

### 3.-Technical corrections

#### Suggested corrections:

C1.- In line 8, substitute “driving (fatigue) loads” by “ driving (fatigue and extreme) loads”. In line 8 substitute “Inaccuracies in current..” by “Some of the inaccuracies in current...”.

C2.- In line 20 and 21, substitute “The design driving DLCs are...” by “ Some of the design driving DLCs are... ”

C3.- In line 22, when referring to the importance of dynamic stall at parked conditions include relevant work, such as “*Unsteady modelling of the oscillating S809 aerofoil and NREL phase VI parked blade using the Beddoes-Leishman dynamic stall model. A Gonzalez, X Munduate , 2007, Journal of Physics: Conference Series 75 (1), 012020.*”

A reference to this work and how previous work compares to experimental parked blade tests is highly recommended.

C4.- In line 59, substitute “...and that they do not specifically describe vortex shedding behaviour. by “ ... and that there are some of them that they do not specifically describe vortex shedding behaviour ...”

C5.- Include the following work to have a more comprehensive citations of related work, “*V.K. Truong. Modeling Aerodynamics for Comprehensive Analysis of Helicopter Rotors. In Proceedings of the 42nd European Rotorcraft Forum, Lille, France, 5–8 September 2016.*”

Here an updated dynamic stall model is presented. This stall model is treating the vortex-shedding phenomenon as a non-linear effect governed by ordinary differential equations. The number of parameters of the model is limited and characterize the vortex-shedding phenomena and the boundary-layer effects. The vortex-shedding phenomenon is simulated as a self-excited oscillator of the Van der Pol-type equation for increases in angle and by a damped oscillator when the flow is reattached.

A reference to this work and how it compares to your proposal is highly recommended.

C6.- In line 220, when referred to the PSD of the shedding frequencies results from Figures 7 and 8, the second order Snel model captures this effect. But to say that captures this effect quite well, may be slightly optimistic. Especially when examining the results presented in Figures 9, 10 and 11, where the deviations between experimental and the model are of the order of and error of lift of 0.2.

C7.- Line 287, there is a typo fault (the bold sentence)