

Dear authors,

Thank you very much for the modifications done to your manuscript and taking into account all of my comments. In my opinion it has improved a lot and shows a very interesting application and nice results. Despite the enormous improvement, I still have some (minor) comments left.

- Abstract: At the end of the abstract, you might want to mention you reduced the amount of data by 50% instead of just referring to a reduction.
- Figure 1: there seem to be an error in the graph: shouldn't the most left block say "Eight months" instead of "Partial load"?
- General comment about the results: Although it is a big improvement to include the results, some thought might be giving to the visualisation of them. In my opinion, the tables can be made more compact and therefore easier to compare if the different parameters are given in the columns and the different statistics in the rows for example. Then in each cell, different colours or symbols can be given for different operation modes or techniques. Such a visualisation makes it possible to easily deduct from the tables which parameters (disregarding the statistics) or which statistics (disregarding the parameters) are most important.
- P. 9 line 8: you depict the maximum and mean windspeed as being highly correlated, which is true. But this statements makes the reader think these are the only two statistics of windspeed that are high correlated. Which is not true, because range and std seem to be even higher correlation than the mean value. Consider to rephrase the sentence. E.g. Several statistics of wind speed, such as the mean value, and power are also highly correlated.
- P. 9, Figure 2: It is a bit confusing both graphs don't show the same time interval. Moreover, I suppose the purpose of this figure is to illustrate the correlation between (mean) wind speed and measured DEL. In my opinion, this is not clear from the graph. A graph of Measured DEL vs mean windspeed would make this better visible I suppose. Another option is to zoom in on a period (of the same length for both) where this correlation is very obvious.
- P. 9: I'm missing a discussion about the results for pitch angle, since this a parameter that is generally important. So even though the results for pitch angle are not high, it might be useful to point that out and explain.
- P. 9, line 19-...: The placement of this paragraph is a bit confusing. You start the section with 56 features and all of a sudden you have more features (63) at a certain point while you expect a decreasing number for features. Consider to move this paragraph (or at a least a part of it) to the beginning of the section.
- P. 10, line 5-6: Although correct, the compactness of the sentence "After removing ... included in the model." might be difficult to understand. Splitting it up into the removal of features due to Pearson correlation and the combining of the remaining features due to PCA might help.
- P. 11, line 19: I think there might be an error and it should be "mean generator speed" instead of "mean wind speed".
- P. 13, Figure 4: the caption might be adjusted a bit with some information on which features were used for the model giving these results. E.g. the resulting features when applying Pearson correlation on the entire dataset.
- P. 14, Figure 5: typo in the caption: "bottom" instead of "button"

- P. 16, line 6-8: It is not clear to me what is meant with “The maximum absolute error ... confirm the results”. Which results are confirmed? Those of Vera-Tudela and Kühn? How?
- P. 16 line 13: I think something went wrong here: half a sentence is written and there seem to be a title of a section missing. If this is not a mistake, I do think it is better to have a separate section on the reduced data set for modelling.
- P. 17, line 6: “from the model trained with the remaining data”. This part seems to indicate two models were trained, one with the first part of the data and one with the second part. Is this the case? Because the remainder of the paper seem to indicate this is not the case.