

Authors' Response to Short Comment by Mr. Li

General Comments:

It's a good paper that the authors have done lots of excellent work. In general, it's difficult for us to compare the results of different measurements of different scales. However, in this paper photosynthesis system, sap flow and eddy covariance at different scales for measuring evapotranspiration were carried out carefully in field. And some reasonable upscaling approaches, which would be the good references for other researchers, were presented. In addition, the authors applied the upscaling results and gave a fraction of transpiration to evapotranspiration at flower and bolling stages, i.e. mulched drip irrigation is obvious beneficial for saving water.

Response:

Thanks for the positive comments.

Specific Comments:

Since lots of complex work was done in the research, I have a few questions or suggestions about the analysis process: 1. For sap flow gauges, the representative plants with averaged height and leaf area index were selected. So, are there any differences of the plants between wide-row and narrow row that may have different soil water content, and the differences of the plants growing under various salinities in field?

Response:

We agree with Mr. Li that soil moisture and salinity may affect plant transpiration rate. Owing to the distance from drip pipe located in the middle of four cotton rows, the wide-row cotton possessed higher soil water content than narrow-row cotton. On July, 9, 2012, cumulative sap flow rate of wide-row plants (plant 2 and 3) was 0.299 and 0.284 g cm⁻² per day, which were higher than that of narrow-row plants (plant 1 and 4) with the value of 0.275 and 0.280 g cm⁻² per day. Therefore, we always considered the difference of transpiration rates between wide-row and narrow-row cotton plants when we carried out the experiments. Two wide-row plants and two narrow-row plants were selected to install the four sap flow sensors for all the periods, and the averaged value was used to represent the individual plant transpiration rate.

Since the effect of soil salinity on transpiration is complex and still not clear, we didn't consider it in this study. In further researches, more studies should be performed to obtain reliable relation between salinity and transpiration. Using this relation, we can get salinity-corrected field transpiration based on the spatial distribution of salinity, and the upscaling results might be improved accordingly.

2. For upscaling approach 6, you considered the leaf area and stem diameter in the function. However, why the plant height is not involved? If plants have the same leaf area, stem diameters but different plant heights, they may have

different canopy structures which have effects on transpiration.

Response:

We agree that the plant height may impact the canopy structure. In previous studies, since the canopy structure was not taken into account, the plant height was rarely used for upscaling. In this study, we took the canopy structure into account to obtain more reliable transpiration at plant scale. However, since the relation between canopy structure and plant height is still not clear, we cannot use dynamics canopy structure corresponding to different plant height to get the transpiration at field scale. More studies can be performed to clarify the relation between plant height and canopy structure in future.

3. It's interesting that the fraction of transpiration to evapotranspiration was quantitative defined at flower and bolling stages in this paper. I think the plastic film may have more meaning for the young plant with small leaf area and the comparison between mulch drip irrigation and food irrigation would be more significant.

Response:

There are several different methods which can be used to partition evapotranspiration components, and each method has its limitation. Since the sap flow sensor can't be installed on tiny stem, the method presented in this study is not suitable for the seedling stage when the cotton is young. During seedling stage we can use some other methods, such as micro-lysimeter to partition ET components.

However, during flower and bolling stages, the partitioning method using sap flow is more advanced and reliable. That is because micro-lysimeter may not provide reliable ET value when the irrigation is implemented. The lateral flow and leakage of soil water induced by irrigation are always cut off by the wall of lysimeter, resulting in the unrepresentative soil water content in the lysimeter. Therefore, it is difficult to obtain sound ET rates by lysimeter method during irrigation period. Our study provides a useful approach to evaluate ET components under irrigation condition.

4. I also have a little confusion about the title. The results of upscaling approaches were used to obtain the fraction of transpiration to evapotranspiration. However, these contents were not reflected in the title.

Response:

Thank you for your suggestion. As in your comment #3, it is important to quantify evapotranspiration components in the whole growth period. However, in this study, we just quantified the ET components in the flower and bolling stages. What's more, we mainly focused on the upscaling approaches and comparison between different methods in this paper. Evapotranspiration partition is just a case of application. Therefore, the title <A comparison of methods for determining field evapotranspiration: Photosynthesis system, sap flow, and eddy covariance> is used here.