The authors would like to thank the Editor for their feedback and comment. We hope that our revisions are satisfactory. Changes are highlighted in blue in the manuscript. Each comment is further addressed below.

Editor: Lines 27-30 – the materials and thicknesses also significantly affect the tower natural frequencies… so concrete tower and hybrids for example will behave differently. Thus, the conclusion that towers of 65 to 110 m are susceptible depend on additional factors… see for example https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy18osti/70642.pdf (just an example since I have it on hand)

Response: The sentence is changed to specify that the statement concerns towers made of steel.

Editor: Line 31 - Tapered cylinders is correct but typically they have sections of discrete diameters (minor note, the above reference also models them as continuous tapered cylinders)

Response: This is added to the text.

Editor: Line 33 – the exclusion of taper is a key assumption… hopefully the limitations of this assumption are thoroughly discussed

Response: The effect of tapering certainly needs to be investigated further. We added in the text that this effect has already been investigated to some extent in the literature, although at smaller Reynolds numbers. Here, the focus of the paper is rather on high Reynolds numbers covering the supercritical regime, which is also of high relevance to the field, and for which publications are lacking even for circular cylinders. Note that the industrial partner co-authoring the study is also particularly interested in cylinders without tapering, because of their relevance for future tower designs. Thus, despite the limited scope of the study, the present outcomes are still highly relevant for the wind energy industry. We also mention the need to investigate tapering further in the conclusions.

Editor: 35 – several decades ago

Response: Corrected.

Editor: Figure 1 is quite small

Response: The size has been increased.

Editor: Figure 2 text is very small and hard to read

Response: The figure has been done again with bigger text size.

Editor: Section 4 Conclusions – the future work portion could be strengthened significantly. Also, the conclusions fail to tie the paper and results back to the context application of turbine VIV during installation. This could be improved considerably.

Response: The conclusion has been revised in order to expand on the future work portion and also provide more links with the application to wind turbine installations.