

The authors thank the reviewer for their additional comments. These final issues have now all been addressed as follows:

Section 2.1 While the authors correctly noted that the bearing life calculation (L_{10}) is based on revolutions, this is still not explicitly stated in the text. To ensure clarity, it is recommended to revise the sentence “is the proportion of time spent in the i th set of conditions” to “is the proportion of the total operation that occurred under operating condition i .”

This change has been made as suggested, thanks!

Section 3.1 Main bearing load estimation It remains unclear whether the loads are applied at the center of the hub or at the interface between the hub and the main shaft. If the loads are indeed applied at the hub center (as suggested by Figure 2), the schematic of the drivetrain should be updated to include the relevant dimensions of the main shaft, as well as the distance between the front bearing and the hub–shaft intersection

The loads are applied at the center of the hub. Figure 2 already includes all relevant dimensions (L_h and L_b) for calculating the force response at each main bearing (see Eqns 4-9). Other main shaft dimension do not impact this load balance and so are not required to ensure readers are able to recreate the analysis.

Main bearing rating life assessment In Table 1, the pitch diameter of the bearing is reported, but this parameter is not introduced or defined in the manuscript. Please include a brief explanation or definition where it first appears.

Good point, a description of what the pitch diameter is has been added as requested.

Section 3.2 In their response, the authors indicated that the wind characteristics would be summarized in a table. This information should be included in the revised manuscript to improve completeness and transparency

Table 2 has been expanded to include the relevant wind characteristic information for the study. Thanks!