

Comment on the discrepancies between MSES and CFD results in Figure 4.

When MSES results from *Ragheb and Selig, 2011* are compared with the CFD results, there is an offset in CL and a considerable difference in CD. It is stated that the offset in CL might be because of "different definitions of zero AoA, which was not clear in *Ragheb and Selig (2011)*" (page 5). And the difference in CD is justified by stating: "as CFD takes pressure drag due to flow separation into account (Vinh et al., 1995), whereas MSES does not." (page 6). Both statements might well be correct although I believe the main reason for discrepancies is not mentioned, which is the fact that the obtained CFD results are with a fully turbulent boundary layer while the MSES results from *Ragheb and Selig, 2011* are obtained with natural transition. I came to this conclusion since I have seen similar results when comparing MSES with CFD-OpenFOAM results for my current work, which also consists on designing and optimizing a multi element airfoil for airborne wind energy applications. According to my work, MSES and CFD will give much closer results when employing the same transition type (forced or natural).

Thank you for this comment. We have adjusted the analysis accordingly in red (see lines 150-151 and 154-156).