

Dear editor,

We are pleased that the final review is there. A point-by-point reply:

- We agree with the reviewer that the manuscript does not evaluate the wind direction (or other) dependence of power production. We therefore added the following sentence in the conclusion: "The performance of the methods depends on the validity of the main assumption behind them: that the short-term power distribution within each wind bin can approximate its long-term counterpart. Or equivalently, that all meteorological factors that control power production of a large wind farm (wind, wind direction, stability, air density, ...) are similarly distributed in the short-term and long-term. The accuracy of this assumption might be different in other wind farms, for examples ones that show a strong directionality because of their shape. The errors reported in this study are therefore indicative, and cannot be readily translated to all other situations."
- The reviewer raises a valid point. We choose to refrain from any value judgement about the magnitude of the bias, but state it as is. Therefore, we removed the relative clause 'which is typical in this application'.
- We do mean involved, as in complex, complicated, sophisticated. See <https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/involved>.
- We changed the name to 'MCP-corrected wind'.