

I have a minor comment regarding your response to Reviewer 2's general comment 3. I agree with the reviewer that repeatedly using time-series plots can become redundant; however, this does not mean that these plots should be removed. Rather, they should be complemented with additional quantitative analyses. Reviewer 2's comment is intended as constructive feedback, not as discouragement. While time series are indeed a useful way to compare different variables qualitatively, quantitative information is equally important. The manuscript should not require the reader to perform the analysis themselves. In this sense, Reviewer 2's suggestion regarding correlation analysis is valuable, as it points toward a quantitative complement to the time-series figures.

We would like to thank the editor for this clarification and have moved the figures that show RMSE and bias to the location of the timeseries plots along with adding relevant text connecting the time series to RMSE and bias.

We have analyzed correlation as suggested by the reviewer and found that the p-values for these calculations are very high and should not be considered statistically significant:

**Table 2.** Two-sided p-value for the Pearson-r correlation coefficients for low-level wind shear, hub-height wind speed, and rotor equivalent wind speed (REWS) for each model setup and each domain.

	Low-Level Shear					Hub-Height Wind Speed					REWS				
	d01	d02	d03	d04	d05	d01	d02	d03	d04	d05	d01	d02	d03	d04	d05
Default	0.997	0.331	0.273	0.302	0.264	0.443	0.840	0.524	0.445	0.347	0.637	0.993	0.994	0.847	0.770
CMC	0.551	0.468	0.142	0.152	0.163	0.635	0.478	0.373	0.508	0.489	0.707	0.969	0.890	0.855	0.820
OSPO	0.825	0.667	0.757	0.519	0.479	0.463	0.421	0.013	0.057	0.166	0.588	0.698	0.412	0.317	0.324
MUR	0.768	0.267	0.414	0.373	0.338	0.933	0.929	0.886	0.918	0.849	0.675	0.925	0.930	0.791	0.710
NAVO	0.655	0.142	0.132	0.225	0.253	0.600	0.766	0.473	0.680	0.540	0.364	0.981	0.888	0.748	0.667
OSTIA	0.880	0.535	0.499	0.487	0.442	0.192	0.259	0.717	0.555	0.679	0.712	0.839	0.972	0.771	0.724
GOES16	0.594	0.167	0.191	0.294	0.364	0.753	0.954	0.368	0.727	0.830	0.411	0.851	0.886	0.877	0.896

Common thresholds for the p-value to state the correlations are significant are from 0.01 to 0.05. None of the correlations here meet that threshold. While we understand the interest in correlation, the amount of data is insufficient to allow for a reasonable representation of how the observations and simulations are linearly related. We hope the reorganization of figures and added context are sufficient to break up the time series figures, highlight the quantitative analysis that was performed, and overall help the flow of results.

Concerning the reviewer's remark about including a "Discussion" section, I would like to kindly remind you that such a section is not meant simply to reiterate or discuss the results, but rather to provide a critical reflection on the model, the numerical setup, its limitations, etc.... In other words, the Discussion section aims to look at the "big picture." I recognize that the term "Discussion" can sometimes be confusing, so I hope this clarification is helpful.

We thank the editor for this clarification and have reorganized the paper to have an entirely separate discussion section following the summary that highlights the big picture as well as limitations and future work.