

Revised manuscript review – note review of changes or unaddressed comments from previous review.

Abstract:

Line 5 ‘the deep-water floating wind reference case’. Not clear what ‘the’ refers to, suggest ‘a’ since it defined in this work rather than a previously established benchmark.

Section 2.1 improved clarity and caveats.

Resource dispatch logic – This provides improved clarity around resource constraint logic however a further recognition that in a time based contractual availability approach, this logic would not be rigidly implemented and is a limitation of the modelling approach should be added.

Turbine operational status – the changes from turbine ‘shall always’ to ‘may’ indicates a difference in logic, was this change implemented and simulations carried out again? If not, confirm how a decision was made as to whether the turbine was shut down or not.

Section 2.2 Improved clarity around process and justification for approach.

3.1 ‘Based on experience’ is not sufficient evidence of 20 simulations providing sufficient convergence. Some quantification / evidence of convergence vs number of simulations should be provided.

Section 3.2 – improved description and justification of study approach behind this. Clarity around model logic implementation

Future work – suggest reflecting how some of the limitations now acknowledged in the study could be overcome in future work.