

Author's response

Dear Referee #2,

Thank you for recognizing the relevance of our manuscript, your valuable feedback and constructive comments! We have revised the manuscript based on your comments and all changes made are presented below.

The article presents a suggestion for a definition of the low-level jet (LLJ) with the aim to harmonize and make LLJ statistics of different sites easier to compare. The article compares statistics of the new methodology, which is based on wind shear below and above the jet core, with statistics based on the frequently used definition, which uses a threshold for the reduction of wind speed above the jet core. The results are compared for 3 offshore and 3 onshore sites of particular interest for wind energy.

The article addresses an important topic of making LLJ statistics comparable for different sites and methods. The new method is well justified and explained, and there are interesting results comparing the different sites. The paper is of large interest to the Wind Energy Community.

However, my main concern is that the new definition is only applied to simulation data. Such statistics is often determined from observational data, e.g. based on wind lidar profiles. If this method should be used by a broad community in the future, it is of high importance to take into account measurement data and compare to the statistics based on former criteria. Measurement data are usually not as "smooth" as simulation data, and there may be more variability of wind speed within one profile of wind speed. Also the treatment of lacking data from a certain height on, e.g. due to clouds, should be considered. If this provides similar results to the numerical data, and if the articles gives guidelines how to identify the LLJ from experimental data, e.g. in which height intervals, it will be much more convincing to the wind energy community.

The sites have been chosen at locations where observational data are available. So it requires large extra work, but should be possible, in principle. Therefore I would suggest to vote for "Major revision" before the article is ready for publication.

Thank you for this comment. When we started this project we were considering to use lidar observations in the analysis but decided that a comparison of the two definitions benefit from a global dataset that is fully comparable between different sites and where multiple decades of data assures for robust statistics for rare events (i.e., LLJs). We agree that the next step in taking our analysis further is to perform the same analysis also on lidar measurements, and we have added a comment about this in the Discussion of the revised manuscript. Lines 152–157 now read:

Building on this study, similar analysis on the best definition of the LLJ should be performed on wind speed profiles measured by lidar instruments. As modeled wind speed profiles often are much smoother than observed profiles (e.g., Hallgren et al. 2020; Kalverla et al. 2020) reanalyses tend to underestimate the actual occurrence of LLJs. Although difficult to compare sites with different lidar instrumentation (implying different vertical and temporal resolution, height range, and temporal coverage) this type of analysis would be of high importance for the wind energy industry, and results could be compared to those presented herein.

As you mention, using observational data raises a lot more issues about data handling and rigorous quality control is needed, especially when analysing extreme events. Further, differences between instruments regarding vertical resolution, height range and uncertainties in the measurements as well as shorter time series (including gaps) requires more advanced statistical treatment to account for uncertainties in LLJ characteristics. Also, some sensitivity tests, such as sensitivity to vertical window, are not as straight forward using actual observations. That being said, we of course acknowledge that lidars measure the wind profile that a nearby wind turbine actually is exposed to, and thus – in many cases – is a data source of higher significance than model data. For now, we have to refer to validations of ERA5 compared to lidar measurements in cases of LLJs, e.g., Kalverla et al. (2019, 2020); Hallgren et al. (2020); Borvarán et al. (2021); Dieudonné et al. (2022); Rubio et al. (2022)

Keeping the manuscript in the compressed format of a Brief communication according to the Wind Energy Science guidelines, it is not feasible for us to include lidar data in our analysis as it would require an extensive expansion of the manuscript. We hope that both you and the editor find our work still worth of publishing as it provides results that will serve for reference in following studies where lidar data is analysed.

Some remarks are listed below.

1: I would suggest to avoid using the term "non-ideal wind speed profiles" in the abstract. It should first be defined what you mean with this. Maybe substitute with "logarithmic"

We changed to *non-logarithmic* in the abstract.

17: Please provide references for the different phenomena that are associated with LLJ

Following the Wind Energy Science guidelines for Brief communications, we are limited to a maximum of 20 references, and thus we had to make hard restrictions on which references were most important to include. However, we kindly ask the editor for permission to exceed this limit and have included the reference to Stensrud (1996) in our revised version of the manuscript. In this paper, the mechanisms for LLJ formation are summarized. For more detailed descriptions, we refer to some of the original papers on LLJ formation, such as e.g., Blackadar (1957) (diurnal variations in boundary-layer friction), Fisher (1960) (the sea breeze), Holton (1967) (diurnal variations in baroclinicity over sloping terrain), Kotroni and Lagouvardos (1993) (cold fronts), and Smedman et al. (1996) (coastal advection).

31-34: The reason for the strong negative shear, low turbulence, entrainment and separation of layers is normally a temperature inversion. Maybe state this explicitly?

Thank you for this comment. We have now clarified that these effects often are associated with a temperature inversion (lines 34–35 in the revised manuscript).

35-39: Please compare the "extreme examples" to values of LLJ wind shear in the literature. E.g. for Emeis (2010) the wind shear values during LLJ events that were observed were only between around 0.03 and 0.095. So what you call "very strong shear" is below the lowest shear of experimental data.

We have rephrased the examples and added a reference to Emeis (2014) for comparison. In the revised manuscript, lines 37–42 now read:

For example, assume that the vertical wind speed profile is discretized with an interval of 30 m. If the wind speed decreases by 0.99 m s^{-1} between two levels (and then slowly increases to the next level), the profile will not be classified as an LLJ according to a 1 m s^{-1} falloff threshold, although having a shear of -0.033 s^{-1} in this layer (compare to e.g., Emeis 2014). On the other hand, if the wind speed decreases evenly by 1 m s^{-1} between, e.g., 100 m and 500 m, the shear is only -0.0025 s^{-1} in this layer, although the profile is classified as an LLJ according to the falloff threshold.

