



# ***Interactive comment on “Improving the complementary methods to estimate evapotranspiration under diverse climatic and physical conditions” by F. M. Anayah and J. J. Kaluarachchi***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 27 January 2014

This paper evaluates three existing complementary methods compared with EC observations, identifies the major model components contributing to predicting ET. Then, a universal model, which is calibration-free, is proposed to predict ET independent of land cover/use. This research is quite comprehensive and interesting.

The proposed GG18 model shown in Fig 7 has the best performance compared with other combinations of components. The empirical equation for computing  $G_i$  is very important for the method. More discussion on this equation is necessary, particularly

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



when it is combined with equations (1) and (7).

Lines 18-19 on page 13611 “Overall, GG22 has the lowest median and average values of RMSE that are 16.20 and 20.23mm month<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.” It is good to mention the uncertainty of EC observation compared with RMSE.

Table 6 compares the GG18 and recently published ET studies. The GG18 performance can also be compared with the original CRAE and AA model shown in Table 2.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 13595, 2013.

**HESSD**

10, C7485–C7486, 2014

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C7486

