

We would like to thank the reviewer for taking the time to re-read our manuscript and for providing further suggestions. Our answers to the remaining issues (shown in *italic*) are shown beneath each issue with the location of the correction in the manuscript indicated in **bold**. Those changes are also highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.

- *Could you make it clear to the reader that in TSEB_2ART soil evaporation and transpiration fluxes are computed as residual terms of the soil and the vegetation energy budget equations from the corresponding individual temperatures derived from 4SAIL ?*

The clarification was added.

Lines 450-453 and 461-464

- *Instead of looking at differences in LST (7.1.2), it would have been more interesting (from an hydrological point of view) to compare the Soil evaporation/Transpiration partitioning between the three estimates rather than the soil and vegetation temperatures.*

The comparison between the components of the modelled LE might not be very meaningful, since very few studies exists in which those components are validated. However, we decided to include a short discussion of the modelled vegetation transpiration while also mentioning the above caveat.

Lines 730 – 753, Figure 7 and Table 4

- *It's still confusing to show on Figure 5 on the one hand data for particular days and on the other 8-year average PET and MIKE-SHE outputs. What is the added value ? (since there is a scatterplot for each dataset as insert in this Figure). According to me, it mostly shows that a linear interpolation of clear-sky estimates is meaningless, but this is a truism isn't it ? Usually one uses an interpolation of EF or evaporation efficiency between clear sky days *. Why don't you show such an interpolation alongside PET and MIKE_SHE for one particular year instead ?*

The purpose of the 8-year average line is to illustrate the seasonal change in the magnitude of ET due to the annual climatology of the study area. It is true that the scatter plots show the same basic information about the relative magnitudes of ET modelled by the remote sensing and hydrological models but we believe that the time-series graph adds another, useful perspective. However, if the reviewer considers this not to be the case we would be happy to shown just the scatter plots. Producing yearly interpolated ET from the clear sky days is beyond the scope of this study.

- Avoid the use of the term “overestimate” (conversely, "underestimate") throughout the paper since you compare model estimates and do not have observed data. Replace it with something like “estimate larger values than...”

Corrected.

Lines 963, 966, 967, 1052-1054

Minor:

- *Abstract: L16: primary input for MIKE_SHE is not soil moisture per se but water inputs (rain and irrigation), please rephrase.*

It is true that MIKE SHE is primarily driven by water inputs. However, what we meant in that sentence were

the inputs to the MIKE SHE ET module. This was clarified.

Lines 15 and 18

- L263: *besides of > besides*

Corrected.

Line 264

- L420: *apart from your cited reference Guzinski et al. , 2013, Chirouze et al., 2014* have also proposed a way to derive fg as a ratio between actual and maximum GLAI values.*

The reference was added.

Line 421