

The authors continue to improve the article, yet questions remain about the article's specific rationale and focus. The authors need to develop a clearer rationale and carry it through the entire article. The literature review primarily focuses infrastructure literature, arguing that it focuses mostly on "the analysis of a single infrastructure typology" and identifies SoS as a potential solution. I would expect the rest of the article to highlight this gap and then develop a solution. Yet the positioning and aims does not discuss this but instead focuses on general systems, their interconnections, and their need for a holistic assessment. Whether the article is about SoS and infrastructure interdependencies or a broader question of general systems the authors should revise these sections to build a more coherent argument for the article.

The authors then need to carry this into the methodology, either referencing or building on previous research to justify their approach. The methodology section overviews literature on graph theory before discussing concepts related to exposure, vulnerability, and resilience and how they might be represented in a graph. While this conceptual discussing is important for the remainder of the article, it is not referenced or imbedded in previous studies. Are the operationalizations outlined in this section new or do they build on work of others? Why are they worth looking at? Be explicit about why it's important to understand issues of exposure, vulnerability, and resilience, and if the concepts are new to this type of analysis say so. This discussion should reference literature and occur in both the literature review and the methodology section.

Finally, the discussion and final considerations should discuss how this study built on, challenged, and/or complemented previous research. What new does this study say? How is it similar or dissimilar to other studies? How does it support more informed DRR decision making (one of the aims identified by the authors). Again, the authors need to bring in and reference other studies, comparing their results to the results of others.

A few other minor comments:

1. tone down the opening statement of 'we live in an increasingly complex world'. Very difficult statement to provide and tangential to the study. Instead, say something like 'the world is complex' and then describe how it's complex. Easier to defend and aligns with the argument.
2. define resilience (paragraph starting on line 330). Resilience is a fraught and contested topic with a multitude of meanings (see e.g. Manyena 2006 'the concept of resilience revisited' as an example of the multitude of meanings). What do you mean by resilience? Is it about recovery and 'return to normal', ability to absorb shocks, the ability to transform in the face of adversity, or something else?
3. avoid the term 'natural disasters'. Hazards may be natural but disasters are not. Instead you can say 'disaster induced by natural hazard'. See <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2017/5/18/Natural-disasters-don-t-exist-but-natural-hazards-do.html>, and <https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/65974> and <https://www.nonaturaldisasters.com>