

## RESPONSE TO EDITOR

Dear Chiara Scaini and co-authors,  
your revised paper received an overall positive evaluation by the sole reviewer appointed.  
However, he suggested specifying in detail the advancements your work brings about the state of the art of exposure assessment (regardless of place).  
Nonetheless, I invite you to further improve the manuscript by addressing this relevant comment.  
I'm looking forward to receiving your revised manuscript.  
Best regards,  
Brunella Bonaccorso

Dear Dr. Bonaccorso,

We revised the manuscript following the reviewer's suggestions and giving more emphasis to the novelty of the approach and how it contributes to addressing the most common challenges in exposure assessment of critical infrastructure.

We thank you and the reviewer for the suggestions that substantially improved the manuscript.

Thank you very much,

Chiara Scaini, on behalf of all co-authors.

## RESPONSE TO REVIEWER

This is my second time reviewing this paper. I was reviewer #2 the last time around.  
I want to commend authors for a thorough revisions of their paper, that goes most of the way towards addressing my main concerns. The introduction in particular does a good job of explaining the challenges in the existing literature.

A few minor comments aside (see below), my main remark is that no specific conclusions are drawn from the introduction, in terms of the gap that this paper addresses through the great work done by the authors in Central Asia. A couple of sentences stating with precision how the work advances the state of the art of exposure assessment (regardless of place), in the abstract, the introduction and in the conclusions, would help the readers grasp very clearly the innovation the paper brings about (right now they still have to guess or know the state-of-the-art themselves). Formulating the novelty of their work clearly would also help the authors when they build on their work, be it in presenting the work at conferences, in finding new collaborators or in preparing their next grant. Last but not least, this would help the paper to unambiguously meet the journal's aims and scope.

A few minor points below.

Introduction:

Line 56, "region" should be plural.

Line 66: the "aforementioned challenges should be explicitly named, rather than letting the reader guess from the above paragraphs.

It would be best to finish with a few sentences presenting the layout of the rest of the paper.

Section 3, line 131: "online meetings were periodically organised" it would help readers better appreciate the scale of authors' efforts to be a little more precise. For instance, consider stating how many meetings in total / per Central Asian country, and over which time frame (e.g., number of months).

Discussion.

Line 410: "is" should be moved after "the contribution of local partners", not before.

Lines 413-414: “and demonstrate its applicability to this case-study” authors should reformulate what they mean here, probably in a separate sentence.

We thank the reviewer for his comments and suggestions, which improved a lot the manuscript. In particular, his comments were very helpful in identifying the novelty of the work and underlining it through the manuscript. Our main changes are summarized below with line numbers referring to the manuscript with tracking changes.

Following his advice, we included a sentence in the abstract, introduction and conclusions to clearly state the novelty of the work and how it contributes to advances regardless the study area:

- The abstract has been reshaped to focus more on the methodological contributions (in line with the paper) and less on the specific case study (lines 15-25).
- The final part of the introduction states the novelty of the approach emphasizing how it tackles the main challenges due to lack of data and dialogue with local scientific community and stakeholders (lines 72-84). The last sentences describe the outline of the paper to help the reader through it (lines 90-92).
- Conclusions were modified to emphasize the results from the methodological point of view (lines 500-503 and 506-507).

We applied the minor edits required to the text and provided more details on the periodic meetings organized with local partners, which are a total of 17, of which 7 specific for data collection and 10 developed during the organization of country-based exposure workshops (lines 148-156). The process of organizing workshops focused on each country and using local data facilitated the data collection process, as discussed here and in Peresan et al., (2023).

Finally, we clarified the sentence in line 413-414 explaining that the work developed here demonstrates that Ged4ALL can be used to develop regional-scale exposure datasets of critical infrastructures (lines 436-438).

We wish to thank the reviewer for his help in giving a broader perspective to our work and demonstrating its relevance for the academic community.