

## ***Interactive comment on “Derivation of the mean annual water-energy balance equation based on an Ohms-type approach” by X. Shan et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 24 December 2018

The paper aims for a physically based derivation of the mean water and energy balance equation. The authors use a description of water vapor transfer between catchments and describe the fluxes in a flux gradient approach. Imposing the Budyko hypothesis then yields the well known Mezentsev-Choudhury-Yang equation. I think that a general derivation of the Budyko or the MCY equation is of high interest for hydrological research and thus of interest for HESS. However, one of aims of this paper is a rigorous derivation which reflects hydrological understanding. To be honest, I find it difficult to understand the reasoning which form the basis for the derivation.

What I do not understand is the framework of water vapor transfer between catchments (illustrated in the figures). Figure 1 and 2 show a moisture transfer from one catchment to the next (downwind?) where the input of the next catchment is set by the evaporation

C1

of the first. This then leads to their statement that after  $n$  catchments there is no water left and  $E = 0$ . However, in reality there are also other sources of vapor which can contribute to precipitation in catchment 2 and these are being neglected. So this framework is not intuitive to me. The main derivation is illustrated with figure 3 where 4 different nodes are introduced. With corollary 2 it is stated that the resistance  $n_{AB} \neq n_1$  arguing that there are other possible routes between the node Atmosphere A and the catchment node B, namely atmosphere A to atmosphere C to catchment D to catchment B. I did not understand this water transfer between the two catchments. I am also not sure if these assumptions and the ones in stated in section 2.1 are actually relevant for the derivation described in section 3. Therefore I recommend major revisions which should particularly improve the description to enable the reader to better understand how considering hydrological processes lead towards the MCY equation.

Further remarks:

abstract: “homogeneity assumption” should be described more specific to the paper

End of abstract, L15: There is no conclusion provided. Please explain what your results imply.

P5L2-5: it is unclear why this is mentioned here

P6L18: Garrison 2017 not in bibliography

P8L10:  $\phi(E_0) =$  ; while  $\phi = E/P$  on L27 ; unclear why the symbols is used for different meanings

P9L1: “. . . the MCY function is the best function among . . .” a) best in which respect and b) why is it the best?

P14: There are two Zhou et al., 2015 indicate in the text to which you are referencing to

C2

Figure 3 and in text: I recommend to use a different symbol for water vapor than P which is precipitation. It may be also useful to consider physical units of the quantities within the derivation.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-598>, 2018.