

The study integrates cyclone impacts with energy demand data — relevant and regionally novel. However, the **novelty statement** should be clearer and distinguished from prior cyclone–energy studies.

Major comments:

1. Daily demand data may mix physical outages and load-shedding. Provide **uncertainty bounds** or a brief **sensitivity test** to confirm attribution.
2. Include quantitative details (wind speed, surge, rainfall) for each event and test the relation between cyclone intensity and demand loss.
3. The India–Bangladesh power-sharing section needs quantitative support—e.g., frequency or MW impact of synchronized dips.
4. Adaptation options are strong but could be ranked by vulnerability or summarized in a schematic table for clarity.

Minor comments:

1. Abstract: Add numbers for average and maximum power losses.
2. Figures: Clarify units, improve color contrast.
3. Methods: Briefly mention missing-data handling and smoothing approach.
4. Reference: Add one or two regional energy policy sources.
5. Maintain consistency in “met demand” terminology.

Overall, the study is good, but improvements in quantitative precision, clarity, and uncertainty reduction are needed before acceptance.