

Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC3  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-126-AC3>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## **correction of the authors' response to the referee 1's comment on Eq. (7)**

Daeha Kim et al.

---

Author comment on "A comparative evaluation of the calibration-free complementary relationship with physical, machine-learning, and land-surface models" by Daeha Kim et al., Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-126-AC3>, 2022

---

While we thought the referee 1's comment on Eq. (7) was wrong, now we understand why the referee required correction.

Before the third-round revision, Eq. (7) combined the two equations as  $T_{dry} = T_{wb} + e_s(T_{wb})/\gamma = T_{avg} + e_s(T_{avg})/\gamma$ . Correctly, the last term,  $e_s(T_{avg})/\gamma$ , was supposed to be  $e_s(T_{dew})/\gamma$  (or  $e_a/\gamma$ ). So, the referee 1's comment on  $T_{avg}$  was right. Nonetheless, there are nothing to do in prior calculations, because we used  $T_{wb}$  when calculating  $T_{dry}$ , i.e.,  $T_{dry} = T_{wb} + e_s(T_{wb})/\gamma$ . So, it was a mistake in writing, not in calculation.

The revised manuscript does not include the misrepresented last term, thus it would not be an issue for potential readers.

We deeply regret our response to the referee's comment, and send a sincere apology to the referee1. Once again, we greatly appreciate the sound comments from the referee1. Thank you.