

## ***Interactive comment on “Probabilistic forecasting of wind power production losses in cold climates: A case study” by Jennie P. Söderman et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 7 April 2018

General comments 1. First of all I would like to state that it is an important subject with a clear application and obvious benefits. 2. How much new stuff is offered here? Neighbourhood method was suggested by Mittermaier [2014] but perhaps not applied. Using ensembles for short-term prediction of icing: To my knowledge this is new. 3. It is a weakness that only a very short time period studied: 2 sites in 2 weeks. One site has two icing events; the other one. So all in all the authors are presenting and discussing three (3) icing events and comparing those with an ensembles modelling. This is a somewhat weak evidence. 4. There is a short discussion at the end of paper. However, in order to judge the practical feasibility of using ensembles for ice prediction I miss more details on the calculations e.g. time elapsed for model runs and a discussion of whether it is feasible using the present approach or is likely to become feasible using

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



input from National weather services. By feasible I am thinking on feasible for owners of wind farms to e.g. obtain that service from specialized consultants.

Detailed comments 5. On page 8 15 10 sites are mentioned, What happened to the 8 remaining? I miss a reason for eliminating these 8 sites 6. The neighbourhood principle is based on either following the landscape or using same height. I suppose you know where the sites are and might have added a short (anonymized) description of the landscape without revealing the location of the site? 7. Effect curve is termed power curve by many in the wind community. 8. It is not clearly stated whether de-icing equipment is included for the turbines studied.

Technical corrections 9. Figures are generally too small especially figures 4 to 10. 10. The choice of colour of the individual curves makes it hard to distinguish the curves especially figs 6, 9 and 11

---

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2017-28>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

