Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2017-15-RC2, 2017
© Author(s) 2017. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.

eawe european academy of wind energy
Open Access WIND ENERGY SCIENCE DISCUSSIONS

Interactive comment on "Progressive Damage Modeling of Fiberglass/Epoxy Composites with Manufacturing Induced Waves Common to Wind Turbine Blades" *by* Jared W. Nelson et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 6 June 2017

Overall, the writing is appreciated and the work contributes to a relevant area, however significant revisions should be made to the reporting of the work prior to being acceptable for publication.

The abstract should be rewritten with a more specific focus on the stated goal / hypothesis of the work and the conclusions clearly stated.

The introduction does not give proper credit to other research ongoing in the field and a more extensive literature review should be performed.

Boundary conditions of the models are not discussed yet are necessary for comparison to any experimental data, as well as for replication of the study.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

CC BY

There is no discussion of the test which is performed for validation. This should at least be touched on so it can be discussed within the context of the paper. I'm not sure what is being "compared" in figure 6. There is no scales or legends, and no actual data is shown for the experimental results. Perhaps this figure could be augmented to more clearly demonstrate what the author is trying to discuss.

No results are shown of testing other than the IP wave model. How did the other models compare with respect to OP models. No data is really talked about with respect to Porosity. If no models were run, why discuss it? If so, discuss the results.

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2017-15, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

CC BY