

General comments:

The authors' changes have substantially improved the clarity of the manuscript. All that remains are a few technical corrections, mostly in the modified text.

Technical corrections:

1. Page 11, lines 190-192: $z_0 = 5.7 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}$ is not within the range of $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m} \leq z_0 \leq 5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}$. Did the authors intend to indicate that z_0 was close to the guideline range, or were they referring to the wind-tunnel scale value of $z_0 = 1.15 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$?

z_0 is very close to the VDI range. This is corrected in the revised version:

"At full scale, it gives $z_0=5.7 \times 10^{-3}\text{m}$ that is very close to the VDI Guideline's range [$1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m} - 5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}$]."

2. Pages 14-15, lines 270-273: Please split this sentence into two sentences to improve readability. A couple words also appear to be missing: "...is linked to the velocity at power 3, so a direct comparison is not straightforward."

This part is modified to:

"At that distance, no peaks are detected for heave and pitch motions anymore (Fig. \ref{fig:rel_max_8}). In the present study, the pre-multiplied PSD of the longitudinal wind speed component is analyzed. In contrast, in \citep{Belvasi2022} the PSD of the porous disc wake power is shown, which comprises spatial information of the wake and is linked to the velocity at power 3. Therefore, a direct comparison with the present work is not straightforward."

3. Page 20, line 321: There is an extra word in this sentence: "...suggesting that are if no clear peak is visible..."

modification done