

Interactive comment on “Reference crop evapotranspiration database in Spain (1961–2014)” by Miquel Tomas-Burguera et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 6 August 2019

This study presents a strategy to calculate a weekly 1.1 km gridded estimate of reference evapotranspiration using the modified Penman-Monteith equation. The study provides a good justification for first interpolating the climatic variables and then calculate ETo, rather than first calculating ETo and then interpolating the obtained values.

The link to the data provided worked as I could download the evapotranspiration data. Honestly though I have not evaluated the data or assessed the visualisation tool. I would rather comment on the structure and content of the paper. Generally I found the structure of the paper to be acceptable. I managed to follow the paper fairly well. One concern is that there are many problems with the grammar and spelling, which detracts from the potential positive impact of the paper. Some specific problems are: 1. The use of tense: the paper switches between past and present tense 2. Commas:

C1

There are many places in the text where commas are needed 3. Spelling mistakes: The authors need to run a spell check of the document 4. General bad use of English in a few places.

Some specific queries I have in relation to the methodology are: 1. Page 4 line 20: Could the description of converting daily values to weekly be clearer? Specifically this description needs to be clearer: 'Trying to adapt the WMO rules for monthly data (WMO, 1989) to weekly data, those weeks with at least two missing values are considered to have no value.' 2. Page 5 line 30: The selection of nearby stations for gap filling depended on three criteria: 1) overlapping period > 7 years; 2) closer than 100 km; 3) $R2 > 0.6$. Could I suggest an additional criterion: that of the station being at a similar elevation.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-64>, 2019.

C2