Second review from: Effect of Tailing-Edge Thickness on Aerodynamic Noise for Wind Turbine Airfoil

Dear authors, the following points of my first round of revision have not been correctly addressed. Please read them carefully and re-organize the paper consequently. The authors did not highlight the modification due to the first round of revision, therefore, it is difficult for me to revise the new parts and to make a comparison with the original manuscript.

My comments and suggestion are in green color.

3 Table 1 and 2 represents some results and data about the mesh dependency study. It is not well organized neither described. My recommendation is the use of the so-called Richardson extrapolation method. You have an example of the application in Computational Modeling of Gurney Flaps and Microtabs by POD Method. Energies 2018, 11, 2091; https://doi.org/10.3390/en11082091

A: Many thanks for your good suggestion, the table 2 has been reorganized and described using Richardson extrapolation method. Specific revisions are shown in Table 2 of the paper.

2nd review: this point has not been properly addressed. The mesh dependency study and the corresponding explanations are still fuzzy and unclear. Why URANS calculation belong to oscillatory convergence? Reasons?
In the other hand, LES results are divergent, why? Reasons?
Please remove the experimental results from Table 2.
The authors used the so-called Richardson extrapolation method but they don’t add any ref. Please add a reference.


A: Thanks for your advice. In section 2.1, a reference and explain about transition SST model, LES and DES model in FLUENT commercial software has been added.

2nd review: Please when mentioning the commercial CFD code FLUENT along the text, a reference is required. Furthermore, the authors did not add the reference of Menter F. R., who was the developer of the SST model.

5. How the author calculated the time step 5*10^-5?

A: Unsteady calculation in FLUENT uses two time steps, physical time steps are directly set to 5*10^-5s, and each physical time step is iterated 20 times.
2nd review: that answer is not enough. Why is 5x10-5 the time step and not other value? Why inner iterations are 20? More explanations are required.
New comments: