

Interactive comment on “Review Article: A comprehensive review of datasets and methodologies employed to produce thunderstorm climatologies” by Leah Hayward et al.

Tomeu Rigo (Referee)

tomeu.rigo@gencat.cat

Received and published: 12 March 2020

General comments

The manuscript presents different a state-of-art of different ways of developing a systematic data base of episodes of thunderstorms, dividing the methodologies in three main groups: thunderstorm frequency, thunderstorm tracking or lightning flash density. The authors show the main advantages and disadvantages of each technique.

Although the idea of the work results interesting, there is a lack of coherence in the style

C1

of the manuscript as a scientific publication. For instance, I can't find the motivation or the goal that leads to start the research. This is basic, because it helps to define the path that you choose along your research. What I mean is that if you want to present some type of methodologies, you need to clarify if the purpose of each one fits to your necessities, and which are the main disadvantages. And this is not appearing in any place of your manuscript.

Please, rewrite this condition and adapt all the rest of the manuscript to your necessities.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-25>, 2020.

C2