

## ***Interactive comment on* “Estimates of tropical cyclone geometry parameters based on best track data” by Kees Nederhoff et al.**

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 15 August 2019

General comments: This study proposed empirical relationships to estimate RMW and R35 based on BTD data. The results are promising since they compare better with QSCAT-R data than other approaches in the literature. TC geometry or radial wind fields are critical for TC damage estimate. In this sense, the study is useful and will be a good add to the TC hazard community. The manuscript is overall well-written and organized. However, some of the presentation can be improved and clarified, e.g., some figures and their captions.

Specific comments: 1. What is A1 in Table 1? It has not been defined and referred to. 2. How do the authors come up with the exponential function forms (Eq. 2 and 4)? 3. P8L1, the sentence starting with “a shape parameter...” is rather confusing to me. 4. P4L9, why  $\Delta_{AR35}$  contains less scatter? It is just the difference of R35

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



from RMW, right? If this is correct, it might imply a close connection between R35 and RMW. This can be mentioned and discussed. 5. References might need to be checked for the format requirement of the journal.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-119>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

