

The manuscript has certainly improved, but there is still work left.

Title

I liked the old title better than the new one. The title should convey the essence of the paper, and for me that is the effect of a two-way coupling of an atmosphere and wave model on the representation of atmospheric and wave parameters in a shallow and complex coastal area. Explicitly mentioning both in-situ and satellite observations draws too much attention away from that. And, moreover, the title is now too much a collection of loose terms without really connecting them.

1. Introduction

line 112: *then* should be *than*.

line 124: I would use *in the German Bight* (more places in the manuscript).

2.2 The wave model WAM

line 169: The first of the paragraph line speaks of version 4.5.4, but here it is 5.4.5 (and with a hyphen).

2.4 Study period and data availability

line 210: Figures 2 and 3 are not (hardly) on storm Xaver, and certainly do not show the minimum pressure.

line 210, 211: Use singular *high tide*: even though it occurs at different locations on the German Bight at different times, it is still the top of one tidal wave.

line 214: *at low tide* instead of *at low water time*? Or do you mean really something different?

line 215ff: something is wrong there.

3.1 Altimeter data

line 253ff: Bad sentence. The time series are of wave heights and wind speeds during storm Xaver.

line 268: *wave heights of 2 meter respectively*: something is missing there.

line 268: Note the inconsistency between *in-situ* here and *in situ* elsewhere.

line 271ff: Do not use the abbreviation *std* without at least one time explaining it in full.

3.2 Altimeter-model comparison

You compare the output of *wave models* to remotely sensed data. It would help if you tell here whether you mean 1-way versus 2-way coupled or also already North Sea versus German Bight.

line 287: In Section 3.1 you found that the altimeters underestimate the wind speed compared to the in-situ measurements. Then, to conclude that a better agreement of the models with the satellite data means a *skill improvement* seems a step too far. They are closer, but might suffer from the same bias.

line 297: *waves smaller than one metre*: Why 1 m? Notice also the inconsistent spelling of *metre*, in other places I see *meter*.

line 307: Something is wrong there

line 314ff: The modeled wave height is much smoother than the observations because the model does not resolve the small scales which you see in the observations. That has little to do with post processing.

line 319: You can not conclude that the peak is shifted northward: you are at the end of the satellite track (Why? The satellite should have data more North as well). The valid conclusion would be that you miss the observed peak just above 58°N, but that the field data suggest this might be outside the model area. But you can not rule out either that there is another peak there which you miss because of the broken satellite track.

line 324ff: this disagreement between model and observation does **not** indicate anything about the satellite algorithm. You might just remark that it confirms conclusions of Fenoglio-Marc or something like that.

3.3 Validation against in situ measurements

line 342ff: *The comparison ... are exemplified* is grammatically incorrect, and you should probably formulate it completely different. Figure 7 gives the results and you are now going to compare them.

line 352: *due to the time shift in the wind data:* suggests that you explained this time shift somewhere earlier. But I can not find that.

line 382: *behaviour* is always singular

line 396: *reduced by 5%:* I read an *increase* of 2.5% in Table 3.

4. Impact of the two-way coupling

I am still not happy with the use itself of *bias* in this case. Bias indicates a deviation from a reference, but here you are just comparing two different model configuration of which neither should be considered as reference a-priori. The phrasing *average difference in wave height* is correct, but you should not call it *bias*.

Something similar applies to the use of *RMSE*. This stands for Root Mean Squared Error, but for that you also need a reference. In the original manuscript it was correctly called *root mean squared difference*.

5. Summary and Outlook

line 342: the use of *perform* is incorrect here.

line 343: I do not think that the coupling software *analyses* anything. It just couples two models.

line 470: *than from ?* Probably *from* should go away.

line 471: *This study* is confusing: do you mean the current paper or Staneva et al.?

line 475ff: The way this is formulated suggests more than what is dealt with in this paper. The use of *largely* is probably not appropriate here, as is *nevertheless*.

Figures

Figure 1b

The name *Westerland* is still unreadable.

Figure 2

What exactly is the radial variable?

Figure 3

The first subfigure is quite different from the other two. Especially when the colours used are not the same: red for Saral/Altika in the map and blue in the time series. I would make a separate Figure 4 for the time series.

The caption of the new Figure 4 should more clearly indicate that it is the observations in station FINO-1 together with the Saral/Altika observation. The blue vertical lines in the time series should be removed: the square is the satellite observation.

Figure 4 (old)

No tick marks on the left axis of the right plot; the Y axis text is far too close to the left plot; the caption is a mess; *pattern* should be *panel*.

Figure 6

Figure 6a lacks the x-axis title *latitude*.

Figure 7

The yellow lines are still hardly visible. I actually meant in my earlier comments, that you should not use yellow for such lines at all.

References

I only looked up 3 or so in the references list, but of those 2 had incorrect years in the text. So, all references should be carefully checked.