The authors apply remotely sensed evapotranspiration and leaf area index in addition to in-situ streamflow to calibrate a SWAT model in Tuckahoe Creek Watershed. The paper is well written, albeit the usage of numerous abbreviations. But, I am kind of skeptical to accept this version of the article.

**Major comment:**

**Novelty:** Even though the article is presented well, under the hood, it is a calibration paper constrained with two additional RS products which has been investigated previously by other researchers listed below.

Suggestion:

Methodology: 20,000 LHS samples have a wealth of information.

- One way to provide insight would be to see among all the parameters that are being calibrated find the one which has the largest influence on the KGE values in par1 and par2. Investigating why these parameters are influential would a very good insight.
- Also, how to choose between single parameter set which gets best performance compared to a cluster of parameters (close in values) which gives good performance?
- Is there a relationship (linear/non-linear) between parameter values and KGE?

These are some of the questions that the authors can address to bring more value to science aspects of the paper.