



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Sensitivity and evaluation of current fire risk and future projections due to climate change: the case study of Greece” by A. Karali et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 December 2013

IN MY OPINION, THIS PAPER PRESENTS A MAJOR METHODOLOGICAL ERROR. IT DOES NOT CALCULATE THE FWI FIRE DANGER RATING CLASSES ACCORDING TO THE STANDARD CANADIAN METHODOLOGY, BASED SOLELY ON FIRE FREQUENCY AND THEY PROVIDE FWI THRESHOLD VALUES THAT ARE UNREALISTIC. THE AUTHORS IGNORED A SIMILAR WORK PUBLISHED BY DIMITRAKOPOULOS ET AL.(2011, METEOROLOGICAL APPLICATIONS 18:83-93)WHERE THE FIRE DANGER CLASSES ARE TOTALLY DIFFERENT (0-38 LOW, 39-48 MODERATE, 49-59 HIGH, >60 EXTREME). USING FIRE OCCURENCE DATA AND FWI METHODOLOGY FORE FIRE DANGER THRESHOLD VALUES (ALEXAN-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



DER ET AL. 1996) YOU COME UP WITH DIFFERENT RESULTS. INSTEAD, IN MY OPINION, THE AUTHORS USED THEIR OWN METHODOLOGY (UNSUBSTANTIATED BY COMMON LITERATURE, AS FAR AS I KNOW) TO COME UP WITH THRESHOLD VALUES THAT MUST BE, AT LEAST, REASSESSED. AS IS, IN MY OPINION, THE PAPER CANNOT BE PUBLISHED BECAUSE THE FWI FIRE THRESHOLD VALUES NEED TO BE RECALCULATED WITH THE SAME METHODOLOGY THAT THE CFFDRS CREATORS AND USERS PROPOSE.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 4777, 2013.

NHESSD

1, C1652–C1653, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1653

