Lines 315-317 state:

“Our understanding is that the reference data for the DU airfoils (Timmer, 2021) were “synthesized” using RFOIL (Van Rooij, 1996) for the Reynolds number of 7 million using correction factors on the basis of a comparison of RFOIL calculations and measurements at 3 million from the Delft wind tunnel in the clean configuration.”

I am afraid that this sentence adds more mist to the understanding of the situation.

The point is that the Re= $3x10^6$ data for the DU airfoils (figures 10 top three) are the result of experiments in the LTT wind tunnel of TU Delft. The post stall behaviour is indeed the behaviour “seen” in the wind tunnel. The “jumpy” behaviour is the result of a “non 2 dimensional flow” that typically occurs in the post stall area. So the measured values are correct for the measured span wise location, but will differ when the measurements would have been done at a different span wise location.

The bottom three figures of figure 10 are the airfoil data for Re=$12x10^6$. Such Re numbers cannot be realised in the LTT wind tunnel of TU Delft and thus are not the direct result of experiments. They are synthetized from the Re= 3x106 data using the airfoil design code RFOIL.

So I would suggest to replace the above sentence into:

“The reference data for the DU airfoils at Re=$3x10^6$ are taken from experiments in the LTT wind tunnel of TU Delft. The results for the higher Re numbers (typically Re=$6x10^6$, Re=$7x10^6$ and Re=$12x10^6$) are the result of a synthesis process, in which measured data for at Re=$3x10^6$ are translated to higher Re numbers using the airfoil design code RFOIL (Van Rooij 1996).”

And consequently you should change the legend in the lower three graphs of figure 10 from ”experiment” to “reference”.