2nd Reply to H. Ohtani (Referee)

Original Comment:

The proposed calculation formula of post-earthquake fire total loss *EFL* shown in the paper is very simple, and related parameters are seemed to be reasonable. However, reliability of the *EFL* and related parameters depend strongly on statistical data published elsewhere. I cannot reach the data, so cannot evaluate reliability of the paper. If possible the authors may present sample data of each databases.

Response:

Thank you very much for your comment. After submitting our first reply to you, we revise our paper carefully. At this time, we discover that there is a correction we have to make in the table we plan to add, namely the Table 1-n in the supplement of the former reply. The R_i in original literature means seismic intensity. However, in our paper we use R_i to denote seismic ground motion parameter. Therefore, we have to make a correction in the Table 1-n, as shown below. We feel very sorry for unable to correct it when we submitted our first reply.

Table 1-n   The vulnerability matrix of industrial factory buildings

	Collapse	Serious damage	Medium damage	Slight damage	Basically intact
$P(D_j/R_i =0.05)$	0	0	0.07	0.2	0.73
$P(D_j/R_i =0.1-0.15)$	0	0.03	0.12	0.28	0.57
$P(D_j/R_i =0.2-0.3)$	0.02	0.15	0.31	0.28	0.24
$P(D_j/R_i >=0.4)$	0.05	0.25	0.4	0.2	0.1

Source: Earthquake loss prediction research team of China Earthquake Administration, 1990