WES-2020-57

Thanks to the authors for including the FLORIS comparison with LES. These results appear to be more compelling to indicate improvements with the heterogeneous flow wake modeling scheme. I have a few minor comments focusing on improving the clarity of the presented results.

1. There are some typographical errors in the new sentences (e.g. Line 362). I encourage the authors to carefully proofread the paper before finalizing it for publication.

2. Eq. 3: The exponent 'p' should be on the cosine, not on the \gamma. $cos^p(\gamma)$.

3. Line 389, sentence starting with: "The comparison of this metric…"

I assume "this metric" refers to Eq. 4. Figure 14 appears to plot an absolute error for each wind direction which is not the same as MAE defined in Eq. 4, which is an average over all wind directions and would produce only one value, not a plot with wind direction dependency. I believe later, this is defined as "average mean absolute error." It would improve the clarity of the paper to define the quantities explicitly and to be consistent throughout the results section.

I would also suggest that Figure 14 does not show that the heterogeneous model provides an improvement in predictions, but Figure 15 clearly does.

4. Figure 15 is an enlightening result which clearly shows the benefit of turbine specific MAE instead of total wind farm power comparisons and the utility of the proposed model.

5. I suggest the authors clarify their quantity of interest notations (e.g. MAE) and descriptions in the results section which appear to be reused and conflicting. In Eq. 4, MAE is defined as the absolute error in wind farm power production averaged over all the wind direction cases. However, in Figure 15, MAE is defined as the absolute error in wind turbine power production averaged over all the turbines in the wind farm.

6. Figure 15: Caption states "average absolute error" and y-axis states "mean absolute error."