

Weather Clim. Dynam. Discuss., editor comment EC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-2021-35-EC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on wcd-2021-35

Johannes Dahl (Editor)

Editor comment on "Analysis of the Campinas tornado (Brazil) in June 2016: damage track, radar characteristics and lightning observations of the supercell" by Lucí Hidalgo Nunes et al., *Weather Clim. Dynam. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-2021-35-EC1>, 2021

The study presents a few synoptic observations as well as radar, lightning, and damage analyses pertaining to a nocturnal tornado in Brazil. While one of the reviewers supports publication after that reviewer's major comments have been addressed, the other reviewer highlights a large number of spots that warrant further analysis (e.g., the thermodynamic/kinematic environment of the storm is not addressed) or where statements are confusing/misleading; that reviewer also noted that no clear goal of the study has been stated. I agree with these observations, and I am not convinced that the scientific content of the present manuscript meets the standards of publication in a peer-reviewed journal focused on the dynamics of weather (and climate) phenomena. While readers generally benefit from case studies, the analysis ought to go beyond the mere presentation of observations (see here for some thoughts about how to write effective case studies: <https://www.ejssm.org/ojs/index.php/ejssm/article/view/66/72>). I am therefore hesitant to invite you to submit a revised version of your paper. Clearly, a major rewrite and further analyses would be required. But before reaching a final decision, I am awaiting your final author comments, where you are invited to address the reviewers' comments, without already preparing a revised version.