

Interactive comment on “Evaluation of Penman-Monteith model applied to a maize field in the arid area of Northwest China” by W.-Z. Zhao et al.

D. Smith

danhe2009@ymail.com

Received and published: 6 April 2010

The authors expressed the bulk canopy resistance in two different approaches, and evaluated which one was better fitting for evapotranspiration estimation with Penman-Monteith model. It is helpful to improve the performance of P-M model to simulate evapotranspiration in the cropped fields. But there are several questions need to be made clear or revised in the manuscript.

1. Keywords should be added unless the journal does not need it.
2. In the conclusion, it is necessary to explain how to increase water use efficiency in the cropped field according to the simulation results.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



3. In the site description, soil fertility should be described, which has a great impact on crop growth.

4. P470, “The surface irrigation districts account for 95% of the total irrigated area, and mainly by means of the border irrigation”. P474, “From the MBE given in Fig. 5, it can be seen that the J-D approach overestimated the bulk canopy resistance. Therefore, the N-P approach is more suitable than the J-D approach to simulate the bulk canopy resistance of the irrigated 20 maize filed under the arid climatic condition.” These sentences are difficult to follow.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 461, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper