

Dear Dr. Sheridan,

Thank you for time you spent reading the paper and for the very interesting suggestions

Based on your comments, parts of the paper have been rewritten and additional data and discussion have been added. Thanks to the additional time available, we have also made a throughout revision of the paper, adding more information and new data, when available.

All modifications and responses to the comments have been highlighted in blue-colored text both in this communication and in the revised version of the paper.

Best regards,

*Alessandro Bianchini* on behalf of all the authors.

oooooooooooooooooooo

The manuscript presents a comprehensive examination of the current worldwide status of small wind turbine design and deployment. Five grand challenges that the small wind community needs to overcome in order to become widely viable, accepted, and competitive are identified and recommendations on how to address such challenges are provided.

The work is timely, well-researched, and needed. I appreciate the comprehensiveness of the paper, focusing on the worldwide small wind market instead of one country or continent and considering details ranging from resource assessment to turbine design to community acceptance.

Thank you very much for your appreciation of the paper.

The following minor considerations are recommended for the final version.

Line 37: Suggest replacing “within” with “for”.

Done, thank you.

Figure 1: This graphic is very helpful. I recommend increasing the hub height for the business or community category from “up to 65” as many distributed wind projects feature hub heights of 80 m or even higher.

Changed.

Line 89: It makes sense to exclude urban wind in this analysis, but I am curious as to what thresholds (population, quantity of buildings) you employed to designate urban versus non-urban.

Indeed, there was no direct threshold to designate urban versus non-urban. The sense was that we decided not to address specifically the issues related to wind turbines in a built environments since they are very specific.

Line 184: I am confused by this sentence about trends being stopped or reversed, and wonder if 5 kW is intended instead of 50 kW?

The sentence has been rephrased.

Line 611: It would be helpful to refine “an error greater than 1%”. Is the error just a little bit over 1%? Or much higher?

Thank you for pointing this out. The sentence has been rephrased with a more detailed estimation of the error.

Line 666: Suggest rewording to something like “Improve prediction and reliability of long-term turbine performance despite limited resource measurements”.

Thanks. We agreed with your suggestion and changed the title of GC#2.

Line 928: In this paragraph, the order of reporting costs in euros and U.S. dollars is inconsistent. It would help the reader if a consistent convention was applied here, with one currency always reported first and the other always reported in parentheses.

Thank you for pointing this out. Notations have been made consistent throughout the paper.