Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

We would like to thank the reviewer for her/his kind comments as well as for the constructive comments and recommendations. In the sequel we provide details on the modifications we performed in the revised manuscript to address the comments. In addition, we have used red fonts in the revised paper to indicate the modifications performed. We note that we have modified the introduction to highlight the novelty of the presented hydro-servo-aero-elastic tool.

Comments and Suggestions for Authors
The paper is well-written, the amount and quality of work is remarkable.

The review of the state of the art is relatively brief, considering the huge body of literature available in the field and its fast evolution, but all in all adequate. I spotted some minor aspects which could be better clarified, discussed later in detail.

Minor corrections are needed to the language. For example:

Point 1: Page 2, line 93: "aircrafts" should be "aircraft" (uncountable)

Response 1: Corrected in the revised manuscript.

Point 2: Ref. 25 contains "Proceedings of" twice

Response 2: Corrected in the revised manuscript. We note that we have revised the references section to respect the template, as well as to provide additional information (i.e. doi).

Point 3: In the introduction, the acronym "BEM" is used for "Beam Element Momentum" (whereas, in other contexts, BEM is used for Boundary Element Method, another method sometimes also used for rotor aerodynamics, thus prone to confusion); its use is common practice, for example, in the rotorcraft scientific and engineering community, from which the wind turbine community inherited the methods. However, it comprises two separate theories:
the Blade Element theory, in which each blade is treated as a single entity, thus a finite number of blades are considered; in this theory, each blade section's circulation and loads does not affect the inflow at other sections, not to mention other blades.
the Momentum Theory, in which the overall force generated by the rotor is used to determine the overall inflow (either uniform or heuristically distributed over the disk area); in this latter case, an equivalent, infinite number of blades are considered.
When the so-called BEM theory (often better addressed to as BEMT, or BE-MT) is discussed, sometimes confusion is made about the attribution of specific aspects or features. For example:

Page 2, line 93: the statement "Vortex models are 3D by construction, with strong coupling along the span 94 which is completely absent in BEM" is correct, in the sense that in BE (Blade Element) theory there is no coupling along the span; interaction is loosely recovered through inflow resulting from MT (Momentum Theory), missing for example the localized strong interaction that occurs close to the tip of the blade.
Page 2, line 95: the statement "while the assumption of infinite number of blades made by BEM" is misleading: the BE (Blade Element) part of the theory does not assume an infinite number of blades; it is the MT (Momentum Theory) that assumes an infinite number of blades.

Response 3: We have changed BEM to BEMT in the revised manuscript, following reviewer's suggestion. In addition we have included a short text in parenthesis to avoid confusion with regard to BE and MT part. The sentence has been revised as follows (newly added text is shown in bold):
*"In vortex models the tip and root corrections implemented in BEMT are no longer needed, while the assumption of infinite number of blades made by BEMT **(in the momentum part)** is dropped."*

Point 4: As a final remark, I humbly suggest - but it is not a requirement - to remove the word "Holistic" from the title.

Response 4: We have removed the word "Holistic" from the title.