

Review report #1

Dear Reviewer,

We sincerely appreciate your time and effort in reviewing our manuscript. We are pleased to note that you are satisfied with the implemented revisions. The abstract is modified according to your first detailed comment presented below.

The responses to the detailed comments are attached below.

Sincerely,

Dylan Eijkelhof
On behalf of all authors

Response to detailed comments in review report #1

7) while giving the power output and the power density, you should also say at which wind speed they are obtained. I suggest to keep the abstract more high-level on the comparison between trajectories, and avoid to quantify the power output. Indeed, this power output seems very uncertain (increased of 22% with respect to the previous version), while the main other messages seem unchanged.

#Response: The abstract is modified according to your suggestion, the quantities are removed.

85) this is the only time you use “we”, please rephrase.

#Response: The sentence is rephrased.

Fig4) please let the lines L0 and L1 with just one arrow, in the direction they point toward.

#Response: Figure is modified accordingly.

139) a citation would be great here

#Response: The sentence is rephrased to clarify it still belongs to the last citation mentioned in the sentence before "Park et al. (2004)".

277) this sentence is not clear: gradient-based method do find local minima at convergence.

#Response: The sentence has been rephrased to clarify that the method identifies a local optimum, while acknowledging the uncertainty as to whether this solution corresponds to the global optimum.

282) I would call them “soft constraints” or “penalties” as it was before.

#Response: They are rewritten to soft constraints, and rephrased a little to avoid term repetition.

360) one or two citations, if available, would strengthen those analyses.

#Response: Three references have been added that discuss the challenges associated with trajectory track-

ing, particularly due to the difficulty of predicting the true velocity of the kite a priori.

513) Please don't use PAPER in the conclusions, but the full term.

#Response: Both mentions are rewritten to the full term.

Review report #2

Dear Reviewer,

We sincerely appreciate your time and effort you have put in reviewing our manuscript. It definitely helps bringing the quality of this paper to a higher level. We are pleased to note that you are satisfied with the implemented revisions.

Sincerely,

Dylan Eijkelhof

On behalf of all authors