

Authors' responses to review comments are in **red, bold**

Anonymous Referee #1

In this paper, the authors evaluated two temperature-based methods (PMT and HS) to estimate evapotranspiration under spatial and temporal criteria, in the Duero basin (Spain). For ameliorating the document, the following suggestions are proposed for changes: 1. Add information on the quality of the data and which techniques they used to detect outliers and for the filling of data. **OK., Done**

2. On line 212, it indicates that the temperature was used to estimate the wind speed, when they only actually used the average or set the value of 2 m / s. **We agree. It has been changed**

3. On line 287, rewrite the paragraph in a more understandable way: RMSE is 0.55 for the PMTOUH model. **Modified**

4. In the conclusion. Please provide also the limitation and future studies of this research. **OK, Done**

5. Manuscript needed some language polishing; technical errors exist in the manuscript. Please improve them to strengthen the readership of journal. I hope these comments will be helpful to you. **Done.** My sense of the reviewers' comments is that there is a very good basis on which I can recommend that this paper be modified in a responsive manner to the comments above. If the modification is done carefully and completely, upon re-submission and evaluation, I think you can be confident that the paper will be accepted for publication.