

This version of the paper is a significant improvement.

I still think that the contribution to modelling science is low compared to other papers in this field.

The contents may be a great addition to a C-Coupler2 paper. But after discussions with colleagues, I came to the conclusion that by itself it may be interesting to some people.

There are still some minor problems that can be addressed to further improve the paper.

Additionally, I would suggest getting this paper checked by someone with very good English language skills, as I have the feeling that there are still some issues.

L15:

„couplers such as MCT“

I would not call MCT a coupler.

L15:

„inefficient global implementation“

Depending on a number of factors like problem size, number of processes, and MPI implementation being used, the global implementation may have good performance. Therefore, instead of generally saying that the global implementation is bad, you could for example point out, that your algorithm has significantly better performance characteristics especially for higher processor counts.

L28-29:

“weights that are from an offline file or from online calculation”

What is an offline file?

How about the following?

“weights that read from a file or are calculated online”

L73-87

The analysis of the complexity does not take into account, that MCT allows the use of a compressed global index description, which can significantly reduce memory consumption and time required to detect common grid cells.

Maybe, do the time complexity analysis only for C-Coupler and mention that MCT should be similar but that it also supports compressed indices (I am not exactly sure about the internals of MCT).

L75-76

“corresponding to MCT (as well as 75CPL6/CPL7 and OASIS3-MCT that employ MCT for data transfer)”

Unless you are very familiar with the internal implementation (I am not), you should refrain from making such explicit statements.