

## RESPONSE TO ASSOCIATE EDITOR'S COMMENTS

The authors thank the associate editor for the valuable comments. The comments below refer to the text in the submitted revised version.

First, some defense of the choice of 2009 (aside from the availability of observations) would be helpful. The revised text simply says (analysis not shown) - please provide some support, even if in an appendix or a reference to another published study.

Authors: A figure (Fig. A1) was added to the Appendix (p. 19), and the text was modified in Section 2.1 (p. 4) to clarify that the selected year is a typical one in terms of wind speed over the region studied and should not affect the results.

Second, the conclusions should repeat the point that some parts of the wind speed distribution matter more than others (because of the variability in the power curve) and suggest future work with appropriate weighting.

Authors: The suggested comment was added to the Conclusions (p. 18). "Finally, because of the shape of the power curves, a further analysis focusing on the errors (i.e., EMD) on certain parts of the wind speed distribution that contribute the most to energy production could be carried out by assigning higher weights to values between the cut-in and cut-out wind speeds"

Finally, please prepare a DOI or github with the WRF namelists and supporting data as suggested in the Data Availability section.

Authors: The reference with DOI was added to the Code Availability section (p. 19).