

Interactive comment on “The European lightning location system EUCLID – Part 1: Performance validation” by W. Schulz et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 23 October 2015

Comment 1: The authors' response is helpful. Although there are indirect ways to use measured LLS data to highlight regions with likely-poor flash DE, it is a complex issue and reasonably goes beyond the scope of this paper.

It would improve the accuracy of the paper if the authors at least made it more-explicit that there are regions of the network that have much longer sensor baselines (such as northeast Poland through the Baltics) where the flash DE is likely compromised.

The companion paper states: “Nevertheless, for the purpose of this study it can be assumed that from 2006 onward the improvements to the network in terms of flash detection efficiency and location accuracy will have minor influence on the outcome presented in the remainder of this paper.” The authors need to either “temper” this

C2107

statement in the companion paper (related to Baltics and similar places) or provide support for the quoted statement in this paper.

Comment 2: I wonder if the authors mean all recent publications “using video and tower observations for CG flashes”? For example, you do not discuss the LMA results, and there are probably other results reported by users of data for local networks that are part of Euclid. Therefore a few words clarifying the scope of this validation work needs to be added in the introduction (and possibly the abstract).

Comment 3: I am happy with the additions suggested by the authors

Comment 4: I accept that such work would be beyond the required scope of this paper

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 5325, 2015.

C2108