Many changes were made through the authors’ efforts in the revised manuscript. However, the grammar errors continue to occur almost everywhere in this updated version. A heavy English edit work is required to improve the writing. It is strongly recommended to seek a professional language service. As I pointed out in the first turn review, it is not useful to present the impact of the ingest frequency of the lateral boundary conditions on the large-eddy simulation (LES) results if the WRF/LES has a capability of running the online-coupling mode. In addition, the simulated sensible and latent heat fluxes presented in Figure 4 are not accepted for publication without further improvement. As pointed by the authors, the observed sensible heat flux could be too low on July 1, 2016. What about the observational data for other days? Did the authors see the same low sensible heat fluxes on other days since you have one-month date in July 2017? Over-predicted latent heat flux in the first several simulation hours should be improved by changing the initial soil moisture in the simulations with the observed value. Did the authors try that? Overall, the manuscript requires another major revision. Specific comments are listed as follows.

1. The LES results presented in Figure 4 need further improvements. It is suggested to use the observed soil moisture as the initial condition for the new LES run.