

The article improved significantly in terms of its writing, added references and improved description of technical choices made by the authors. Although there are some lines added to the results, the manuscript continues to lack a section with a proper discussion of the results (as pointed out by the other reviewer in her earlier comments). In line with earlier comments, I recommend adding a more thorough discussion of the results.

The writing style has improved significantly; there are only some minor technical issues left, namely:

P. 10. L.2: depend -> depending

P. 10 L.15: statement lacks a reference.

P.7 L. 6: is important -> is an important

P.4 L2: German -> Germany

P.2 L21/22: IM has already been defined earlier in L.1 of the same page.

P.2 L15: Bridge damage state of bridges -> Damage states of bridges

P2. L14: there's a period missing at the end of sentence

The manuscript's title has been adjusted correctly in the main manuscript document but not in the abstract file.