

Response to reviewers

Ida M. Solbrekke

September 2021

1 General comment to reviewer # 1

We would like to thank associate editor Andrea Hahmann for her time and effort reviewing the manuscript with the working title of “Norwegian hindcast archive (NORA3) - A validation of offshore wind resources in the North Sea and the Norwegian Sea”. With Andrea’s detailed comments and suggestions we believe that the manuscripts now is better and more precise. Please see the response below.

1.1 Response to minor comments

RC1: For the title, I would suggest: ”Norwegian hindcast archive (NORA3) - A validation of offshore wind resources in the North Sea and the Norwegian Sea” or ”Norwegian hindcast archive (NORA3) - A validation of offshore wind resources in the North and Norwegian Seas.” Both are grammatically correct.

AC1: Thank you. I have now changed the title to the following: “Norwegian hindcast archive (NORA3) - A validation of offshore wind resources in the North Sea and the Norwegian Sea”

RC2: Nearly all table headers lack units. Many figures lack the axis field. Please see the attached annotated manuscript.

AC2: Thank you for pointing this out. I have now added or changed the table headers and figure axis for clarification.

RC3: Some references lack detail. In the case of non-peer-reviewed reports, you should provide a full link to the document.

AC3: Done.

RC4: The source of the observational data, including references, should be added. The FINO platforms, for example, require an acknowledgement when using the datasets.

AC4: I have added to the acknowledgement about the Fino1 data set. I have also added a section (Data availability) providing links to where the reader can get access to the observations from the Norwegian Meteorological institute, Fino1 data, and the NORA3 data.

RC5: Appendix B: Flow distortion by large structures does not show that large structures are not a problem for wind resource validation—quite the opposite. I don’t see the purpose of this section and suggest removing it from the

manuscript.

AC5: Thanks for this comment, and I agree with you. I have now rewritten section 4.4 "Uncertainties in observed wind speed" and removed Appendix B.

RC6: The manuscript lacks information on how the readers of WES can download the NORA3 data. Would you please add that information?

AC6: Done. See AC4.