Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2019-104-RC1, 2020


Open Access
WIND ENERGY SCIENCE DISCUSSIONS

# *Interactive comment on* "Continued Results from a Field Campaign of Wake Steering Applied at a Commercial Wind Farm: Part 2" *by* Paul Fleming et al.

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 21 February 2020

This paper reports on a field test campaign for wake steering. Such field tests are vital to increase confidence in the usefulness of wake steering, while being difficult to design, and producing results which can be difficult to analyse conclusively. This campaign appears to have been well designed, and to have run for long enough to generate enough data to allow useful conclusions to be drawn. The paper presents a very clear description of the tests, of the analysis methods used, and the results obtained from the analysis, and is a valuable addition to the literature on this topic.

Although the paper is acceptable as it is, I have three minor comments to consider in any revision:



Section 6, page 11, line 10: the justification for the decision not to use T5 data in the South campaign is that the results are noisier (for credible reasons). It is important in any such analysis to demonstrate every effort to avoid unconscious bias that might result from such decisions, so it would be helpful to present some evidence to justify this decision.

Same page, line 12: typo: 'resimulations'.

Section 7.1, page 16, last line: the 'overall' figures for wake loss reduction in Table 2 are described as 'across all wind directions'. Is this an average across the bins, or an average weighted by the number of points in each bin?

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2019-104, 2020.