

Dear Authors,

Two reviewers have provided very useful comments to your manuscript. While the general issues noted by both reviewers appear similar and both are positive about the manuscript, they have also pointed out some specific critical issues.

The energy balance closure needs special attention, with specific references to the use of the eddy covariance (EC) data for comparison.

Referee 1 "On page 7089 (15) you state correctly that the energy balance closure can leaf to 20% uncertainty in your E estimation." should read as "On page 7089 (15) you state correctly that the energy balance closure can **lead** to 20% uncertainty in your E estimation." but needs an error analysis as a quantification.

You are invited to provide a point by point response to both reviews.

In additional, I have some more specific comments and suggestions.

You need to analyze the relationship between the EC fetch area and the footprint of the satellite product. A critical question that needs to be answered is - are those spatial scales comparable to each other?

What is the difference or consistency between the LST from LandSAF and Tsk? What is the implication if they are different?

With best regards,

Bob Su,

Editor HESS