

Interactive comment on “Linking critical infrastructure resilience to social vulnerability through minimum supply concepts: review of gaps and development of an integrative framework” by Matthias Garschagen and Simone Sandholz

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 December 2017

In their paper the authors address the very relevant interrelation between critical infrastructures, social vulnerability and minimum supply. They conduct a comprehensive literature review of science and policy documents and provide an analysis of the literature along these three dimensions. Based on this analysis they identify current gaps and present a future agenda for science and practise. Their paper is well structured and written and provides a very good overview of the current literature.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



There are only some minor, mostly technical comments:

Page 3, line 3: The paper sets out examine -> The paper examines

Page 3, line 7: the paper develops and novel -> the paper develops a novel

Page 3, line 7: to help structure -> help to structure or help structuring

Page 3, line 11: why is the abbreviation CI introduced so late in the paper?

Page 3, line 14: science, practise and policy has -> science, practise and policy have

Page 3, line 19: Figure1 -> Figure 1

Page 5, line 9: Cutter 2016), and -> delete comma

Page 7, line 13: recommend private equipment of necessary medical equipment -> rephrase

Page 7, line 14: outages However -> outages. However

Page 8, line 10: the vulnerability to CI failures of the population at large -> the vulnerability of the population at large to CI failures (maybe easier to understand).

Please add an Acknowledgement section at the end of the paper where you include the "BMBF Fördernummer" and the name of the (sub)project

As additional side note: It would be nice to have a structured comparison table where the (found) references are linked to chosen (to be defined) subcategories. This will help the reader to identify relevant literature on specific sub topics more easily. Having everything just in the text is possible, but one or two overview table will improve the readability.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-375>, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)