Recommended Revisions:

* Reviewer 1:  
  Comments:
  1. Figure 6 shows actual and predicted wind power on farm 2. The unit of y axis is not given. I assume it is MW. Since the base line of wind power is less than 1MW, I do not think the proposed method shows its advantage for predicting the wind power accurately.
     + I think that the data is normalize so it is not 1MW. We can add a sentence about normalized data it in section 2B.
     + I think that you can fix the unit on y-axis.
     + For last sentence, we can mention something like “The main objective of this research is to improve the existing best methodology. Experiment results on the same public competition dataset show that the proposed prediction model has the best performance compared with several the state-of-the-art approaches as shown in Table IV.
  2. The unit of RMSE and MAE are also not given in Tables IV and V.
     + I think that you can fix or clarify it the unit on y-axis.
* Reviewer 2:
  + Comments: The paper proposes a new hybrid model that predicts wind power generation based on meteorological forecast. The proposed hybrid model contains three layers which take account of wind speed, turbine inertia, seasonality, and wind farm location. The following comments/questions are raised for the authors' consideration:
    - 1. On the second page of the paper, the authors argue that "A major challenge of this problem comes from the instability of wind power generation. Another challenge part is the time-series nature of the data. Both problems are addressed by...". No explanation is given regarding how the "instability" and "time series" nature of the data present a challenge. Some elaboration is desirable to help audience appreciate the challenge being solved and the effectiveness of the prediction tool developed by the authors. The reviewer assumes that the authors mean to say "variability" of wind power generation. If this is the case, "instability" would be a mis-use and refer to something else in the domain of power system stability.
      * Please change “instability” to “variability”
        + Note: we already use “variability” in several paragraphs in both abstract and introduction.
      * Jian this is what I have in mind that address the whole comment. Feel free to change wording:
        + Change “A major challenge of this problem comes from the instability of wind power generation. Another challenge part is the time-series nature of the data.” to “A major challenge of this problems comes from the unpredictable nature and variability of wind condition especially difference between meteoritical wind forecasts and actual wind condition at actual location of wind farms due to microclimate. Another challenge is the time-series nature of the data that inherits non-linear dependencies in data thus traditional approach such as an autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) model that rely on linear method is not suitable for this task”
    - 2. In Fig. 2, notations "f0, f1, f6..." are used multiple times across the paper but lacks description. Please provide a definition of the notations.
      * Note – I think that description of “f0, f1,…” was already in Table III but
      * It might be better to change "f0, f1, f6..." to “M1”, “M2”, M3” and make it sequential.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| F0 | Model 1 |
| F1 | Model 2 |
| F6 | Model 3 |
| F7 | Model 4 |
| F10 | Model 5 |
| F11 | Model 6 |
| F12 | Model 7 |
| F13 | Model 8 |
| F15 | Model 9 |

* + - * Change Table III title to “The layer 2 models and associated features”
      * Change “meaning” in Table II to “description”
      * Please state in the response that “We revised Fig 2 and Table III to clarify the reviewer’s comment”. At least to inform the reviewer that description is already in Table III.
      * Since Fig 2 is introduced early without model description, it is better to make it more generic. Please change Fig2 to something below.

