

Author response to Reviewer comments

RC: Reviewer comments; AR: Author response to reviewer comments

RC-1: Page 3, Line 3: “Add reference”.

AR-1: A suitable reference was added in the revised manuscript (Page: 2, Line: 34)

RC-2: Page 3, Line 16-18: “I think that the formulation of the objectives should still be sharpened. What is the exact ambition as compared to the state of the art”.

AR-2: The objectives have been fine-tuned (Page:3, Line: 13-16)

RC-3: Page 3, Line 27: “Add scientific names of the crop”

AR-3: Scientific names of crops were provided in the revised MS (Page: 3, Line: 25-26)

RC-4: Page 8, Line 10: “You should explain how Rs_down, RI_down and RI_up have been assessed. Directly from landsat band? In other words how are LST values and L lambda linked to this!”

AR-4: Computation of RS_down, RL_down and RL_up has been explained in the revised MS (page: 8, Line: 10 to Page 10, Line:9). The utilization of LST and L_lambda in the calculation of energy flux components was also explained (Page: 6, Line: 24-25) and the LST was utilized in Equation 16 and 19 (Page: 9).

RC-5: Page: 11, Line: 2-3: Does this apply for the Omran et al., study?

AR-5: No, it does not belong to Omran et al., study – The ambiguity in the sentence has been removed (Page: 12 Line: 19-20).

RC-6: Page: 11, Line: 4-5: This is very unclear. Should be rephrased.

AR-6: As suggested, the sentence has been rephrased (Page: 19 Line: 20-22).

RC-7: Page: 11, Line: 8: The low and high LAI cases.

AR-7: The sentence has been modified (Page: 12, Line: 26-27).

RC-8: English edition, grammar check and fine-tuning of the manuscript.

AR-8: As suggested by the reviewer, the MS has been subjected to English grammar, edition.