

Journal: NHESS

Title: **A methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events from convective origin**

Author(s): Rodríguez et al.

MS No.: nhe-2019-294

MS Type: Research Article

Iteration: Third Review

I thank the authors for the further efforts made to develop the manuscript. I think it has improved a lot, with respect to the first and previous version, and is now suitable for publication in NHESS, after some minor revision to the text and a revision of section 1.

Indeed, I think that this section still represents a weakness of the manuscript, being confused, bad structured and with many repetitions, probably because of authors willingness to address all the comments made by reviewers on the need to better explain the objective of the paper with respect to the current state of art. I strongly encourage the authors to review this section; particularly, lines from 45 to 60 are really bad connected with the other contents and should be moved to a dedicated section or sub-section.

Finally, I think authors should put more efforts to justify uncertainty bands in table 1. The given answer "We may did not expressed in the exact way what these errors mean" is not acceptable.

Specific comments

Pg. 1 line 32 "The systematic elaboration of post-event forensic in-situ field surveys" → consider rephrasing; I guess in-situ and field are synonymies

Pg. 4 line 113 " Secondly, the in-situ fieldwork tasks, which include direct gathering of man-made structure and vegetation damage information, and also direct witness experiences" → please, check. I think the verb is missing

Pg. 4 line 114 "Finally, post in-situ damage assessment tasks, which involve ordering and organising all the information collected into three deliverables " → please, check. I think the verb is missing

Pg. 5 line 129 "i.e., extended at least 50% the distance between the cloud base and surface" → what is it? A feature of available data? A requirement? Not clear, please specify

Pg. 5 line 146-149 → considering moving this before line 129 to be coherent with Figure 2

Pg. 7 line 222 "As mentioned in Sect. 1 the maximum wind field (direction and intensity) associated with a strong-convective wind event can be approximately derived from the fallen trees pattern" → this discussion is not present anymore in section 1, please correct

Pg. 10 line 310 "together with a brief explanation from the initial information gathered before starting the damage survey" → replace "from" with "of"

Pg. 13 line 393 "to perform this kind of studies it may be necessary more detailed information" → for example?

Pg. 13 line 403 "This information is extremely valuable to analyse the impact of tornadoes in different scenarios and future projections" → please, expand this concept more, e.g. with some examples

Figure 2 → the location of the process “ Contact with local authorities and emergency services” is not coherent with the main text, please amend the figure or the text (see previous comment)

Figure 2 → I would change the description of the starting point with “detection of an event”

Table 2, caption “Dragged distance, direction and weight of wind-borne debris should be measured.” → please, indicate when these actions must be performed to be coherent with the remaining description