

2nd round of the review of the paper entitled

“Brief Communication: On the influence of vertical wind shear on the combined power output of two model wind turbines in yaw”

I would like to thank the authors for their efforts to address my and the other reviewer’s comments. However, I still have a few concerns regarding the experimental setup employed in this work, namely:

- Based on the response of the authors, the upstream turbine operates under constant loading (constant U_{FET}). As a result, TSR decreases with the yaw angle as shown in Fig. 1 of the response letter. This means that comparison of the turbine power production at different yaw angles can be questionable as turbines operate at different (not necessarily optimum) TSRs. This may not affect asymmetry in the power output reported in the manuscript. However, the results are indeed more reliable if, first, the value of the load corresponding to the optimal TSR is found for each yaw angle.
- Based on Fig. 2 in the response letter, the value of the turbulence intensity of Profile 2 at the turbine hub height level is more than two times of the one for Profile 1. Due to this significant difference in the turbulence level between Profiles 1 & 2, the wake of the upstream turbine can have a totally different recovery rate depending on the incoming profile. This in turn affects the power production of the downstream turbine. One has to therefore compare the power output for Profiles 1 and 2 with caution.
- In response to the other reviewer, the authors acknowledged that the incoming boundary layers are not fully developed. I think it is useful if the authors mention this limitation in the manuscript with more quantitative information (e.g., variation of velocity in the streamwise direction without the presence of the turbines). This helps readers to bear this limitation in mind when they try to interpret the presented results.

Minor comments:

- Please update the caption of Fig. 2 in the manuscript, following the changes made in this figure.

Overall, I think the paper is well written and it is worth of publication. However, the above-mentioned limitations should be first addressed, or at least they have to be clearly stated in the manuscript for the sake of completeness.