Dear Editor

We would like to thank the editor for the suggestion.

Editor

The paper improved considerable by including several suggestions and ideas of the reviewers. The only weak point in my opinion is that the reader is left a bit puzzled with the differences between the studies presented in Figure 1. I think the main reason for this is, that the reader only is informed about the methods used in the different studies, but not about the assumptions and details (spatial and temporal scale, vegetation type, models or/and measurements, which flukes are measured (soil evaporation, transpiration, interception). I think it would be very useful if the authors could attached a table with the necessary information to each study presented in Figure 1, so the reader is better able to evaluate why the results are different.

We added table 2 in our manuscript in order to provide detailed information from figure 1.