

***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

– It is stated that the paper offers a new approach to evaluate the “RS-derived ET” using SWAT, which allows overcoming the limitations of the commonly used point-based approaches (i.e. station-observed data). The PM computed ET is done using only one meteorological station (section 5.2). Therefore, the evaluations/conclusions presented in 5.1 are actually based on a single point. So, not clear how exactly the ET evaluation approach presented here is different. The SWAT usage presumes spatial assessment. How well does the RS and the SWAT ET compare?

– Conclusion states that spatial and temporal analyzes were performed to assess the monthly ET throughout the domain. No results demonstrating the spatial analysis could

C442

be found in the text.

– Overall the paper is a bit hard to follow and needs to be modified; e.g. all data sets and their usage need to be clearly explained. It is advised that the authors review the manuscript for spelling (i.e. line 13: “ditribution”) and grammar mistakes. The abstract is very long and has a lot of abbreviations (some of which are not defined, i.e. RS, PM); it is recommended that the authors shorten it, reduce the number of abbreviations and remove the references.

---

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

C443