

Dear authors

The new version of the manuscript has improved. Nevertheless, there are some points that requires more effort or a better explanation

- 1) The presentation: the presentation of the paper has improved from the first version but in my opinion need more effort. In the new version remain some sentences difficult to understand: e.g. page 12 line 21: "As mentioned in the Introduction, the exposure to floods and other extreme events depends not only on the geophysical hazard but also on how urban growth and infrastructures have been, are and will be evolving in the areas at risk". Another important error of presentation is that figure 12 is not cited in the text. Please review all the manuscript taking care of this questions.
- 2) The critical point of reviewer 2 have not been addressed properly. *"Section 3.3 – There is a significant issue with the analysis here that the authors will need to explain or address. At P9, L38, the authors state, "Beside property values, the database also contains the year when each property was built, which we use for our expanding bull's-eye effect analysis." Information for year built is useful, but it is not a time-series. Unless I missed it (and apologies, if so), the authors do not say when their property data were compiled – but it looks like the dataset is housing stock as of 2018. In that case, they have a current snapshot of stock, not a continuous record of stock through time (i.e., annual records of all properties). That means that the dataset will be inherently skewed toward newer properties, as old buildings get replaced. (See the same issue in Armstrong, S. B., Lazarus, E. D., Limber, P. W., Goldstein, E. B., Thorpe, C., & Ballinger, R. C. (2016). Indications of a positive feedback between coastal development and beach nourishment. Earth's Future, 4(12), 626-635.) To demonstrate their bull's-eye effect, Ashley & Strader (2016) work with a semiempirical spatio-temporal model of housing stock in tornado zones over time. Year-built records are not the same. Unless the authors can imagine a way to overcome this limitation in their analysis, they may not have the information they need to actually measure an expanding bull's-eye. The housing stock in their area of interest has certainly grown dramatically over time – the bull's eye is evident from space – but their properties dataset can only capture it indirectly".*
In your reply you accept the limitations of the data but you must to include some comment on this limitation of your data/analysis in the text.
- 3) Please address the minor remark of the referee: P5,6 – "Addressing this point is crucial to account for those impacts related to the choices that our society makes to continue the expansion of urban areas and that have been addressed by experts as the "bull's-eye expanding effect" (Ashley and Strader, 2018), in which "targets" of geophysical hazards, such as people and their built environments, are enlarging as populations grow and spread. We use the term "bull's-eye" to define the eye or center of a storm." – Given the Introduction, seems a strange reorientation of the bull's eye terminology. Instead of the target, makes it sound like the bull's-eye refers to the dart – as though the argument here will be that storm size is increasing (and not an elaboration of the premise that hazard exposure is increasing). Not sure that this is the case the authors intend to frame?