Overall comments
- The overall impact of the paper is not well developed and the scientific novelty not clearly presented nor argued well. This is critical to justifying publication of the article in a scientific journal
- Written very well, but there are still several typos throughout. I have noted those I found but please do a final thorough read through and edit prior to final submission

Abstract
- The abstract doesnt speak explicitly to the value of the contribution – what is the potential impact?

Introduction
- Typo line 53 should be as not has
- Typo 57 probes' not probes
- Introduction starts nicely and lays out the complexity of the problem. The literature review is very thorough
- However, the literature review and introduction fail to make the case for the unique contribution of this work. What is unique about the approach that makes is journal publication worthy? What is special about the BeRT blade? It still is unclear at the end of the introduction what the point of this paper is from the perspective of scientific contribution.

Methodology
- This seems to be the first introduction of the point of this paper on line 181 – why is this a significant contribution? Elaborate!
  - Also, Why is this intent not discussed at the beginning of the introduction? You need to reiterate the point of the paper in the abstract, introduction and in the conclusions. Don't expect the reader to dig it out for themselves
- Why were the particular locations along the blade span chosen and why pressure tabs and 3HP at the respective locations? I don't think again the motivation for why everything is set up as it is is fully developed. The section is more descriptive than analytical
- Line 182 has a typo, either when it is or when applied but not when is
- Typo line 202, while the pressure tap uses the static pressure in…
- Line 227 typo, because the blade itself induces…
- Line 324 to keep the

Results and discussion
- Long sentence line 334 is hard to read
- Figure 14 seems to have incomplete caption. Should explicitly say what each figure represents in the caption not just the text
- Typo line 384
- The discussion and interpretation of the differences between the results and to prior publications could be more fully developed – and perhaps help provide the paper

with more analytical substance. Right now, the results section reads very descriptive rather than identifying and pulling out key insights

Conclusions
- Finally in lines 459-470 the paper gets to the point. This was not obvious throughout the paper. Please think about how to strengthen the paper in lifting up and highlighting the novel contributions.