

Reply to Anonymous Referee #5

Original Comment:

The methodology used in the paper to calculate the post-earthquake fire total loss *EFL* is adequate. However, readers of this paper cannot recheck the calculated *EFL*. If some existing data of *EFL* are available, the authors may verify the calculated *EFL* by using these data. Expression (6) on page 1784 should be expression (5).

Response:

Thank you very much for your comment. As you have mentioned, readers of this paper cannot recheck the calculated *EFL*. Therefore, we will develop a newly revised manuscript in which we select the Heping District of Tianjin City as a sample and we will insert Table 2-n into Page 1785 Line 15.

Table 2-n. Expected loss of earthquake-fire for the petrochemical enterprises in the Heping District of Tianjin City

Petrochemical enterprises	PE ₁	PE ₂	PE ₃	PE ₄	Total
Fixed Assets of those in Tianjin City (10 000RMB) *	7432100	2179400	30300	1390700	
Fixed Assets of those in Heping District <i>W_k</i> (10 000RMB)	201806.96	59178.17	822.75	37762.27	
Earthquake loss of those in Heping District <i>EL</i> (10 000RMB)	49018.91	14374.38	199.85	9172.45	72765.59
Residual values of those in Heping District <i>W_k'</i> (10 000RMB)	152788.0	44803.79	622.90	28589.81	226804.5
Fire loss of those in Heping District <i>FL</i> (10 000RMB)	28.86	21.68	0.089	8.27	58.90
Total loss <i>EFL</i> (10 000RMB)	49047.77	14396.06	199.9344	9180.729	72824.49
Expected Loss Per Unit Area (10 000 RMB/km ²)	4619.57	1355.89	18.83	864.69	6858.98

Source: Authors;
the item marked by asterisk is collected from
Leading Group Office of the Second China Economic Census of the State Council (2010).

Thanks again for showing us the mistake we have made. We are so sorry for making such unprofessional mistake. In our online Discussion paper, 'expression (5)' on Page 1784 Line 25 should be 'expression (6)'. We will correct it in our newly revised manuscript.