Editor comments for
Improving the complementary methods to estimate evapotranspiration under diverse climatic and physical conditions
by F.M. Anayah and J.J. Kaluarachchi
2014.2.7

1. It is interesting to compare the CR methods in the contrasting land and climate conditions. Also, it is an ambition to try to develop a universal CR model which is calibration free. This paper has obtained some useful and promising results.
2. However, the reviewers also raised some important questions. I would like to ask the authors to revise the manuscript according to all the comments, especially the following two major points:
    1) Please pay more attention to the 'universal' of the proposed GG18 model. J. Szilagyi (comment #9) mentioned the comparison of different models. Referee #1 (major comment #1) mentioned the physical consideration about the definition of ETp or ETw and wanted more discussion/explanation on the physical (not pure empirical better) basis of the proposed variations of CR models. For this, I would like the authors to refer to the following papers.

        Han S. et al. A nonlinear function approach for the normalized complementary relationship evaporation model. Hydrol. Process, 2012. DOI: 10.1002/hyp.8414

        Lhomme, J.P. and L. Guilioni, Comments on some articles about the c omplementary relationship. Journal of hydrology, 2006. 323: 1-3.

        Lhomme, J.P. and L. Guilioni, On the link between potential evaporati on and regional evaporation from a CBL perspective. Theoretical and Applied Climatology, 2010. 101(1): 143-147.
    2) Please pay attention to the height of the EC instruments, which is an important detail for the representative scale of the ET measurement.