Author Response to Referee Comments

We thank again referee 2 for a thorough review. Regarding the main remaining recommendation concerning the flow-field visualization, we realize we didn't explain the reason why we included instantaneous velocity profiles and not contour plots of instantaneous velocity fields as suggested last time. The reason is simply because we don't have this data available. In addition to LES, only the DWM implementation from NREL (FAST.Farm) could provide instantaneous velocity fields in the xy-plane (or xz-plane), and for that reason the data in these planes were not saved for any of the simulations.

Regarding the additional minor comments and recommendations provided in the attached file, we have done our best to take them into account and incorporate them into the updated version of the manuscript. For the comment on page 37 regarding the difference in tangential blade forces between ALM and BEM, however, we have not included the suggestion directly. Based on experience from other studies, we believe that the ALM setup is well chosen and that the introduced deviation here mainly comes from differences in the aeroelastic coupling. This conclusion is also strengthened by the fact that we only see significant differences in the tangential blade force distribution (and therefore power), but not in the normal blade forces (or thrust force/mean wake deficit).