

Interactive comment on “At which time scale does the complementary principle perform best on evaporation estimation?” by Liming Wang et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 August 2020

The MS is carelessly written. It should be thoroughly rechecked for grammar, typos, language constructs. For example, the AA method is mentioned several times before it is explained. Also, the first asymmetric AA method was of Kahler and Brutsaert (2006), and not by Brutsaert and Parlange (1998). Also, nobody reads the original work of Bouchet (1963), it seems, as it is in French. That may be the reason for frequent misquoting it. My understanding is that he never proposed a symmetrical CR. Even Brutsaert in his seminal book (1982) is controversial about this issue. The authors should clarify this issue though. I do not really see what we gain from this study. The high NSE value for the month comes about because its high variance between months and it is already being long enough to smooth things out. I bet that between Mays, Junes, Julys, etc., the NSE value would not be better than for the seasons and

C1

years. The low value for the annual time-scale is a bit worrisome as it means that these two chosen methods cannot replicate any long-term trends in ET rates to acceptable accuracy, which diminishes their potential values for long-term hydrological modeling.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-379>, 2020.

C2