

Answers to reviewer 1:

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.

We agree that with larger sensor baselines the DE (flash DE and stroke DE) is generally reduced. The analyses in the companion paper are based on flashes because flash DE is not as sensitive to network performance and especially larger sensor baselines as stroke DE. Using a reasonable multiplicity distribution it was shown by [Schulz *et al.*, 2014] that in the region of high flash DE a change of stroke DE of ~30% only results in a ~10% change of flash DE. Due to the reason that we do not expect such a high variation of stroke DE inside the EUCLID network and inside the area of analyses we think that the statement below is correct. Thanks for the important point - we will discuss this in the paper.

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 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).

We agree and will add some sentences in the introduction.

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

References:

Schulz, W., S. Pedeboy, and M. M. F. Saba (2014), LLS Detection Efficiency of Ground Strike Points, in *Lightning Protection (ICLP), 2014 International Conference on*, pp. 381–384.