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This manuscript is very interesting and on an important topic of earthquake vulnerability assessment in one of the most vulnerable regions of the Indian Himalayas. The topic has high significance and the approaches used are good. Though well written there are some typos in the paper that need to be corrected. However, it may help the authors to improve the manuscript by considering my following comments and suggestions:

- The authors have provided useful information about the past destructive earthquakes in the region in a tabular form. Despite such a long history of destructive earthquakes, the authors claim that people don't follow the building codes and plans which is hard to believe. The authors should provide information about urban/city planning of the region and why these are ineffective (in the Study area section) and state briefly how findings from this research might help to build better earthquake-safe master plan for the city (in the Conclusion section)
- The authors have used two methods; AHP for assigning weights and MCA-based TOPSIS for ranking wards based on the best alternatives. The integration of the outcome from these two methods is not very clear and needs to be elaborated further in the methods section.
- The authors have, at a few places in the paper, briefly talked about the virtues of the traditional wooden earthquake-resistant construction practices in the city but have not really provided any details about these traditional buildings and how these are considered earthquake resistant. It would add value to the manuscript if a section is added in the paper on these traditional and now abandoned construction types
- The authors have not included socio-economic vulnerability in this paper and intend to do that as separate research, however, it would be helpful to the readers if the authors can provide a brief general overview of the SE vulnerability in this paper.