

Interactive comment on “Benefits of sub-component over full-scale blade testing elaborated on a trailing edge bond line design validation” by Malo Rosemeier et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 December 2017

The authors addressed some of the comments fairly, however, a few comments need to be addressed effectively.

The second and third comments about the literature review on sub-component testing should be addressed. The title of the paper is on sub-component testing but the paper lacks a rigorous literature review on this subject. The authors should improve the literature review so that a wide spectrum of the readers, specially the ones who are less familiar with the novel concept of the sub-component testing get engaged. Although the authors discussed a very specific type of subcomponent in their study, they should still include an exhaustive literature review and discuss the other methods that have

C1

been developed so far and elaborate on their advantages and shortcomings (at least look at the works by JF Mandell, F. Sayer, D. Zarouchas, ME Asl and G fernandez).

The fifth comment (supporting of the finding for sub-component testing) has not been addressed effectively. The authors have discussed the FFST and its respective stress ratios and testing time in detail, however, the SCT part lacks a rigorous discussion.

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2017-35>, 2017.

C2