Thank you very much for this nice article. I think you give a very good overview of various dynamic stall models. You also show a good performance of your new model. Moreover the article is well written and structured.

I went through the revised version which you made after the comments from my fellow reviewer Mr Truong and I donot have much to add.

There are a few relatively minor things which I ask you to consider

- Could you add a section *Recommendation for future work*. This is mainly because I agree to Mr Truongs comments that the airfoils which you consider are thin. Although you reply by saying that these thin airfoils can be found at the tip of HAWT's I think that most of HAWT tip airfoils are 18% or thicker (inboard even very much thicker). Apart from that the Reynolds number is much lower than found on most nowadays wind turbines. A recommendation on a dynamic stall experiment for thicker airfoils as found on modern wind turbines at much higher Reynolds numbers would make sense to me
- I would also appreciate a few words on the limitations of your model:
    - All discussion are 2D. In the very beginning of your article you put some emphasis on 3D effects which are very important for wind turbines indeed but these effects are excluded in the rest of the article.
    - I think the model is tuned for dynamic stall operation at relatively small angles angles of attack only, not for dynamic deep stall which may occur at standstill.
- You often use the word robustness as driver for your work? What do you mean with it? I sometimes interpret it as simplicity, sometimes as general validity or do you mean numerically stable?
- In line 24 you mention that dynamic stall effects can be dangerous. Still dynamic stall generally enhances the aerodynamic damping
- Line 25: Can you be a bit more specific? If the models are working reasonably well why are you trying to improve them. And wrt the very small computational effort: I would write 'without any notable increase in computational effort' or something like that.
- In figure 7 I note that the IAG results are sensitive to time step as well?
- References: I think the list is rather complete and all references seem retraceable. The reference from Ricardo Pereira was a MsC thesis and not a PhD thesis. It may anyhow be better to refer to his article https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3A6e98580d-7f76-493e-a74e-b3f73542b32a/datastream/OBJ/download. Some other TUDelft publications can be found on their repository. You could refer to this repository since this increases accessibility to the background information, an example is https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3Af1ee9368-ca44-47ca-abe2-b816f64a564f
- Notations: I think you manage to give a very good overview of dynamic stall models with consistent notations indeed. These notations are explained on page 34 but you are not 100% complete. For example the reduced frequency k and frequency f are not included. I also note that model constants are excluded from the list. You explain these in the text when they are first introduced but they return at other places and then they are not explained. Please be aware that an ignorant reader might get a bit confused by all these formula. You could help him/her a lot by making a very accurate list of notations including all model constants. Donot forget to add units as well.

Then a few typos/language issues:

- Line 59: Mainly
- Line 386 Usually a step of
- Line 396: This sentence which you add as response to Mr Truong's comments does not read well. Maybe you mean:
  Because dynamic stall models are added to an aerodynamic model based on e.g. BEM, vortex wake or actuator line, which in turn is integrated in a wind turbine solver, the studies are relevant.
- Line 546: comparison
- Line 551: Again I donot like the sentence which you have added in response to Mr Truong's comments.
  I would write …. *for lift. The opposite is true for the pitching moment*