

The manuscript presents an experimental study on a 3 m diameter horizontal wind turbine rotor. The focus was on the effects of Gurney flaps on the aerodynamic performance of the blade. Two Gurney flaps heights were tested on a clean blade and with turbulator tape. Experiments studies are always welcome, whether for the knowledge provided and/or for data generated that can be used to validate numerical models. Only few attempts to physically comment the experimental observations reported. This should be improved in the revised version of the manuscript. My comments and suggestions are presented as follows:

1. A linguistic revision of the manuscript is recommended.
2. The introduction needs to be improved to show the relevance of the presented experiment. Can author briefly mention what are the wide knowledge gaps and what portion of that current study is trying to fill. List point-by-point objectives and map the achievements of objectives in conclusion.
3. Line 38: add (c) after chord-length.
4. Line 48: correct the range ($1.3 \%c < GF < 3.5 \%c$).
5. Line 87: the authors stated a blockage ratio of approximately 40 %. Could authors elaborate on this (how did they evaluate this value; what impact will have this blockage on the results...)
6. Line 109: mention that XFOIL is a program.
7. Section 2.2.1-2.2.2: To adjust the dimensions of the ZZ tape and the GF, the authors used XFOIL to evaluate the BL thickness. XFOIL is a 2D airfoil calculator, could authors explain how can exploit this result to a blade flow which is 3D?
8. Please rearrange Table 1 for clarity. Tripped case is missed. Measurement method part could be arranged in another table.
9. Lines 138-139: the authors stated that their findings are relevant beyond the Re-numbers of the BeRT blades, as long as the GF/BL ratio is kept constant. Are you suggesting that 2 flows with different Re numbers are comparable? Please explain more about this statement and define the ratio (GF/BL) in the text.
10. Line 217: RBMs#RBMs
11. Curves in graphs with 2 vertical axes must be correctly identified. For example, in figure 7a, indicate which curves correspond to axial and tangential velocities.
12. Line 245: free flow conditions may be confusing (flow without turbine or without wind tunnel walls).
13. Lines 245-253: The authors showed that the axial wake velocity is more sensitive to the wind tunnel blockage than the tangential velocity, could you please explain this phenomenon?
14. Line 276: Define $\Delta\alpha_{GF}$
15. Line 277: Please what do you mean by "*to a more favourable level in terms of the BeRT rotor*"? I think it is better to reformulate lines 277-278.
16. Is there a reason to evaluate the angle of attack at $r=0.56R$ and the pressure coefficient which depends on this angle at a different radial position ($r=0.45R$)?
17. Line 285: Define ΔC_p .

18. Lines 285-290: Description of Figure 10 needs to be rewritten more clearly to show the effect of GF on the pressure coefficient.
19. Line 312: change Δc_l to c_l .
20. Regarding the conclusion, please see comment #2.