileng5040050
8. Pavel F, Lungu D. (2013). Correlations between frequency content indicators of strong ground motions and PGV, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 17(4): 543-559, WOS:000317824600004, https://doi.org/10.1080/13632469.2012.762957 =2/2=1.00 =2/2=1.00 =2/2=1.00 **3 citări, 3.00 p.**	1. Elhout, E.A. (2024) Influence the A/V ratio of recorded ground motions on the response of RC frames structures. Asian Journal of Civil Engineering 25, 4091–4105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42107-024-01033-9 2. Kontoni, DP.N., Akhavan Salmassi, M. Effect of end shear walls on seismic pounding between two adjacent reinforced concrete high-rise buildings. *Asian J Civ Eng* **26**, 4649–4664 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s42107-025-01448-y. 3. Open-source MATLAB framework for MDOF seismic response using real earthquake records. Journal of Dynamic Disasters, Volume 1, Issue 4, 2025, 100043, ISSN 2950-5763. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdd.2025.100043.
9. Pavel, F., Văcăreanu, R. (2017) Spatial correlation of ground motions from Vrancea (Romania) intermediate-depth earthquakes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 107(1): 489-494, WOS:000394004900038, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120160095 =2/2=1.00 **1 citare, 1.00 p.**	1. Guoliang Shao, Ruizhi Wen, Hongwei Wang, Yeifei Ren, Baofeng Zhou, Spatial correlations in ground motion intensity measuring from the 2023 Türkiye earthquake. Earthquake Research Advances,Volume 4, Issue 1, 100231, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eqrea.2023.100231
10. Pavel, F., Nica, G. (2024) The seismic evaluation of existing buildings for energy renovation—a case study for the residential building stock in Bucharest (Romania). Buildings, 14(6), 1742, WOS:001254449200001, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14061742. 2/2=1.00 **1 citare, 1.00 p.**	1. Al-Yaseri, A.M., Al-Hadithy, L.K. (2025) Advances in the structural performance of reinforced concrete flat plate-column connections under gravity and seismic loads. Journal of Building Pathology and Rehabilitation 10, 58 https://doi.org/10.1007/s41024-025-00568-x

3.2. Prezentari invitate in plenul unor manifestari stiintifice nationale si internationale și Profesor invitat (exclusiv ERASMUS)

3.2.1. Internationale

3.2.2. Nationale

3.3. Membru in colectivele de redactie sau comitete stiintifice ale revistelor si manifestarilor stiintifice, organizator de manifestari stiintifice, Recenzor pentru reviste si manifestari stiintifice nationale si internationale – **4 p**

- membru în comitetul științific al Conferinței "Different City - Smart City" conference and exhibition - București, 2016
- membru în comitetul de organizare și cel științific al 3NCWE (3rd National Conference on Wind Engineering) – București, 2024

- recenzii (peste 40) pentru: Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration, Computers and Concrete, Earthquakes and Structures, Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, Journal of Earthquake Engineering, Earthquake Spectra, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Natural Hazards Review, Journal of Seismology și International Journal of Civil Engineering.
3.4. Experienta de management – prodecan FILS – 2020-2022 – 2*5 = **10 p**