Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, C437–C438, 2010 www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/7/C437/2010/ © Author(s) 2010. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



Interactive comment on "A new approach to accurate validation of remote sensing retrieval of evapotranspiration based on data fusion" by C. Sun et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 April 2010

- There are three models for estimation of ET listed in Section 3: (1) RS-retrieved, (2) Penman-Monteith, and (3) SWAT. SWAT already has the option to estimate ET with the Penman-Monteith equation. It is not clear what is the difference between (2) and (3).

- How was the "data fusion" into SWAT performed – simply by directly inserting the PM/RS-computed ET into SWAT? Towards the end of Section 5.2, it is explained that the PM-computed ET is done using only a single meteorological station. So, in this case the SWAT PM-based runoff was computed assuming that the PM-estimated ET is representative for the whole catchment? If so, what would be the implications of this assumption?

C437

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 1745, 2010.