

Title: Observations for high-impact weather and their use in verification

Authors: Chiara Marsigli, Elizabeth Ebert, Raghavendra Ashrit, Barbara Casati, Jing Chen, Caio A. S. Coelho, Manfred Dorninger, Eric Gilleland, Thomas Haiden, Stephanie Landman, Marion Mittermaier

Journal: Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences

General comments

The manuscript presents a very interesting issue, which is a current main topic of interest in the verification processes around the World. The text is well-written and the language is clear. I have only some comments about general aspects:

- It is difficult for the reader understanding the link of the two selected phenomena: thunderstorms and fog. The objectives, the products and many other points are very different. If this was the main objective (to show the differences), I think that you should clarify and make a shorter text presenting the different products used for analyzing the results.
- Some of the products are very well presented but, on the contrary, other ones do not. I encourage you to make an exercise of making "uniform" them.
- One of the main differences between the products is the number of references. Some of the cases present some references and other ones only one. Having in mind that most of the presented issues have been largely studied and are easily found in the bibliography, I think that you should include more references in the poor cases
- About the lightning data, what about the lightning jump?