55: Your results are based on ERA5. How well is ERA5 able to represent LLJ? Maybe there is a validation in the literature? If yes, please quote as a reference, if not, could you provide such an example yourself? Maybe at least exemplary for one month for one of the sites?

Please see our reply to your main comment, where we have included references to validations of ERA5, comparing the reanalysis with lidar measurements, focusing on LLJs. All studies conclude that ERA5 (just like the other reanalyses) struggles resolving LLJ characteristics. Regional reanalyses (see e.g., Hallgren et al. 2020; Kalverla et al. 2020) might perform better in this respect, but we needed a global reanalysis for the purposes of this study to assure a fair comparison between sites. References to the aforementioned papers are included in the revised manuscript, see line 60 and lines 153–154.

67: You suggest to make use of the height interval 10–500 m. For experimental data it would be good to have a suggestion how to calculate shear if this altitude range is not available. E.g. some lidars have an overlap issue and start measuring only from 40 m on, some have an upper range of 200m, etc.

The calculation of shear is independent of the height interval and only depends on the height resolution. In other words, we are not considering the average shear in the full profile but rather all shear values in the profile. This is one of the reasons that the shear definition is less sensitive to the height interval and also means that the method to calculate the shear is directly applicable to lidar data covering different height intervals. In the revised manuscript, we have clarified that it is the *local* wind shear that is considered for the shear definition (see excerpt of the definitions below, or lines 51–54 in the revised manuscript).

90 Unclear, please rephrase: "On average the LLJ occur in weaker wind conditions than the climatology"

We have rephrased as *On average the LLJs occur in weaker wind speeds compared to the climatological mean*

What about strong logarithmic increase of wind shear? Could this falsely be identified as a LLJ, e.g. in experimental data, when the wind speed minimum above the jet core is not covered by the data?

No, it could not be falsely identified as an LLJ by the definitions we provide, as the wind shear has to reach certain thresholds both below and above the local maximum. So if the shear threshold above the local maximum is not met, then the profile is simply not classified as an LLJ.

In the revised manuscript, we have clarified both definitions (lines 51–54):

- **Falloff:** *an increase in horizontal wind speed of at least 1 m s^{-1} and 10% of the core speed below the core and simultaneously a decrease of 1 m s^{-1} and 10% above the core*
- **Shear:** *a local wind shear (i.e., between two vertical levels, see Fig. 1a) of at least 0.01 s^{-1} below the core and simultaneously at least -0.01 s^{-1} above the core*

Once again, thank you for all your comments.

Sincerely,
C. Hallgren, J.A. Aird and co-authors

References

- A. K. Blackadar. Boundary layer wind maxima and their significance for the growth of nocturnal inversions. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 38(5):283–290, 1957. doi: 10.1175/1520-0477-38.5.283.
- D. Borvarán, A. Peña, and R. Gandoin. Characterization of offshore vertical wind shear conditions in Southern New England. *Wind Energy*, 24(5):465–480, 2021. doi: 10.1002/we.2583.
- E. Dieudonné, H. Delbarre, A. Sokolov, F. Ebojie, P. Augustin, and M. Fourmentin. Characteristics of the Low-Level Jets Observed over Dunkerque (North Sea French coast) using 4 years of wind lidar data. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 2022. doi: 10.1002/qj.4480.
- S. Emeis. Wind speed and shear associated with low-level jets over Northern Germany. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 23(3):295, 2014. doi: 10.1127/0941-2948/2014/0551.
- E. L. Fisher. An observational study of the sea breeze. *Journal of Meteorology*, 17(6):645–660, 1960. doi: 10.1175/1520-0469(1960)017<0645:AOSOTS>2.0.CO;2.
- C. Hallgren, J. Arnqvist, S. Ivanell, H. Körnich, V. Vakkari, and E. Sahlée. Looking for an Offshore Low-Level Jet Champion among Recent Reanalyses: A Tight Race over the Baltic Sea. *Energies*, 13(14):3670, 2020. doi: 10.3390/en13143670.
- J. R. Holton. The diurnal boundary layer wind oscillation above sloping terrain. *Tellus*, 19(2):200–205, 1967. doi: 10.3402/tellusa.v19i2.9766.
- P. C. Kalverla, J. B. Duncan Jr, G.-J. Steeneveld, and A. A. M. Holtslag. Low-level jets over the North Sea based on ERA5 and observations: together they do better. *Wind Energy Science*, 4(2):193–209, 2019. doi: 10.5194/wes-4-193-2019.
- P. C. Kalverla, A. A. M. Holtslag, R. J. Ronda, and G.-J. Steeneveld. Quality of wind characteristics in recent wind atlases over the North Sea. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146(728):1498–1515, 2020. doi: 10.1002/qj.3748.
- V. Kotroni and K. Lagouvardos. Low-level jet streams associated with atmospheric cold fronts: Seven case studies from the Fronts 87 Experiment. *Geophysical research letters*, 20(13):1371–1374, 1993. doi: 10.1029/93GL01701.
- H. Rubio, M. Kühn, and J. Gottschall. Evaluation of low-level jets in the southern Baltic Sea: a comparison between ship-based lidar observational data and numerical models. *Wind Energy Science*, 7(6):2433–2455, 2022. doi: 10.5194/wes-7-2433-2022.
- A.-S. Smedman, U. Högström, and H. Bergström. Low level jets – a decisive factor for off-shore wind energy siting in the Baltic Sea. *Wind Engineering*, pages 137–147, 1996. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43749611>.
- D. J. Stensrud. Importance of low-level jets to climate: A review. *Journal of Climate*, pages 1698–1711, 1996. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26201369>.