

Interactive comment on “A reconstruction of the August 1st 1674 thunderstorms over Holland” by Gerard van der Schrier and Rob Groenland

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 October 2016

OVERALL

The paper is nicely structured, logical and sequential. This is an interesting and well-researched contribution BUT it really does need some attention to presentation. I shrink from being too critical of authors writing in a language other than their own. However the style requires attention as it often reads rather, shall we say, oddly. Moreover the text is littered with typos too abundant to list. Can the authors please attend to this.

Try also please to avoid 2 and 3 lines paragraphs. The style is not good and breaks the text too much.

I have no dispute with the science or methods employed, all of which are more than adequate and suitable.

C1

ABSTRACT

Good, and apart from my general points on clarity, style etc. noted above it needs no changes

INTRODUCTION

Ditto

SECTION 2

p.4, line 13. From whom is this ‘personal communication’?

SECTION 3

Section 3.2 begins to get a bit technical and a couple of citations to refer the reader to fuller explanations of the processes might be helpful.

SECTION 4

Section 4.1 might be a shade too long and would benefit from shortening. It’s interesting but becomes a bit of a litany of reported disasters. I know why this evidence base is included, but some brevity might be in order.

Section 4.3 It would help to have a little (no more) justification for using the Finland series as the basis for the estimation of the return period. After all, it’s in another part of Europe some distance from the Netherlands.

p.9, line 19 104 (10,000) or 103 (1000)? See your final line on p.12 where you state a return period of 1000 years.

MY RECOMMENDATION

Publish subject to minor revisions as noted above.

I hope my comments are of value to the authors.

C2

