

Interactive comment on “Contrasting roles of interception and transpiration in the hydrological cycle – Part 2: Moisture recycling” by R. J. van der Ent et al.

S.C. Dekker (Editor)

s.c.dekker@uu.nl

Received and published: 23 May 2014

Dear authors

The referees support publication of this manuscript after revisions. The authors are welcome to submit a carefully revised manuscript. Based on the point-by-point response and the suggestions by the reviewers I have the following remarks

1. As suggested by the referees, Fig.1 needs to be improved. The point of the outgoing blue arrow is confusing, as the numbers in Fig.1 suggest that this is 0 (see remark Gossling)

C174

2. Definitions: It is clear that you do not like the term evapotranspiration, but as seen in your reply the term is often used. So define the term E very clear in the manuscript as the total amount of all sources of evaporation, including transpiration; In addition to that, all recycling definitions must be made clearer in the manuscript

3. The regional study of Western Africa: All referees have a problem with that. One referee asks for more details, while two other referees do not see the additional value for it. The authors can choose to make it more logical and informative or simply remove it.

4. The point-by-point response of referee 3 on the reliability of the numbers needs to be improved. The authors response that they still think it is robust, is not very strong and should be checked with figures.

I look forward to see the new revised manuscript

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 5, 281, 2014.

C175