

**Interactive comment on “A methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events from convective origin” by Oriol Rodríguez et al.**

**Reply to Anonymous Referee #2**

We thank Anonymous Referee #2 for reviewing our manuscript “A methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events from convective origin”. We believe that the comments provided help to reconsider the structure of the text and improve the clarity of some aspects of the manuscript. We provide an item-by-item reply below:

The submitted manuscript is based on very important work, but the manuscript itself is not ready for publication. I thank the authors for taking this step, and I value their wish to contribute to a proper standardization of working methods.

- (1) My suggestion is to write a more focused and condensed paper on the methodology. Details on practical approaches and case examples could be added separately as an attachment file.

Reply: Thank you for your constructive suggestion. According to this comment and Referee #3, in the new manuscript version we will provide, as an example, a set of deliverables (KML file, table and text summary) of one case study as supplementary material, with the aim to better illustrate the results of the damage survey assessment. We will also be more focused on the methodology and the discussion, although we think that some practical approaches that need to be taken into account should be mentioned in the main text.

- (2) Literature search shows that in this journal only last year important aspects of this topic were discussed in the following paper, namely "(2) to propose a repeatable working method for assessing damage and reconstructing the path and magnitude of local windstorm and tornado cases": 04 Jun 2018 A forensic re-analysis of one of the deadliest European tornadoes Alois M. Holzer, Thomas M. E. Schreiner, and Tomáš Púčik Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 18, 1555–1565, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-1555-2018>, 2018. In the submitted manuscript there is no reference to this work or no discussion about the previously proposed working method in comparison to the newly proposed one. Such comparison or discussion could help make a newly submitted version useful for the severe storms community, and I therefore encourage the authors to submit such a more streamlined paper.

Reply: thanks for considering this valuable reference. We agree completely on the interest of comparing both methodologies. Although in Holzer *et al.* (2018) a historical event is analysed, there are some similarities in how to proceed to collect and present data from recent events after carrying out an in-situ damage survey. In that paper, it is commented the importance of visiting the affected area as soon as possible to avoid the alteration of the scenario due to cleaning service tasks. They also propose to build up a database with DI and DoD for each damage object, whereas we propound to compliment it with in-situ measurements as weight, wind-borne distance of debris, and a description of previous weaknesses that could magnify damage. Moreover, in case of damaged trees, we also recommend to

measure trunk diameter (if snapped) to enhance the intensity rating, despite the difficulties of applying the EF-scale out of the United States. We also propose to record tree fallen direction (if uprooted); which is potentially useful to try to estimate which phenomenon affected the area in case of lack of direct witnesses or recorded images. They also mention the necessity to standardize tornado intensity throughout the world. The method for geo-reference photos of damage explained in [Holzer \*et al.\* \(2018\)](#) is similar to our proposal. In both cases, the objective is to estimate the location and direction where the author took the photo. In the corrected version of the paper we will develop these ideas comparing our proposal with that presented in the reference given.