

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



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.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

