Interactive comment on "The most similar predictor – on selecting measurement locations for wind resource assessment" *by* Andreas Bechmann et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 13 August 2020

General Comment: The overall structure and flow of this paper is very unconventional and makes it very hard to follow the logic of the paper. I suggest the sections be rewritten with more flow from topic to topic. The introductory material should be made more robust. Perhaps some more background information and references would make the author's thoughts clearer. The Conclusion section is very good, but it was not until the conclusion that the author's thoughts became clear to me. Overall, I think the content is good, but the presentation and writing needs some work.

Specific Comments:

-In the conclusion you acknowledge that this study benefited from having data from

existing met masts. In a real site placement exercise, what spatial resolution do you feel would be necessary to adequately classify a location as "most similar", particularly with respect to terrain? Do you truly feel that WRF, without LES, would be an adequate model to use with spatial resolutions only down to ∼1km?

-Line 88: Define RIX, and how it is determined.

-Section 2.2: Give more details about the model setup. At what resolution are the topography maps? What source did they come from? Are the wind measurements you refer to the data from the 185 masts?

-Where did the met mast data come from? Industry partners? You do not need to specifically name companies, but some indication of the data source should be mentioned. Also, is there any information that can be shared about the anemometer types/ model numbers/ calibration status? Providing more information will speak to the reliability of the dataset used.