Bangladesh's electricity network, though expanding quickly, remains structurally vulnerable to tropical cyclones. The extent to which these storms disrupt power system operations has not been comprehensively assessed. This study integrates daily electricity demand records from the country's nine power zones with meteorological and hazard datasets spanning the past decade. Findings indicate that cyclones making landfall reduce national electricity supply by an average of 20%, with coastal regions suffering the most—experiencing losses of up to 38%. Case analyses reveal that outages are primarily driven by strong winds, storm surges, and intense rainfall. Although Bangladesh supplements its energy security through power imports from West Bengal, India, the results show that cyclone-induced disruptions often occur simultaneously across both areas, diminishing the effectiveness of cross-border power support. The study underscores the urgency of sustained investment in climate-resilient energy systems and adaptive strategies to address the increasing severity of such extreme weather events under a changing climate. I would suggest the authors to revise the article by considering the following feedback.

Abstract: The methodology of this study is not much clear in the abstract. I would suggest to make it more explicit.

I was trying to read this section with interest, but I missed to read those recent changes and following publication on coastal region of Bangladesh.

1. Change in cyclone disaster vulnerability and response in coastal Bangladesh.
2. Factors affecting cyclone disasters death in Bangladesh

The analytical framework would benefit from greater methodological integration between the hazard and energy components. The authors present these analyses in largely parallel sections—examining meteorological intensity, storm surges, and rainfall separately from the demand-side impacts—without sufficiently articulating how these dimensions are combined quantitatively. The causal links between specific hazard metrics (e.g., wind speed, surge height, or accumulated rainfall) and observed demand reductions remain more descriptive than analytical. A more explicit coupling—through correlation analysis, regression modelling, or joint risk mapping—would strengthen the inference that particular hazard mechanisms drive grid disruptions.

Additionally, while the cross-border energy trade with India is discussed insightfully, the statistical treatment of correlated impacts could be deepened by using synchronized event analyses or network resilience modelling. The use of daily data, while pragmatic, also limits temporal precision in understanding outage onset and recovery dynamics. I am curious whether the authors could draw connections to Bhasan Char, an island located in the Bay of Bengal, Bangladesh, where solar energy is extensively utilized and has shown comparatively higher resilience during cyclone-induced disruptions.

Overall, the study makes a significant empirical contribution.