

Reply to interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 13595, 2013.

Authors' reply to "Interactive comment on "Improving the complementary methods to estimate evapotranspiration under diverse climatic and physical conditions" by F. M. Anayah and J. J. Kaluarachchi" by 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.

Reply: The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for the time and effort made available to comment on the manuscript.

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

Reply: The authors will edit the manuscript as needed for further clarity and explanation.

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⁻¹, respectively." It is good to mention the uncertainty of EC observation compared with RMSE.

Reply: The authors will edit the manuscript as needed and give information required.

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.

Reply: The authors will update Table 2 or an appropriate location in the revised manuscript to provide this comparison.