

Interactive comment on “A performance assessment of the World Wide Lightning Location Network (WWLLN) via comparison with the Canadian Lightning Detection Network (CLDN)” by D. Abreu et al.

D. Dockendorff (Referee)

dave.dockendorff@rogers.com

Received and published: 24 June 2010

Pg 1869 "...Fig. 6 shows the detection efficiency of the WWLLN as a function of peak current (assuming that the CLDN detects all lightning events)..."

A figure depicting the calculated detection efficiency of the CLDN can be obtained from Environment Canada and could be used as an additional figure in this paper.

Pg 1871 "...it can be assumed that these are indeed valid lightning strokes that were missed by the CLDN since its efficiency is not 100%..."

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



This contradicts an earlier statement that the author assumes that the CLDN has a 100% detection efficiency. This statement also infers that the WWLLN detection efficiency is actually 100% which is not what one would expect. I suspect that the additional events detected by the WWLLN are either false alarms or echoes of events; i.e. one stroke being counted twice.

Pg 1880 Fig 1 The locations of the operational NLDN sensors should also be shown as their data is used to compute the CLDN lightning solutions.

Otherwise a good paper

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 3, 1861, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

