

Dear Authors,

I have read with interest your manuscript as well as reviewers' concerns and your response.

Although the effort you put in the survey is valuable and the evidence you got from the survey has big potentialities, I think you did not give value to them in the paper whose conclusions, as suggested by the first reviewer, are limited to "avoid old and low quality buildings". At present, such results are very poor for a research paper.

I am quite sceptical that the changes you proposed in response to reviewers' concerns can improve the paper substantially. For this reason, I strongly recommend a deep review of the manuscript which should be directed to two main aspects of the research:

- The first one is the survey. I think that the way in which you conducted the research (how many buildings? In which area? How they were chosen? Why? How many persons involved? Which tools/instruments you implemented? How long does it take?) as well as its objectives (Which are the parameters, aspects, evidences you collected? Why?) must be fully described, also in order to allow other research to repeat the experience and to compare their results with yours. Maps suggested by the first review can support the discussion.
- The second one concerns results. How can I use collected evidences on damage and its cause? E.g. (1) for calibrating new damage models or validate existing one, in order to improve our risk knowledge of the area? If this is the case, why you did not analyse the relation between hazard and vulnerability? (2) to identify the buildings which are most at risks? How? according to which criteria? (3) to suggest mitigation strategies, e.g. retrofitting, better spatial planning, etc.; what results tell us about this? (4) others?

I think that, at present, results (or better evidences) are simply discussed in a narrative form without any critical analysis of them... which can be the really added value of the research. But, above all, what results tell us which is novel with respect to the state of the art?

I also thing, as suggested by the referees, that the paper must be better situated in the existing literature on the topic and that the research question(s) must be clearly identified. At last, a re-organisation of the contents and a revision by a native speaker are required. The poor English and the fragmented organisation of the manuscript do not help the full comprehension of its main contents.