

Interactive comment on “50 years return period wet-snow load estimation based on weather station data for overhead line design purpose” by H. Ducloux and B. E. Nygaard

H. Ducloux and B. E. Nygaard

herve.ducloux@rte-france.com

Received and published: 8 October 2014

We would like to thank referee #2 for the time spent reviewing our paper.

Unfortunately, that review does not help us to improve our initial text for the five following reasons:

1. Rule n°7 of the "General obligations for referees" (Referees should explain and support their judgments adequately so that editors and authors may understand the basis of their comments) has not been respected.
2. Negative comments on another paper (Nygaard et al. 2013), already reviewed and C2235

published in another world-renowned journal, have been made.

3. Comments on basic probabilistic or statistical issues are erroneous.
4. Other comments show a lack of comprehension of the text.
5. The final comment (conclusion) is very difficult to understand.

Moreover, there is not a single comment on one of the most important aspects of the paper: the description of the accretion model and its parameterization.

Please see the attached supplement for more details.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C2235/2014/nhessd-2-C2235-2014-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 5139, 2014.