

Thank you for kindly reviewing our paper and checking our responses to the reviewers. There were some issues with the structure of the paper and some unclear parts, and it was good that you pointed them out. We think that with your help the quality of the paper has increased.

Comment: Please explain carefully the methodology that you use and make sure you disambiguate what you mean by 'probable seismic damage'.

Answer: We have included the more detailed explanation of the methodology in the text.

By the term "probable seismic damage" we meant the estimated economic damage that would occur in a specific area in the event of an earthquake. We agree that it was unclear; therefore, we removed this phrase and kept a simpler explanation. Also, for clarity, we have corrected the title of Chapter 3.2 from “Probable Seismic Risk Assessment” to “Seismic Risk Assessment”.

Comment: Please discuss how the buildings classification that you used compares with other building typologies defined for Uzbekistan and at the regional scale for Central Asia (e.g. EMCA).

Answer: We have included a table (Table 6) which compares the local classification (which we used in our study) with the EMCA classification.

Table 6. Classification of buildings in Tashkent according to the vulnerability index

	Our classification	EMCA		
		EMCA Classification	Subtype	Description
1	Adobe (local)	EMCA4	ADO	Adobe structures
2	Masonry	EMCA1	CM	Brick masonry of a complex structure
3	Wooden	EMCA5	WOOD1	Wooden structure, load-bearing frames with connections
			WOOD2	Wooden structure, wooden frame, and adobe infill
4	Concrete	EMCA2	All subtypes EMCA2	All descriptions of EMCA2 subtypes
		EMCA3	All subtypes EMCA3	All descriptions of EMCA3 subtypes
5	Metal frame	EMCA6	STEEL	Steel structures

Comment: Carefully rewrite section 3. Please make sure that session 3 only contains results and discussion, while data sources and methods should be included in section 2. For example, the number and type of buildings are necessary to perform the risk assessment so they should be introduced before you estimate the risk. Also, 3.1 speaks about asset values but you provide figures in terms of number of buildings, not economic value, which is mentioned in section 3.2.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have revised section 3 and put the data sources and methods in section 2. Also, we have added the figure in terms of economic value which is mentioned in section 3.2 (Fig. 13).

Comment: Please make sure the figure captions contain enough explanation for the reader to understand them and consider merging figures.

Answer: We have revised the figure captions to have a better explanation. But we think that merging figures will negatively affect the flow of discussion.

Comment: I think your response to the last comment of reviewer #1 is unclear ("The seismic risk map is calculated only considering the ground conditions"). Please specify in the manuscript what you mean and discuss how your results compare to past risk assessments done in the region.

Answer: We have specified in the manuscript the idea of compiling the seismic risk map based on the ground conditions and have added the past risk assessments and similar studies done in the region.