

Clarification of review suggestion for hess-2015-520, Trends in atmospheric evaporative demand in Great Britain using high-resolution meteorological data by E. L. Robinson et al.

Near the top of my review I again suggested changing the attribution procedure to use net-LW as the LW variable rather than downward longwave, so as to put all of the canceling temperature dependencies in LW radiation together and simplify the story as to which terms are important. After submitting the review, I realized that it may be much easier for you all to make this change **only** in section 4.4, and not in section 4.3.

The idea is exactly analogous to how you already implemented the RH attribution: keep section 4.3 as-is using your “official” variables from your derived product, and then let section 4.4 be the “alternative” analysis where you use RH instead of q and, **simultaneously**, L_n instead of L_d . That way you will have just two analyses in total... one original/naive and one using more fundamental LW **and** humidity variables together to simplify the story and get rid of the cancelling terms. That is, the number of figures and tables will not change: Fig 15, Table 5 and Table 6 will now just employ L_n instead of L_d (in addition to employing R_h instead of q_a .) Fig 13, Table 3 and Table 4 will be left alone.

Though, I suppose if you wanted to bother making equivalents of Figs. 14 and B3 for L_n , then you would have extra figures after all. I don't know the space limitations for this journal, hopefully that would not be an issue.

In any case, the appendix C equations would then be changed as follows: there would be an extra (short) equation for dE_p/dL_n between C6 and C7, with the exact same right-hand side as C2. And, C7 would have the $-4*\epsilon*\sigma*T^3/R_n$ term removed. C1-C5 would be unchanged, contrary to my original suggestion.

Again, this all should be thought of as optional but potentially very useful – it is a great study regardless!