

I recommend accepting with technical corrections. Although the scope is narrow and the results have limited novelty, the study is valuable for its addition to existing knowledge and for highlighting two sites that are important for the ongoing development of wind energy. I think the authors have sufficiently addressed the issues raised by the referees and editor. Some language and technical issues persist and should be fixed before publishing (see below). The most critical problem is that Fig. 11 was not rendered correctly in the “Author’s tracked changes” PDF, which made it impossible to see all the details of the figure correctly.

1 Specific comments

- P1-P2 “Dataset” and “data sets” are used, perhaps “datasets” would be more consistent with “dataset“ or vice versa?
- P8L157 wind resource → wind resources
- P9L164 use → used
- General language comment: mix of past and present tense
- P12L227: ERA’s → ERA-5’s
- P17L300: consistently → consistent?
- Fig. 11 is not rendered correctly in the PDF, so I cannot fully review it
- P20L299-L300: Two sentences start with “On the other hand”
- “On the other hand” and “slight/slightly” are used frequently. Using more variation in the language could benefit the text. Just a suggestion.