Overall, the revisions made to this paper have led it to be a much more understandable and cohesive presentation of the closed loop helix method. Although the paper is slightly long and brevity should be sought after wherever possible, use of the appendix helps tighten the focus of the paper on the results and relevant methods.

The authors did a very good job in providing strong justifications for the critiques presented, and I appreciate their effort. At this stage, I believe the methodology and results are sound and well presented. My only suggestions at this stage are regarding organization.

As I mentioned above, the paper still stands a bit long, and much time is spent establishing the methodology and background. The appendix sections are relatively short, so it could be beneficial to move more of the background to the appendix. For example, the LiDAR introduction on pages 3-4 is somewhat unnecessary, and could be split between the LiDAR Subsystem Design section and Appendix A. In addition, it could be worth considering a restructuring of the Discussion section. Only 1/3 talks about the potential impact of the CL helix method on wind turbine loads, which is of particular interest to potential stakeholders and readers who are interested in the viability of this method. Some of this discussion is already integrated into the Results section, so some reshuffling of the information already presented would be beneficial. Lastly, the structure of the Results and Discussion is somewhat overwhelming. There is a large number of different sections, and although this naturally extends from there being six test cases, it can be easy for the reader to be lost in all of this information. While Figure 14 contains much of the relevant information, it is still quite large to digest, so perhaps the authors could consider a table summarizing the major effects of closed loop helix controller. This could help structure and summarize sections 4.4.X.

Overall, the state of this paper is very strong, and the minor changes suggested above could be optional. It may be worthwhile to pursue some additional proofreading as well. For example, line 429 should be corrected to “actuation”, and the EKF abbreviation at 448 could be omitted for clarity (since it is not referenced again. Also, EKF could be confused with Extended Kalman Filter).