







N.	Status	Reviewer	Position	Observation(s)	Action(s)
	 → To-Do  → In Progress  → Reviewed				
1		1	Page 8, lines 2-17	It is not clear what the word coupling really means within the context of the application of the boundary displacement. For example, does the application of the coupling of horizontal displacements u_x along the left and right hand sides. Means simultaneous application of the horizontal displacement u_x along the left and right hand sides? Similarly, what does the statement coupling of the vertical displacements u_z is applied to the upper boundary really mean? What were the imposed boundary conditions for this particular loading state? Was the horizontal displacement applied simultaneously as the vertical displacement? Linear distribution of horizontal displacement what was the linear function for the displacement distribution used, as the choice of this will have a significant influence on the strain energy release rate.	
2		1	Pages 9, 16, and 19	include the section numbers.	
3		1	Page 9, lines 35-36	The applied horizontal displacement is chosen to correspond to a horizontal strain $\varepsilon_x = 1\%$. However, there is no information about the applied vertical displacement u_z for the other load cases.	

4	✗	1	Figure 4	the results for G_I for the load case 1×1 coupling suggest G_I zero when $\Delta\theta > 80^\circ$. This is very surprising. The load case 1×1 coupling involves the application of vertical displacement u_z . Thus, with increasing value of $\Delta\theta$, u_z will tend to have more opening mode effect on the debond. Thus one would expect G_I to remain finite and positive, and to increase as $\Delta\theta$ increases beyond 45 degrees. Can the authors comment on this and the difference between this expectation and their results?	
5	✗	1	Page 16	the difference between the energy release rate (ERR) for $n = 1$ and $n = 21$ (Figures 4 and 6; and Figures 5 and 7) was attributed to strain magnification. As stated in the manuscript, the case with $n = 21$ is much stiffer than that with $n = 1$. The application of the same remote strain of $\varepsilon_x = 1\%$ to both cases, means the net average applied remote stress would be higher for $n = 21$ than for $n = 1$. It is well known that ERR scale with the remotely applied load or stress. Should the comparison between the two cases not be made at the same average remote applied stress (not strain)?	
1	✗	2	Introduction and Conclusions	However, the authors could remark more clearly the novelty of their results versus the previous referenced ones.	<i>In Introduction:</i>
2	✗	2	Page 2. Introduction: lines 7, 11, 22, 27 and 35.	Erroneous ? seem to appear.	
3	✗	2	Page 2. Introduction: line 9.	At the lamina level, the use should be At the lamina level the use	

4	X	2	Page 3. Introduction: lines 6, 17, 18, 19, 38 and 40.	Erroneous ? seem to appear.
5	X	2	Page 4. Introduction: lines 5, 9, 17, 18, 20, and 38.	Erroneous ? seem to appear.
6	X	2	Page 6.	Equation (2): An extra dot at the end seems to appear.
7	X	2	Page 7. Line 21.	The following modification is proposed: the laminates are assumed to be SUBJECTED..
8	X	2	RVE models & FE discretization: Figures 1 and 2.	Discontinuous vertical lines on the outer boundary should be desirable in order to reinforce the unlimited length of the model in the longitudinal (x) direction.
9	X	2	RVE models & FE discretization: Figures 1 and 2.	How is real is to find horizontally aligned debonds in an actual cross ply composite (specially in the several rows model)? Is there any experimental base for this damage pattern? It could seem more realistic to consider vertically quasi-aligned debonds. Could the author envisage if the conclusions would be the same in this vertical pattern case?
10	X	2	Page 7. Line 44.	RUC nomenclature $n \times k - m \cdot t_{90^\circ}$ seems a bit complicated specially when used in sections where different combinations are continuously referred (see for instance pages 13 and 14).
11	X	2	Pages 8. Line 31.	$n = 1$ does not seem an actual case from transverse cracking point of view. Additional clarification for the use of this model is recommended.
12	X	2	Pages 9. Line 23.	Numbers of sections are missed.

13	✗	2	Finite Element (FE) discretization.	Since the properties employed are realistic and the results presented are not dimensionless it does not seem too logical to employ not real dimensions for the models (see for instance $R_f = 1\mu m$ or cell sizes). The complete use of realistic parameters could provide additional conclusions for the G results presented.	
14	✗	2	Page 10. Line 41.	Should CUSTOM be CUSTOMER?	
15	✗	2	Page 11. Line 46.	Should ALBEIT be ALTHOUGH?	p
16	✗	2	RESULTS and Discussion Section.	In addition to G_I and G_{II} , total G graphs seem necessary to compute global effects in all cases presented.	p
17	✗	2	Pages 16. Line 22.	Number of section is missed.	p
18	✗	2	Pages 18. Lines 40 and 41.	Number of section is missed.	
