Much work is still needed to improve the Introduction section, see comments below. Besides, the authors have still not addressed the issue with limited area coupling (only catchment uses 3D groundwater model, while rest of the domain uses 1D land surface model), except stating that that there is significant change in land surface variables for the coupled domain, which is what one would expect and some discussion on scale of variables in Section 4.5. How does this discontinuity in the landsurface physics introduce uncertainty in the atmospheric variables analyzed in this study for the coupled runs?

Minor Comments:

Pg. 1, Ln 20: computational interaction or coupling ?
Pg. 2, Ln 39: coupled to what?
Pg. 2, Ln 41: Change stand-alone to offline hydrological model, and begin with new sentence.
Pg. 2, Ln 42: simulated
Pg. 2, Ln 44: Explain what model they used.
Pg. 3, The authors mention very little about the previous studies, only emphasizing the number of hours of simulation carried out by different coupled modeling studies but fails completely to expand on the important findings of these studies, which is more relevant in context of this paper.
Pg. 4, Ln 82: replace long-term with annual simulation. At the same time, since the coupling is done over a catchment only, not the entire domain of the atmospheric model, this should be mentioned here as a limitation as there is a discontinuity in model physics on how the lower boundary condition is computed for the atmospheric model.
Pg. 8, Ln 189: Three dimensions variable exchange?
Pg. 12, Ln 296: The sentence does not correspond to the figure.
Pg. 13, Ln 298 to 301: RMSE or variability?
Pg. 13, Ln 303 to 305: Does not follow above paragraph and heading, confusing.
Pg. 13, Ln 311: But observed precipitation also decreases right ?
Pg. 14, Ln 323-334: Give background on why these time periods were chosen? The figures do not illustrate much either.
Pg. 14: Ln 345: Is this improvement significant?
Pg. 15: Ln 347-Ln 364: Again why this period chosen, give background. Is it even compared with observations?
Pg. 18: Ln 441: performance . In …
Pg. 18, Ln 443: tend to underestimate
Pg. 18, Ln 445, e.g.,
Pg. 19, Ln 450, higher degree or low frequency coupling?