

Reviewer 1

The paper is dedicated to the description of the construction and structure of a global database of lightning-ignited wildfire (LIW) holdover times collected from a large number of studies during the last century in different regions. The investigation of LIWs characteristics, especially on the background of global climate change is a topic of highly relevance and interest. Moreover, this database is the first freely available and usable in its current format. Since this data set is the first one and unique, it is probably incomplete, but it can be assumed that it will be constantly updated in the future, of course. Even now, the database on holdover has diverse potential applications. This database undoubtedly may become a significant data source for researchers interested in studying LIWs.

We would like to thank the reviewer for the positive comments.

However, I have some points that are unclear for me.

1. May be, it is worth to exclude Table 3 and Table 4 from the text? They are already presented in the database. Or if the authors want to provide an example of data, probably it will be better to make the Tables shorter? However, this is just a suggestion, it is on the authors' decision.

We included Tables 3 and 4 because we want to give a good overview of the database to the readers of the paper, especially with Table 3. We think that some readers may find more reasons to download the database if some information provided in these tables is of interest for them. Therefore, we prefer to keep these two tables.

We thought carefully about what information to show in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 is on the long side (43 rows), yet it should still fit on one page in the published final version. Table 4 only contains ten rows and can easily be included in the manuscript.

2. What concerns Table 4, as I understood non-censored data also could be derived from the censored data? For what purposes non-censored data are provided (in Table 4 and in the database, in general)? Moreover, non-censored data are not discussed and analyzed in the text. How one can use them?

Non-censored data (summarized in Table 4) cannot be derived from censored data (summarized in Table 3); however, the opposite is true. As explained on Lines 134-135 of the manuscript, non-censored data refer to estimated values of continuous holdover time (i.e. the exact estimated value of holdover time for each single LIW); for example, 1.55 hours is a non-censored value of a holdover time. We can bin these continuous values of holdover time in interval classes (e.g. a histogram) to obtain censored data. Nine censored datasets in our database were derived from the non-censored datasets, as we pointed out on Lines 135-136 of the manuscript.

We believe that both non-censored and censored data may be of interest to the research community, yet fewer non-censored datasets exist. We obtained 42 datasets of censored data versus only 9 datasets of non-censored data. Thus, the manuscript has a strong focus on censored data given that the current version of the database relies heavily on frequency distributions. Nonetheless, for some applications, non-censored data (continuous values) may be preferred over censored data (frequency distributions). We want to give to users of the database the opportunity to work with the datasets as they see this fit

for their applications. Furthermore, we hope to add more non-censored datasets to the database in the future.

In general, the article is well structured and clear, the language consistent and precise. The article is appropriate to support the publication of a data set.

Best regards

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript.