

Response to Reviewer 2

We thank the reviewer for his/her time reviewing our manuscript, and the comments on our work, which have substantially improved the quality of the manuscript. In the following we address the concerns point by point.

Comment 1 : This paper studies the wind turbine blade design based on an inverse method. The idea is reasonably presented. The paper is well organized and written. The following improvements are suggested before it can be recommended for publication.

Reply: Thank the reviewer for his/her kind consideration of our work.

Comment 2 : The proposed inverse method should be compared with other existing inverse methods. The improvements and drawbacks of the proposed method should be discussed.

Reply: The improvements and drawbacks of the proposed method has been discussed in comparison with the existing inverse methods in the revised manuscript (lines 71-85, page 2).

Comment 3 : The design result of the proposed method should be dependent on the design target. However, the design target is not clearly stated in the abstract and the conclusion.

Reply: It has been clearly stated in the abstract (line 1-2 and 6, page 1) and conclusion (lines 221-222 and 225-226, page 13) in the revised manuscript.

Comment 4 : Some discussions on the design results from the fluid dynamics aspect are suggested.

Reply: Discussions from fluid dynamics aspect have been added (lines 181-194, page 9).

Comment 5 : Some discussions on the improvements of the design results compared to the state-of-art standard are suggested.

Reply: It has been discussed on lines 206-210 on pages 10-11 of the revised manuscript.

Comment 6 : Line 42, among the aforementioned three blade design approaches..., Only two methods are discussed: the direct approach and the inverse approach.

Reply: It has been corrected.