We thank the anonymous referee for the helpful comments, and constructive remarks on this manuscript. Our reply to the numbered General and Specific Comments are given below:

This paper reviews the accuracy of remote sensing information for the relevant components of Water Accounting: rainfall, land use and evaporation. The paper is well structured and well written. The topic is relevant for Hydrology and Earth System sciences. The content of the paper is also relevant since it puts a substantial number of important studies on satellite based estimates of hydrological components in perspective. I have two main concerns:

We are pleased to know that the referee finds our paper well written, well structured, and of relevance to HESS.

1. In the introduction reference is made to a specific tool Water Accounting Plus (WA+). Subsequently the title of section 2 contains the same name WA+. Does this mean that the review is limited to and geared to a specific tool? If so this should be clearly stated in the introduction and preferably also be reflected in the title of the manuscript.

   Response: The use of results of this review is not limited to WA+. However the choice of the hydrological parameters that have been investigated for their accuracy in this paper (ET, Rainfall, LULC) is based on the parameters that are used in WA+. The paper will be revised to explicitly reflect on this matter.

2. The very small errors (1%) reported on a number of studies where SEBAL is used for evaporation estimation should be explained. Whereas any ground truth evaporation measurement will have a larger uncertainty then 1%, it is unclear what this errors of 1% actually represent.

   Response: All the inputs for this review come from published scientific papers and reports. As explained in the paper we agree that there is bias towards reporting low errors in published works in which often the authors are both developer and tester of the proposed algorithms. For this reason, the data points were fitted by means of a skewed normal distribution so that less weight is given to the class with exceptionally low errors.

Minor issues:

3. Why not keep the same sequence in section 3 as in section 2: Rainfall, Land use, evaporation?

   Response: Noted. Will revise the sequence.

4. P1077:L22. Note that under convective daytime conditions a decrease in the wind speed, with a reduction of turbulent mixing may also increase surface temperature and this will not necessarily lead to a higher sensible heat flux.

   Response: Good point. We will reflect on this issue.

5. P1083:L09-10 this sentence is unclear. Perhaps delete " Reviewing" and change "were" into "are"

   Response: will be revised.