

## ***Interactive comment on “Temporal variations of evapotranspiration: reconstruction using instantaneous satellite measurements in the thermal infra red domain” by E. Delogu et al.***

**E. Delogu et al.**

emilie.delogu@cesbio.cnes.fr

Received and published: 30 April 2012

A key issue with this paper is that the paper is not well written and structured. The authors should address the structuring and presentation of this paper before it is published. The section headings do not cover the issue of a discussion.

The structure of the paper will be improved, and a discussion section will be added.

The abstract should be revised to highlight some of the key findings and comparisons in the paper. For example instead of saying just saying, “with a clear advantage for the evaporative fraction” the “clear advantage” can be supported by salient error statistics

C1205

presented in the paper.

It is usually not recommended to use figures or scripts in an abstract. However, your suggestion will be taken into account to improve the conclusion section.

I think the title of the paper can be revised and simplified to bring much more focus on the important issues in the paper.

As suggested by reviewer #2, the title will be improved.

Whilst it is commendable that the authors attempted to present a detailed review of previous work in the contextualisation of their work, the introduction is a bit too long and winding. Some aspects of the introduction can be left out of the paper without changing its quality. For example, whilst I understand why the authors wrote about MISTIGRI proposal (Pg 1702, Line 13 – 18), the information is not very important in the context of this paper. It can be left out, and the quality of the paper will not be affected. There are other sections that can also be left out. I recommend that the authors revise and summarise this section.

In a fairly general journal such as HESS, we feel on the contrary that the issue of using sparse instantaneous remotely sensed ETR estimates should be clearly put into context of both actual and coming satellite missions as well as its relevance for hydrological applications. However, we agree that the MISTIGRI proposal could be left out.

Exactly how many sites were analysed in this paper? Clarify this! The number of sites seems to change throughout the paper. At some point the plots or sites appear to be five (5) and then later the sites are said to be eleven (11).

There are 4 sites and 11 years of data available for the study on these sites (Table 1). This point will be clarified.