

Response to the Referee report # 3

Dear Referee,

Thank you for the time and effort you dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful for your insightful comments and valuable suggestions that helped us to improve our paper. Please find below, highlighted in blue, our point-by-point response to your comments and concerns (in red). All page numbers refer to the revised version of the manuscript with tracked changes.

I would like to thank the authors for the answers to the remarks and questions of the first review and the revision of the manuscript!

In my opinion, the chosen domain size of 10 chord lengths is not sufficient for investigations in the stall range and I suspect that at $\alpha = +/-15$ deg. a dependence of the results on the domain size cannot be excluded. The authors should at least reconsider the setup for future studies.

Nevertheless I can agree to the publication of the contribution, but would be pleased if the authors could take the following minor remarks into account in the final version:

- **Comment 1:** Line 217 of the revised manuscript: Also to be consistent with the wording on line 224, “maximum suction peak” should be written here and not “minimum suction peak”.

Response: Thank you for your comment. It has been corrected in the final manuscript (line 214).

- **Comment 2:** Line 227, dto. Figs. 11 and 12: This probably refers to the arc length and not to the camber of the airfoil. I would suggest: “lower camber” - “lower side”, dto. in Figs. 11 and 12.

Response: Thanks for pointing this out. This review has been implemented in the final manuscript (lines 217-218 and fig. 11 and 12 as well).

- **Comment 3:** Figs. 11 and 12: Obviously - c_f and not c_f is shown here. This should be clarified.

Response: Thank you for bringing this to my attention. It has been corrected in the final manuscript.

- **Comment 4:** Line 237: According to my information, standard XFOIL contains the Karman-Tsien and not the Prandtl compressibility correction.

Response: Thank you for raising this point. You are correct that XFOIL utilizes the Karman-Tsien compressible correction; however, we have implemented the Prandtl-Glauert correction.