In general this is a well-written research report with data that confirms existing results/expectations. The authors set-up their own complete toolchain to do the full analysis were some of the elements have been proposed by others or published in earlier work. This is also my major concern about this paper. The authors have to explain many steps and alter their own in-house design codes while some of the methods (maybe slightly different) have been published elsewhere or are available in an open source setting. Now the authors need a lot of tool development and explanation to reach their final conclusion. I believe that the paper would have been much stronger if connections were made to work by others (e.g. uncertainty quantification framework). Still, I believe that the final conclusion is important for the wind farm control research community.

Here some remarks:

Pg 1. "considered as the most potential technology" please add a citation

Pg 3. "is quite unrealistic" also a rather bold statement

It is "spatial" instead of "special"?

Section 2, at the beginning they talk about different sample rates (yaw vs flow) and there they question arises if you can do that. Later in the article they explain that the flow has two time scales (fast and slow).

Fig. 1. is really nice

Pg. 7. "because" …"because" (two sentences in a row)

Pg. 7. How the steps are explained it is just not clear. It is also not relevant that you are working with DLL's

Section 3, this should really be connected to ongoing efforts/frameworks

Pg 22. Figure 11 is not clear, Figure 12 is better (color) but still hard to read

Conclusion: is a conclusion of a research report and should be shortened. It should answer the research question (is there a research question?).