- *A recommendation to the authors is that in 5.3 the edgewise loads could be also checked. Usually, edgewise loads increase faster that flapwise loads when stall induced vibrations take place as the yaw angle increases. In -/+15deg yaw case some mild separation of the flow over the blades is expected (it is seen in the AoA results presented by the authors). Therefore the lower AoA predicted by the NW model will retard stall and probably push high edgewise loads to higher yaw angles. Could that be the case?*
    - We will include some edgewise loads in the revised article. In the yaw angle range between -15 and 15 degrees the observations are very similar to those for the flapwise loads. At higher yaw errors edgewise vibrations start to occur.
- *It would be also interesting to check how big is the effect of the new model on idling speed results (if any).*
    - There is a small effect on idling speeds. HAWC2 NW predicts slightly lower idling speeds than HAWC2, which is consistent with the lower flapwise loading for the pitched out blades. We will include a figure in the revised version of the article.

From PDF

- *Page 2: At this point you can add that large dynamic variations with 1P frequency are also caused by nacelle tilting and wind yaw/inclination. Even a small yaw/inclination angle is directly translated to AoA variation in the absence of rotational component.*
    - Thank you for the suggestion, this plays an important role for the idling investigations. We will include this sentence in the revised article: 'In idling conditions a yaw error, as well as nacelle tilt and wind inclination, is directly translated to AOA variations as the blades rotate slowly.'
- *Page 2: This sentence is too long. You can consider re-phrasing or splitting into two: In order to save computation time, the decreasing induction due to a vortex element trailed at a certain position evaluated at a blade section as it moves away from the blade is approximated using two exponential functions.*
    - The sentence will be replace by: 'The induced velocity at a blade section due to a trailed vortex element is decreasing as that vortex element moves away from the blade. This decreasing induction is approximated by exponential functions.'
- *Page 9: Although I understand what you mean, I don't think this part will be perfectly clear to all readers. Perhaps you could re-phrase it. What you probably mean is that the loop predicted by HAWC2 (without NW model) corresponds to higher AoA in deeper stall conditions and that's why the slope of the loop is lower and the loop is wider. Also I don't quite understand the last sentence. "Thus the offset in the mean value is unexpected"*
    - In the revised version of the article, these sentences will be replaced by: At the 80% station for example HAWC2 NW predicts the slight loop opening due to beginning separation that is seen in the measurements. The HAWC2 computations show a cn-gradient and loop opening that is characteristic of a too large mean AOA. This observation is in conflict with the comparison of the steady state cn in Figure 4. There, the larger values predicted by HAWC2 results

    - are in better agreement with the experimental data at the 80% section than the HAWC2 NW results.
- *Page 9: The local increase of Cn at high AoA in the 63% radial position is due to a leading edge vortex formation. Since your dynamic stall model does not account for LE vortex effect it is expected that you cannot predict this overshoot. I think that the high reduced frequency in this case justifies the appearance of a LE vortex. The local increase of Cn at the end of the upstroke is very typical of the behaviour of Cn when such LE vortex is released. The same but to a lesser extend appears in 47% and 80% radial positions. You could add a comment about that.*
    - The revised article will include the following sentences: ' However, the local increase of c_n at high AOA in the measurements at the 63% section appears to be due to leading edge vortex formation. This effect is not included in the dynamic stall modeling, therefore this overshoot of c_n can not be predicted by HAWC2. To a lesser extent, the same effect can be seen at the 47 % and 80% stations.'
- *Page 9: But it is fair to note that at higher AoA the same will happen also with the NW model because this is a deficiency of the dynamic stall model. It is mentioned in the conclusions part. Perhaps it should be also explained herein.*
    - The revised article will contain the following sentence: However, the narrowing dynamic stall loops are just delayed towards higher geometric AOA.The underlying issue, that the dynamic stall model is not suited for deep stall conditions, remains.
- *Page 19: Standstill vibrations are usually stall driven. I could not easily think of any other reason that could trigger vibrations especially in attached flow. Is it classical flutter that you have in mind?*
    - Edgewise vibrations parallel to the inflow might have a very low or negative aerodynamic damping even when the lift gradient is positive, especially if the wing is very flexible and there is also a torsional component present. But also for stall driven vibrations the modeling might make a difference since the trailed vorticity might lead to lower angles of attack and thus avoid stalled sections on the blade. Also classical flutter might be an issue for very flexible blades at very high wind.

- We will incorporate all the other minor suggestions concerning phrasing and wording in the revised article.