Thank you for your work in developing the European windstorm dataset based on ERA5 reanalysis.

This work lacks a good motivation for their study as providing windstorm track data from already existing ERA5 reanalysis data for insurance and risk management industry is not an innovation. Not sure why authors did not come up with strong objectives that should result in a journal paper. The authors mentioned, "The objective of this innovation is to promote a knowledge-based assessment of the nature ...," which clearly is vague. The overall paper is written inadequately and hard to follow the style.

In line 55, authors used words, such as "innovation" which I would rather avoid using such words or phrasing without claiming any notable innovation.

The conclusion section is more geared towards "summary and conclusions." Please take care of it.

Authors said, "The choice of the tracking algorithm is shown to be an important factor in the decision-making process, as it results in non-negligible uncertainties in main windstorm statistics," I would suggest that adding a quantifiable result that can really show if it is an important factor or not.

The font sizes of axes, ticks, titles, captions, etc. are non-uniform in most of the figures. Same goes for colorbar as well. Please be sure to make them uniform. The figure resolution needs to be enhanced for better readability as they appear to be of low resolution in the current version of the manuscript. In addition, some of the figure captions are inadequately written without adequate sub-plot numbers, such as a, b, c, etc. for the reader. Make sure to provide numbering to all sub-plots and be consistent with the results and discussions provided.