**Report**

1. The Study should highlight the novel contributions of the research more clearly. While it claims to propose an innovative control method, it does not distinguish what is new or unique about this method compared to existing solutions.

2. The study does not clearly state the specific problems or limitations in existing control methods for structures exposed to severe earthquakes that this new method aims to address. While it mentions "seismic uncertainties" and "remarkable accuracy," it lacks details on what specific uncertainties or inaccuracies are being improved. How and Why?

3. One notable limitation in the study is the reliance on a small and potentially outdated set of four earthquakes from the 1990 to 2000 period to evaluate the proposed control method. While the El Centro and Kobe earthquakes are significant historical events, the seismic activity spectrum has evolved, and there is a broader range of earthquake data available today that could provide a more comprehensive evaluation. Modern standards, such as those suggested by FEMA, recommend using a much larger set of earthquakes, often up to 100 different seismic events, to thoroughly test and validate the robustness and reliability of structural control systems. This broader testing spectrum would ensure that the controller's performance is assessed against a more diverse range of seismic characteristics, including varying magnitudes, frequencies, and durations of ground motion. By expanding the set of test earthquakes, the study could provide stronger evidence of the proposed controller's effectiveness and robustness. It would also enhance the generalizability of the results, demonstrating that the control method can reliably manage the seismic response of structures across a wider array of real-world scenarios. Thus, incorporating a more comprehensive set of earthquake data could significantly strengthen the study's conclusions and its practical implications for seismic control engineering.

4. The conclusions section of the paper appears to be a summary of general improvements and known facts rather than a presentation of novel outcomes. While it claims that the proposed IT2FNN-FOPID controller outperforms existing controllers in mitigating seismic responses, it does not provide specific details or evidence to highlight what is innovative about this work. The percentages indicating performance improvements (e.g., a 70% improvement in the J\_1 index during the El Centro earthquake) are not sufficiently detailed or contextualized. They lack the necessary comparative analysis and critical insights that would clearly demonstrate the novelty of the research findings. Furthermore, these figures are presented without adequate explanation of the methodologies used to achieve these results or the significance of these improvements in practical applications. Moreover, the conclusions do not introduce any new theoretical insights, methodological advancements, or practical innovations that distinguish this work from existing literature. To convincingly establish the novelty of the outcomes, the conclusions should detail specific advancements, explain how these differ from prior work, and provide robust, quantifiable evidence that supports the superiority and uniqueness of the proposed method. In its current form, the conclusions section falls short of illustrating the groundbreaking nature of the research. It would benefit from including more specific, detailed, and evidence-backed statements to enhance the perceived value and originality of the contributions to the field of seismic control.

5.While the paper claims to introduce a novel idea, the extensive list of references—exceeding 100—gives the impression of a review article rather than a research paper presenting groundbreaking work. This extensive citation of numerous studies, many of which appear to be irrelevant, dilutes the focus and impact of the novel contributions.

6. The authors' use of a double citation style, such as "Ümütlü et al. (2021) [49]," raises concerns about the consistency and professionalism of the paper's formatting. This dual approach, combining the author-date style with a numbered reference, is unconventional and can cause confusion for readers. Typically, academic papers adhere to a single citation style throughout, either using an author-date system (e.g., APA or Harvard) or a numbered system (e.g., IEEE or Vancouver), but not both simultaneously.

7. The flowchart presented in the paper is unclear and lacks a coherent structure. Ideally, a flowchart should guide the reader through the process in a logical, step-by-step manner. However, the current flowchart moves in different directions, making it difficult to follow the progression of the control method.