

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 #2

Received and published: 30 April 2010

I found the paper hard to follow since the aim of the study and methodology are not clearly described. Also, the main results obtained are not clearly illustrated and it is difficult to capture the innovative aspects of the research. It seems that the main improvement obtained using RS method is in the R^2 values shown in Figure 9, i.e. $R^2=0.84$ for simulated runoff (PM method) versus observations, and $R^2=0.85$ for simulated runoff (RS method) versus observations. The authors state that this suggests a major accuracy of RS method, but from a scientific point of view this is “false”. Moreover, there is a confusion between PM and RS methods in relation to SWAT and data fusion, between ET validation and ET validation through runoff (what does it means?).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

The abstract is too long, the text very confusing and references are too many. Figure 6 is described before Figure 4 and 5.

Thus, I think that the paper does not fit the fundamental requirements for a publication on a high quality international scientific journal like HESS.

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper