

Review of “On the self-similarity of wind turbine wakes in complex terrain using large-eddy simulation”, by A. S. Dar, J. Berg, N. Troldborg, E. G. Patton

The authors have responded to some of the comments raised previously but not all. As noted below, the responses in the response letter do not match with the revised manuscript. It may be that the authors uploaded the wrong file. The outstanding issues are quite minor, but I think they would improve readability of this paper for future readers.

1. **On response to “Major Issue 2”:** The authors have responded to my question raised in ‘Major Issue 2’, but (unless I have missed them) haven’t made any changes to the manuscript. So, from the manuscript, it still isn’t clear in which horizontal and vertical planes the self-similarity is being evaluated. Please include this information in the manuscript so as to help future readers.
2. **On response to “Major Issue 3”:** I do not see a Figure 16(b) in the revised manuscript. Did the authors mean Figure 15(b) in their response?
3. **On response to “Minor Issue 1”:** The authors claim to have added a reference here, but in fact I don’t see it in the revised paper.
4. **On response to “Minor Issue 10”:** The authors mention that the value of u_h has been written in Section 4, but I again cannot find it in Section 4 of their revised manuscript.
5. **On response to “Minor Issue 11”:** The authors have claimed to have mentioned grid sizes of the cases shown in Fig. 5, but I do not see it in the caption or in the text accompanying Fig. 5. I understand that this information is mentioned in Table 1. But there are three cases labeled ‘Steep’ in Table 1, and it is unclear which of these is depicted in Fig. 5.
6. **On response to “Minor Issue 15”:** If the differences between velocity deficits are caused by the normalization, the values used for normalization should be mentioned. Going back to point 4 above, I could not find the reference velocities u_h anywhere in the manuscript or in Section 4 as the authors claimed in their response.
7. **On response to “Minor Issue 16”:** The authors refer to an additional figure in their response, but I do not see an additional figure in their manuscript.