

# Reply to comments by Chief Editor

Giorgia Guma on behalf of the authors  
IAG, University of Stuttgart

November 25, 2020

The authors would like to thank the editor for his efforts and valuable comments in this final process of review. They are very much appreciated and incorporated into the revised paper.

In the present document the comments given by the editor are addressed consecutively. The following formatting is chosen:

- The editor comments are marked in blue and italic.
- The reply by the authors is in black color
- A marked-up manuscript is added. Changed section with regard to the comments by the editor are marked in yellow.

## General comments

1. *"Units should be in roman, not italic."*

Thank you for your comment. All units have been changed from italic to roman, see **R1:G1a** (page 1, line 1), **R1:G1b** (page 3, line 68), **R1:G1b1** (page 1, line 14), **R1:G1c** (page 5, line 108), **R1:G1d** (page 7, line 165), **R1:G1e** (page 9, line 214), **R1:G1f** (page 13, line 267), **R1:G1g** (page 13, line 272), **R1:G1h** (page 17, line 304).

2. *"In the abstract you define abbreviations, even CFD which I think is good because it increases readability. Please also define BEM. Many people only or at least start to read the abstract and the conclusion. Therefore, please also define the abbreviations in the conclusion, again to increase readability."*

Thank you for your valuable comment, we defined the abbreviations again in both abstract and conclusions, see **R1:G2a** (page 1, line 8), **R1:G2b** (page 22, line 382), **R1:G2c** (page 22, line 383), **R1:G2d** (page 22, line 388), **R1:G2e** (page 22, line 391), **R1:G2f** (page 23, line 394), **R1:G2g** (page 23, line 397), **R1:G2h** (page 23, line 401) and **R1:G2i** (page 23, line 405).

3. *"Figure 2 seems not to add much to the manuscript. It is hard to see the coordinate systems attached to the blade and also difficult to under the point of showing it. Could it be improved or removed?"*

Thank you for your valuable suggestion. Considering that it is only a beam model and therefore its full visualization consists of only points, we decided to follow your suggestion and delete it.

4. *" Various smaller things: References in parenthesis should be (Schepers, 2016), not (Schepers (2016)). Use citep or parencite if you use LaTeX. On figure 3 why are the same thing (?) called both  $F_x$  and  $F_N$ ? Figure 8: is  $Fx$  the same as  $F_x$ ? Please be consistent. Additional formulations here and there could be improved, but the publisher will also help with that."*

Thank you for your comment. We changed all citations in parenthesis using now the command citep as you suggested. And yes, exception for figure 4 where the loads are referred to the chord length,  $Fx$ ,  $F_x$  and  $F_N$  (in figure 2) are the same thing. All figures related to the loads have now been consistently changed, see figures 2,6,7,8,10,11,18,19,20 and 22.