

Minor Comments

I would like to thank the authors for their thorough responses and the revisions made to the manuscript. The quality and clarity of the paper have clearly improved. However, a few minor issues remain that should be addressed prior to final acceptance:

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 .*”

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.

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.

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.