

Status: this preprint is currently under review for the journal WES.

New method to characterize aerodynamic flow state around wind turbine blades

Dimitri Voisin , Didier Velayoudon, Mattéo Capaldo, John-Richard Ordonnez-Valera, Rachel Jorand, and Mohammed Fajar

Status: final response (author comments only)

Comment types: AC – author | RC – referee | CC – community | EC – editor | CEC – chief editor | : Report abuse

Login for authors/associate editors

Subscribe to comment alert

RC1: 'Comment on wes-2026-6', Anonymous Referee #1, 08 Feb 2026 

As reviewer of the Manuscript wes-2026-6 entitled " **New method to characterize aerodynamic flow state around wind turbine blades**", I have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript, and I would recommend in **accept the manuscript** based on my review. Thank you!

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2026-6-RC1>



AC2: 'Reply on RC1', Dimitri Voisin, 24 Feb 2026 

Thank you for time for reviewing our article and for your comments.

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2026-6-AC2>



RC2: 'Comment on wes-2026-6', Anonymous Referee #2, 18 Feb 2026 

The article does a great job in describing the problem, the state of the art and in presenting detailed data of the new wind measuring methodology. I think that this work can have broad

impact on wind energy production. The data is organized and presented well, and it demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed e-tt technique.

The paper mentions the use of machine learning for bettering the data. Some more information would be needed – or a pointer to a reference publication – to understand which type of learning method is used.

Section 4 is long. It would be better to split it into discussion and conclusions, to keep the conclusions short and up to the point.

While the paper is reasonably well written a few sentences can be improved (e.g., line 42 and 50)

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2026-6-RC2>



AC1: 'Reply on RC2', Dimitri Voisin, 24 Feb 2026 

Thank you for your time reviewing our article and for your feedback that we appreciate.

Comment 1 concerning the learning method we used:

This is part of our IP and we would prefer not to mention it in the article. Is it an issue for you to accept the article if we keep it like this ? Thank you for your understanding.

Comment 2 about the length of section 4:

We will split section 4 in 2 parts "discussion" and "conclusion" as you suggest. It will be updated in the next revision of the article.

Comment 3:

We acknowledge your comments that few sentences can be improved (i.e. line 42 and 50). Please see thereafter the modifications we propose to you:

Line 42 :

- The original sentence " *In modern wind turbines that allow adjustments to both speed and blade pitch, the efficiency depends on two main factors: the ratio of the rotor tip speed to the wind speed, and the angle at which the blades are pitched*"

To be changed to " *In variable speed and variable pitch wind turbines, the power production efficiency depends on 2 factors: tip speed ratio (TSR) and the pitch angle.*"

Line 50:

- The original sentence " *To address these challenges, in literature can be find the Extremum Seeking Control (Creaby et al., 2009) and more recently the Log-Power Proportional-Integral Extremum Seeking (Kumar et al., 2022).*"

To be changed to " *To address these challenges, there are existing methods which can be found in the literature like the Extremum Seeking Control (Creaby et al., 2009) and more recently the Log-Power Proportional-Integral Extremum Seeking (Kumar et al., 2022).*"

Thank you for your future response,

Best regards,

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2026-6-AC1>



RC3: 'Reply on AC1', Anonymous Referee #2, 26 Feb 2026 

I agree on your reply on Comment 1. This info is not necessary.

I appreciate you following up with Comment 2.

Also the rewording (comment 3) is perfect

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2026-6-RC3>

