

Reviewers' comments

RC1

The manuscript presents an analysis of mixing and turbulence in the wake of offshore wind farms. This is based on the WIPAFF campaign that took place the 2016-2017 winter. Relative to a number of simulations that have explored turbulence in the wakes of turbines, this study is based on a thorough analysis of dedicated airborne measurements. The analysis is sound, the measurements have great value for the wind energy sector and the understanding of the boundary layer in the vicinity of offshore wind farms. Some minor points and suggestions are made below (eg inclusion of error bars in figures providing estimates- of the length scales), but minor revision will be sufficient to address them and allow for publication.

Minor Concerns

I48 citation of Cortina: add parentheses

Authors' Response:

The parentheses are now added. (See I51)

I70-75: clearly stated objectives; not completely clear how objective 1 and 4 relate to each other: 1 aims at turbulent length scales, while 4 aims at dominant scales of entrainment.. both concern different locations relative to a wind farm; objective 4 gives more emphasis to the horizontal organization (around the wind farm, not just linearly upstream, above and downstream, and objective 4 includes a focus on different stratifications (objective 2). In other words, objective 4 seems to combine objectives 1 and 2 and to be somewhat redundant.

Authors' Response:

The authors have modified the description of the study objectives based on the reviewer's suggestion. (See I77)

Figure 1: it would be appropriate and useful to a concise description of the meteorological situation; at present, only the stability is discussed (figure 2..). The direction of the dominant wind should at least be indicated in figure 1, possibly

some isobars from reanalyses could be included to give a sense of the general direction of the flow.

Authors' Response:

A new figure is now added which provides information about the dominant wind direction and prevalent stability conditions in the region of interest. (See Figure 1)

l108-109: the vertical potential temperature gradient is indeed a measure of the stability of the atmosphere; it constitutes the basis for the calculation of the buoyancy frequency, or Brunt Vaisala frequency. This should be calculated and also given (either the buoyancy frequency or the period..), cf Holton, An introduction to dynamic meteorology (2004).

Authors' Response:

The authors have calculated the buoyancy frequency for all the flights and included it in Table 1. (See Table 1)

figure 5: the estimates include uncertainty; could error bars be added to give some appreciation of the uncertainty on these estimates? This would be helpful to identify which features of the figure calls for interpretation, and which is likely without meaning.

Authors' Response:

Error bars are now included in all the figures which indicate standard error of the mean values of the quantity being analyzed.

l150: missing 'as': '...are more dominant, as clearly shown...'

Authors' Response:

The word 'as' is now added. (See l165)

This is not clear: the contrast between the black curves of the four panels is not so striking. The black curve of panel a extends to larger scales than that of panel c.

There is only panel d (flight 40) which really sticks out as significantly different, with clearly larger scales present. (This is consistent with figure 5)

Authors' Response:

For flights 32 and 33, the autocorrelation values drop quickly at lower spatial lags and then we get large values at large spatial lags because the atmosphere is slightly stable. For Flights 39 and 40, the autocorrelation values drop at a slower rate, and we observe a gradual decrease in the autocorrelation values. The main difference is the rate at which autocorrelation drops at lower spatial lags which correspond to the presence of small-scale structures in the flow.

I170-180: The introduction and explanations for the formulas used for the spectra are insufficient or placed too late; a key quantity is wavenumber component (k_2) which is introduced before equation (4), but explained only after equation (5). References are given for more information on the subject, but there should be some more explanations given here nonetheless: what are the assumptions? What do these spectra correspond to?

Authors' Response:

Assumptions of isotropic and incompressible flow are now included. The explanation of (k_2) is now given before its introduction in Equation 4. (See I190)

The spectra correspond to the inertial sub range and this has been mentioned in the text with underlying assumptions. (See I187 and I192)

Regarding direction: k_2 is the wavenumber along the flight path because, by construction, this is the only spatial information we have access to with airborne measurements. The flight strategy implies that it is the wavenumber across the mean wind direction. Is this understanding right? The phrasing in line 183 puts the two information on the same level, which can create confusion.

