

Response to Reviewers' Comments

We would like to sincerely thank the editor and reviewers for their valuable comments that helped significantly improve the manuscript. Below response, and corrections to the comments are given:

Rev.	Comm.	Reviewer comment	Response	Location in the corrected manuscript
E	1	Particularly the review of the state of the art needs to be improved. There are few references - about 20 are recommended - to prove that there is a discussion on the matter.	We have improved the literature review by adding more references	Introduction section, Lines 81-82
	2	Also, and especially related to the short list of references, there are many self-citations.	Two self-citations was removed.	All text
	3	The discussion part also needs to be extended in order to proper support the conclusions. This applies to comments on the figures and tables in particular.	New analyses are now included with additional discussion regarding the 50-year wind speed, which is the most important for the design of new structures.	Section 4
1	1	Bibliography almost absent...Two references ([3], [4]) appear in the abstract that are unexplained;	We have improved the literature review by adding more references. The references [3] and [4] were removed from the text	Abstract, Introduction section, Lines 81-82
	2	-Little attention to details (uppercase and lowercase letters like r.31 "Section"), as well as a sometimes inaccurate use of English (i.e. r.102 "Strong and intense winds are the two types of winds into which it is classified") and a level of writing that is sometimes inappropriate for a scientific article (r.53 "And the authors of this paper are opposed to this proposal. We do not have tropical storms in Poland, so the name hurricane should be not used");	The manuscript is now proof-read	All text
	3	section 4: understandable but written in a very concise way, with the data and calculations reported in the text creating confusion;	Section 4 is now rewritten including data used for the analyses, and calculations using BM and POT methods	Section 4
	4	section 5: how were tables 1 and 2 produced? the section should contain the innovative and publication-	To create Table 1 and Table 2 the estimation developed by the IMWM, by Lorenc, by Fujita	Lines 151-159

		worthy aspect of the work, which is missing or not highlighted by the authors. Furthermore, the tables are reported with the wrong numbering in the text.	(F-Scale), and by Mehta (EF - Scale) were taken into account. Additionally, the author's observation of the wind damage was considered. Lines 151-159 have been rewritten to clarify this matter. The numbering is now corrected	
	5	section 6: does it make sense to insert a section for the reported content? The idea of inserting the procedure is good, but how are the contents of the paper and ISO 1382 connected? Nothing is explained...Furthermore, the idea included in the abstract on the future construction of structures in Poland, for which studies of this type are needed, is also interesting, but it is not at all detailed in the paper.	Section 6 has been now removed	-
2	1	you should use block maxima (BM) or peak-over-threshold (POT) method for extreme winds	The analyses using BM and POT methods are now included in the paper	Section 4.3 and 4.4