I thank the authors for their efforts to review my comments. I particularly welcome the inclusion of Figures 1 and 2, which substantially improve the quality of the manuscript. However, there are a few follow up comments below that I think should be addressed before publication. The comment number provided at the start of each comment refers to the previous round of review.

1. Main comment #2a: Suggest changing "at risk to natural hazards" to "exposed and vulnerable to natural hazards"
2. Main comment #2b: The point I was trying to make here is that the output of a vulnerability curve is typically a continuous measure of *loss*, whereas the output of a fragility curve is a measure of *damage*. The authors refer to a damage factor as being the output of a vulnerability curve in line 41, but this is actually a financial loss ratio (as they define in the parenthesis). In other words, the "damage" output of a vulnerability curve is typically expressed in terms of percentage of replacement cost and is therefore actually a loss rather than a damage metric. I would suggest making the distinction between the two types of output more explicit, so that readers have a clear understanding of the differences between the two curves. Along the same lines, the authors should qualify that the "physical damages" captured by the database include consequences in the form of repair cost (i.e., financial loss) ratios (currently referred to as "damage factors") output from vulnerability models.
3. Minor comment #1: "level of susceptibility" seems a little vague to me. I would suggest using something like "level of loss experienced" or "level of impact experienced" to be slightly more specific.
4. Minor comment #2: I don't think the notation "E(C>c)" makes sense when referring to a mean value, which is why I thought you were referring to a probability. I believe it should be re-written as E(C)
5. Minor comment #4: To make this point clearer, I would suggest that you mention the development of both fragility and vulnerability curves being common practice within the earthquake community.
6. Minor comment #6: The statement provided here does not specifically mention that the cost values are country-specific.
7. Minor comment #8: By using the term "building typologies", I think you are still welcoming the possibility of the database being extended beyond the critical infrastructure depicted in Figure 2. This is fine if it is your intention, but, if not, then I would remove the word "building" and use something along the lines of "various forms of critical infrastructure (e.g., in terms of construction material)"
8. Additional comments:
    a. I think that Figure 1 should also account for the "vulnerability" and "critical infrastructure" search terms, in addition to hazards