

Interactive comment on “Wind tunnel comparison of four VAWT configurations to test load-limiting concept and CFD validation” by Jan Wiśniewski et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 10 June 2020

Summary:

The manuscript discusses a set of experiments and CFD simulations examining various VAWT configurations to reduce the cyclic shaft loads produced by the standard Darreius-style, 3-bladed VAWT. The authors have spent a good deal of time generating the experimental and numerical results which may have applications to VAWT design and optimization.

General Comments:

The manuscript could benefit from several revisions. The first of these is to expand the introduction and review sections, as they stand the literature review is weak and

C1

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



incomplete. Many studies have been conducted on the twisted-blade VAWT and these should be included in the review and motivation given as to why the current geometry was chosen.

There are a large number of typos throughout the manuscript (use of “effect” vs “affect” and “smoothening” instead of the correct “smoothing”).

Overall, the data presentation could be improved throughout the paper. Results placed in large tables are difficult to interpret and force the reader to sift through various tables to make comparisons. These data sets should be plotted in an organized fashion.

The conclusions section needs revision as well. The comments on the Reynolds number are out of place, with no other mention of the effect of Re anywhere else in the manuscript. Furthermore, the experimental results (on which the bulk of the paper focuses) are barely discussed, which of the 4 designs performed the best? How close did the simulation and experiment data match?

Line Comments:

The statement on line 33 stating the “high aerodynamic efficiency potential” needs to be further justified besides the Ferreira 2014 paper. Many articles have also shown the lower aerodynamic efficiency of the VAWT as compared with the HAWT, some reference should be made to these. There are also other benefits to the VAWT design not mentioned such as insensitivity to wind direction and the ability to mount the generator near to the ground.

Line 46: What is the blockage of the model in the tunnel? Were any corrections made to the experimental data to account for the effect of flow acceleration? It appears that the simulations did not reproduce the walls of the tunnel, so some correction should be used.

Line 60: Figure 2 is very difficult to interpret. Can dimensions be added to each figure and perhaps reduce the shading of the 3D CAD models so that they show up more

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



clearly? The figure caption should also have a brief but clear description of the 4 test cases to aid the reader.

Line 70: “For many conditions up to 6” Use specific language, what does “many conditions” mean? Also in this same sentence “momentarily” should be “momentary” and “effect” should be “affect” (there are other instances of this in the rest of the manuscript).

Line 83: The use of “smoothing” is incorrect it should be “smoothening”. This should be fixed throughout the paper.

Line 83: What is meant by the term “chamfering”? Again, please use technical and precise language in the discussion.

Line 86: The entire sentence “While the process performed has no influence on the general nature of the experiment results or conclusions unto the effectiveness of the proposed solution, it is entirely possible it has a very slight influence on the exact result values.” Is self-contradicting. How can a process have no influence on the results but have an influence on the exact result values? Did you mean that it does not change the data trends? Please clarify and re-word.

Line 90: Table 1 should be made into a plot, there is no need to have tabulated data for these comparison points in the paper (similar comment for other data tables).

Line 96: Plot the data sets non-dimensionally with the tip speed ratio, what you will find is that forces/moments scale with the velocity squared so this result is not surprising.

Line 115: Shape of what curve?

Line 165: Some comments about how these results might scale up from the laboratory experiments to full-scale Reynolds numbers would be useful. Comments on the CFD Section: Why are these results (and the plotted data) not compared directly with the experimental results of the previous section? I recommend making new plots showing the comparison directly. The section title is “CFD Validation”, but you have not validated anything because there is no comparison to the experiments.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Line 209: The conclusions section needs to be revised due to several issues. The first is the discussion of the Reynolds number which is not mentioned anywhere else in the manuscript (for instance, what is the Re of the experiment?) It is also not surprising that the performance of the 0018 was poor, it is an airfoil designed for high Reynolds numbers (3 million and above). Also, the conclusion section makes no mention of the 4 different configurations, which one was the best?

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2020-41>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

