

The article presents an interesting investigation with a lot of materials and procedures to deal with the complete problem of LCOE of wind turbines considering the transportation constraints.

All the parts of the study are presented, not in details cause referencing to previous studies or materials, but with sufficient explanations to understand the needs and the specificities of the current study.

The results of the mechanical part are well presented and the trends of each configurations are pointed out. However, the LCOE results are obtained and presented a bit shortly.

A drawback of the article is the way of redaction letting think in the start that the focus will be on the transportation analysis. The reader has to reach the 4<sup>th</sup> section to understand that the transportation (rail way especially) is only treated has a bending deformation capability. Then it may be valuable to modify a little the redaction to be clear that the study is a quite classical wind turbine system optimization introducing the flexibility has a new constraint and with an objective function based on the total cost from construction to energy production and also logistic technologies.

The study is based on several previous works and previous stuffs (as softwares) and the writers give a lot of references. Nevertheless, some key points of the mains used tools may be given in order to simplify the reading (it is not a simple task to go check in each reference to get the may assumptions).

A last, the study finally being an optimization problem, it would have been clearer to redact a part as well: design variables, constraints, goal function. And especially, the 4<sup>th</sup> section presenting the blade configurations may be concluded with a synthetic analysis of the differences between designs. It has to be noticed that the rail way transportation constraint induces design constraints on the blade, that last influencing the optimization of the wind turbine system, but there is no detail of the blade design.

Writing advises:

- There is a lot of “speaking” formulations: penetration (lines 21 and 24), mounts (line 26), aggressive (28), fairly rigid (28), nonnegligible (46) ...
- There is “too much” coma: “...chord, prebend, sweep ...” (line 33), “...large,jointed, flexible...” (47) ...
- The mathematical notation may be avoided in the text: (line 45) “+10-+15%” => “increases from 10% to 15% ...”