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.



HESSD

7, C437-C438, 2010

Interactive Comment

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?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



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

HESSD

7, C437-C438, 2010

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

