

Second Review of “A forensic re-analysis of the one of the deadliest tornadoes in European history”

I thank the authors for improving their manuscript by removing the weather information and focusing the purpose of the manuscript around the forensic re-analysis. (Note that this reviewer did not have any problem distinguishing a forensic re-analysis from reanalysis datasets.) This revision has helped tremendously with the readability of the manuscript.

I am, however, unhappy with their marked-up version of the manuscript explaining simply, “All comments by the referees were taken into account. The paper was improved in structure and clarity. English proofreading was performed.” and the manuscript highlighted with broad sweeping red comments. More specifics of the tracked changes from the original submission should be shown for the ease of the reviewers comparing to the original manuscript.

1. The authors have improved the English language somewhat, but it still requires more work. If this is to be done by the copyeditors of NHESS to some standard, then so be it. However, I want to impress upon the authors that before their manuscript is passed to the copyeditors it must pass the reviewers at least once. Reviewers struggling through poor language does not make for happy reviewers. Reviewers must be able to read and understand the manuscript. Failure to be clear and precise, regardless of whether the authors are nonnative English speakers or not, is not an acceptable excuse, in my opinion.

2. That being said, it is clear that more precise proofreading by the authors is necessary. Words and punctuation are inconsistently used throughout the manuscript. For example, sometimes “eyewitness” is one word (correct); sometimes it is spelled as two words (incorrect; p. 7, line 3). Sometimes quotes are normal; sometimes they are inverted (p. 8, line 3; p. 10, lines 6-7; p. 20, lines 4 and 12). Sometimes locations are in quotes (e.g., p. 7, lines 18, 23); other times they are not. Citations are used inconsistently (p. 1, lines 23-25; p. 9, line 7). Errors in an author’s last name have been made (e.g., p. 18, line 19). All of these errors are clearly not due to not being a native English speaker. Punctuation is improperly used (e.g., p. 5, line 20). These errors are due to the failure to adequately

proofread the manuscript before submission.

3. Title: The title is vague: “One of the deadliest tornadoes in European history” does not tell the reader anything (and is also verbose). How about adding the date and location of the tornado, such as **“A forensic re-analysis of the one of the deadliest European tornadoes: 10 July 1916, Wiener Neustadt, Austria.”**

4. The authors have an inconsistent use of “tornado” in this manuscript. Sometimes the manuscript refers to one tornado (as in the title). Other times reference is made to two tornadoes that merge to form the Wiener Neustadt tornado (p. 17, lines 23-24). Yet other times the tornadoes are considered a “plausible deduction” (p. 14, line 1). Given the uncertainty involved, more skepticism should be stated each time these two predecessors are discussed, rather than definitive statements. More clarity and consistency throughout the manuscript is required.

5. p. 1, line 27: The term “damage point” is used, but not defined. Please define it.

6. p. 1, line 25: “a study by” is not necessary. Delete it here, as well as other similarly unnecessary phrases throughout the manuscript.

7. p. 1, line 16: Should “was” be deleted?

8. p. 2, line 16: The authors misinterpret the findings of Antonescu et al. (2018). The number of fatalities is not “more than 1000 fatalities”. It is more correctly stated with the error bars included: “170–1696 fatalities” because the worst-case scenario could be as small as 170, depending on the assumptions that go into their model.

9. p. 2, line 24 is not a question, so it does not fit into the parallel structure of the rest of the items in that list.

10. p. 2, line 1: Is there any truly objective way to do this? I suggest deleting the word “objective”.

11. p. 6, line 4-5: Please rephrase “Keeping this physical nature in mind”,

which is unclear.

12. p. 17, line 23-24: In the summary, the manuscript reads that the tornadoes approached each other at 70° . As far as I can tell, this is the first that is mentioned of this fact (determined by searching the text for “70”), a fact that is presented visually in Fig. 2, but not specifically mentioned in the text. New facts should be discussed in the body of the text, not in the summary.

13. More specifically, what kind of weather phenomena would explain two tornadoes meeting at 70° angles and merging into a single violent tornado? Is there any historical precedent in the literature? More explanation that would help the reader understand the physical and plausible reasoning for this occurrence would be welcome. Otherwise,