

Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2022-22-RC2>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Comment on wes-2022-22

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "A New Way to Estimate Maximum Power from Wind Turbines: Linking Newtonian with Action Mechanics" by Ivan Kennedy et al., Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2022-22-RC2>, 2022

---

After reviewing the manuscript "A New Way to Estimate Maximum Power from Wind Turbines: Linking Newtonian with Action Mechanics" by Kennedy et al., I came to the conclusion that it is not just poorly written but also does not adhere to the standards expected of a scientific paper. These deficits make the evaluation of the ideas presented considerably more difficult. For this reason, I recommend a rejection of the manuscript at this stage.

More specific comments (in the order of their appearance in the manuscript):

ll 16-25: The abstract is far from sufficiently specific. Statements as with the last sentence are rather inappropriate and should be replaced by more specific conclusion and summarized results.

ll 28: The introduction includes far too few references, so that most statements and given details are not sufficiently verified.

ll 57: The introduction of "action mechanics" and explanation what is meant by it, comes far too late here.

l 73: Somewhere there should be an introduction of the manuscripts structure – maybe here.

l 80 (e.g.): It is not clear to me why the authors use square brackets here. Overall,

inclusion of maths should be reviewed and revised carefully.

I 87: Both Figure 1 and 2 are far too busy and must be revised and improved.

II 93: The authors follow a very unconventional structure (for this type of scientific publications) – in particular this part does not seem suitable for being part of (still) the introduction.

I 172: Formatting of equations (not just this one) needs to be revised and improved.

I 184: Please use section numbers for referencing instead.

I 189: Nice to read this but not suitable for a scientific paper.

I 239: Also, having a "Methods" section after the "Results" is not common and does not support a well structured manuscript.

I 253: All the details summarized in the table lack suitable references.

I 298: Bad figure quality.