

***Interactive comment on* “Subsea cable management: Failure trending for offshore wind” by Charlotte Strang-Moran**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 19 May 2020

General Comments This paper discusses about the failure of subsea cables for offshore wind. It lacks substantial scientific literature review to place the reader into context. This is also particularly helpful for establishing the scientific contributions of a manuscript, which I do not see clear. Some figures are not properly described, the methodology is extremely short and it does not explain what was done exactly, and the results do not provide important outcomes.

Specific Comments - Literature review/Introduction. This needs to be noticeably enlarged to bring value to the paper. International organizations such as CIGRE and IEC have reports regarding cables failures (CIGRE Working Group B1.10. Update of Service Experience of HV Underground and Submarine Cables; CIGRE: Paris, France, 2009, CIGRE Working Group B1.21. Third-Party Damage to Underground and

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Submarine Cables; CIGRE: Paris, France, 2009.), and some scientific publications are available as well in this particular topic (for instance, <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/12/14/2682>). - Methodology. It needs to be described how the database was populated, indicate sources and parameters under study. If possible, it needs to be benchmarked with other databases. - Results. Statistical analysis is required. In Figure 2, there is no explanation about what needs to be understood for the different types of root causes. The database should lead to the estimation of the Mean Time Between Failures parameters, but this is never discussed in the article. In Figure 3, all required parameters must be indicated: assumed price of energy, type of cable failure, projects under analysis, etc. The failures need to be segregated between MV and HV, to show the influence of the voltage level over failures.

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2020-56>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

