

Interactive comment on “Spatial uncertainty assessment in modelling reference evapotranspiration at regional scale” by G. Buttafuoco et al.

G. Buttafuoco et al.

coscarelli@irpi.cnr.it

Received and published: 3 September 2010

Dear anonymous referee #1, We would like to thank you for your review and your good judgment on the paper. We thank you also for your comment, that are now reported with our answers:

Comment 1: Line 13 (Abstract). It is better to move the explanation of the model used in the working the part relative to the aim of the paper (line 16).

Answer 1: We will move the citation of the model (“Among the evapotranspiration models, the Hargreaves-Samani model was used”) to the end of line 18.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Comment 2: 2. Line 14 (introduction). Separate ET0 from is. Answer 2: We will insert a space between “ET0” and “is”

Comment 3: Line 5 (Results and discussion).It is not so clear how elevation data corresponds to the temperatures. It is better to comment the table 1. Answer 3: The elevation is the auxiliary variable and in table 1 we have reported the statistics of this variable measured at the experimental points (weather stations). In “Materials and Methods” the use of this auxiliary variable as external drift has been explained. The phrase of lines 2-4 (3 Results and discussion) “The summary statistics of mean maximum (Tmax) and mean minimum temperature (Tmin) data (Celsius degrees) for June and elevation data (m a.s.l.) are reported in Table 1.” will be changed as follows “The summary statistics of mean maximum (Tmax) and mean minimum temperature (Tmin) data (Celsius degrees) for June and elevation data (m a.s.l.), measured at the weather stations, are reported in Table 1.”

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 4567, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

