

In the project, the authors consider the task of improving data resolution with physics informed model on the particular example of the data about wind power. I appreciate the practical part of the project: the description of the used methods in the report, the “design” of the GitHub repository and the given instructions for the reproducing experiment. However, I suppose that the overall report text should be major revised. My comments are the following:

#### Major comments.

- What is the main contribution of your project? It’s not clear from the Introduction and Method sections.
- In general, the text is written as a post from the science blog, whether a scientific paper;
- I suggest the author use more simple sentences in future works. Now the significant number of compound sentences, long additional comments in parentheses and grammar mistakes make the text hard to understand.
- Preliminaries seem to be incomplete/unnecessary now. Probably, it will be better to put it in the Method section or even in the Introduction section.
- We preprocessed data by extracting actual wind speeds from PNG files and linearly scaling them to the interval  $[0; 1]$ . – is it some simple operation, or does it require extra tools? Not obvious to me.
- It’ll be better to bold the best results in Table 1.
- Please, proofread your text to correct grammar and punctuation mistakes.

#### Minor comments.

- (consider (Bochenek & Ustrnu, 2022) for review of the current state in the field). – it’s not common to make such remark. In my own opinion, it’s normal just to cite this review in the Introduction and then add some information about the review in the Related work section like “The review blabla covers the major current methods for mathematical modelling”. The same for “(we encourage our reader to refer to (Karniadakis et al., 2021) for complete overview)”
- Neural-based methods and due to this are very popular nowadays. – Probably, something is missing.
- Data is publicly available at doi:10.22002/D1.2126 – please, use href with replacing the doi with a more accurate word, e.g. “link”.

I can easily run the notebooks with baseline methods but, unfortunately, fail with the Mainmodel.ipynb. The problem was in the used package version, so it’s necessary to add requirements on the used package in the GitHub repository.