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Thank you for taking your time and reviewing our paper. The feedback you provided is very useful and the paper was edited where possible according to the recommendations provided. Here is the response to your comments:

- Electric system is included in the inputs for all simulations. Each turbine in COMPASS is split into subsystems e.g. Generator System or Control and Protection System. However activities for these systems are not discussed in the paper mainly because they have been created by the ORE Catapult team and are not publically available. The final version of the paper includes more detail on how turbines are split into subsystems and components (l. 133).
- The sensitivity of the results against maintenance costs is not included. If maintenance costs would change equally for both strategies there would be no effect on the difference between them. SOV cost variation is not considered significant (especially in comparison with other factors) and is therefore not included in this study.
- The discount rate has been changed according to the latest findings (l. 327). An Appendix A was added to the final version of the paper which shows how the results would change if a discount rate was different.
- Spare part storage has not been considered in this paper and it is now explicitly mentioned in the finalised version of the paper. A reference for interested readers has also been added which analyses storage capabilities of SOVs (l.110).
- The use of commas was revised.