Authors' Response:

The phrasing has been changed to make it clearer to readers. The word 'across' has been changed to 'perpendicular'. (See I190)

Figure 6: the choice is made to put the constant level (indicating dissipation rate) at the same height in the three panels; hence the reader must check the labels of the vertical axis to understand which is larger or weaker. It could be more visual

and closer to expectations for such a figure to use the same vertical axis for the three panels. (Even if that leaves quite some space empty in the first panel..) However, the information is present in the following figure, so it may be fine to leave the figure as is.

Authors' Response:

The same vertical axis is now introduced in all three panels of this figure. As mentioned by the reviewer the information regarding the different magnitude of spectra in three locations is translated into the different magnitude of the rate of energy dissipation, which is shown in Figure 7.

I214: remove 'in': 'some momentum flux upstream..'

Authors' Response:

Done. (See I230)

I250-255: again, one needs to know for sure what k_2 corresponds to? Is it defined as the wavenumber along the profile (flight path)? Or as the wavenumber in the direction perpendicular to the main flow? (My understanding is that the flight paths were chosen perpendicular to the dominant wind, so that both coincide for this specific campaign; it may be stated in section 2, but I missed it. It is worth emphasizing. A modification to Figure 1, including a description of the large-scale flow, would be welcome)

Authors' Response:

Yes, the flight paths were chosen perpendicular to the dominant wind. Here, k_2 corresponds to the wavenumber in the direction perpendicular to the main flow. It is now also mentioned in Section 3.2 where it is first introduced, and also described here in Section 3.4. (See I273)

I257: is the appropriate lengthscale to consider $1/k$, or $2\pi / k$?

Authors' Response:

No consensus is present to define the length scale from wave number. Both definitions are present in the literature. Here the authors made a choice to define $1/k$ as a length scale.

Figure 11: same remark as for Figure 1: helping the reader have an idea of the background flow for these newly introduced flows will be a significant improvement.

Authors' Response:

This has been achieved with the addition of Figure 1 and a relevant explanation in the text. (See I93)

Figure 12: error bars are necessary; uncertainties are discussed in section 4.1, a result of these considerations should be included in the figures, even in anticipation; this concerns Figure 12 and the previous figures which present estimates of scalars.

Authors' Response:

Error bars are now added to all the figures where values from multiple flight legs were obtained at the same position. The error bars in these plots represent the standard error of the mean values of the quantity under discussion.

The only exception is Section 3.4.2 (Figure 13), where we only have single flight legs at every location downstream of the case study wind farms. This has been now mentioned in the text as well. (See I312)

I360-361: the influence of farm layout has large practical implications. The authors should develop a bit more this statement: if some recommendation for farm layout may be tentatively stated, it is of interest; if the current study only hints at this influence, without making any conclusive statement possible, the authors could mention it and point to directions for further research.

Authors' Response:

The authors have not made any conclusive statement on the effect of the wind farm layout on the energy entrainment inside the wind farm, although some results indicate that it could have important implications. This has been discussed and analyzed in many CFD/LES and numerical modeling studies but is not the main research question of this study. The authors' have made some recommendations on how to measure and analyze the effect of wind farm layout on kinetic energy

entrainment which can be an interesting research topic to pursue in the future.
(See I360 and I403)

I363: 'inifitely large wind farm' conditions: the authors should either explain or point to an appropriate reference (or both), both here and in the introduction.

Authors' Response:

The authors have now added a brief description of the "infinite wind farm" case. Appropriate references are also added. (See I36)

I370: providing perspectives for future research would be appropriate here; the study has the originality of using real observations, in contrast to many numerical studies. Is the way forward to carry out more detailed numerical simulations? Other observational campaigns (and then come other questions: what is missing from this one? Is it just necessary to sample more cases? Or should the measurements be different? Enhanced? More numerous, denser?)? Combinations of both?

Authors' Response:

The authors have included their recommendations for the future work in the conclusions section. (See I403)
