

## Author's Feedback against Editorial Comment:

First of all, dear professor many thanks for your valuable comments. The responses to different your comment which all have been done in our revised manuscript are as blow:

**Comment 1:** Abstract. Generally non-standard abbreviations should not be used in the abstract.

**Response to comment no 1:** We deleted all non standard abbreviations in our revised manuscript abstract.

**Comment 2:** References in the text must be numbered in order that they appear in the text:

- use number [1] (without the author name) for the first citation in L34 after '...vegetations)', it is the first citation of the manuscript. In L34 after '...is defined in Allen' use number [2], it is the second citation different form the first.
- in L38, L41, L48 use only the number, no need to use the author name.
- check during all the text the correct sequence of reference numbers and its correspondence in the reference list.

**Response to comment no 2:** We did all corrections based on your valuable comments on L34 and also journal standard in all parts of our revised manuscript well. In L38, L41 and L48 we used only the number of references and we deleted the author's name. Also, we checked all part of our revised manuscript text for correct reference number and its correspondence in the reference list.

**Comment 3:**

Reference list

- Not found the references cited in L154, L196, L208 – Doorenboss...
- reference list should be in numerical order of citation in the text and not in alphabetical order.

**Response to comment no 3:** We added the above mentioned references to reference list in our revised manuscript.

**Comment 4:**

Introduction

Abbreviations should appear in the text at first use, thus in L34 use: 'Potential or reference evapotranspiration (ET<sub>o</sub>) is defined in Allen [2]...' , then, during the text, when referring to potential evapotranspiration use only the abbreviation ET<sub>o</sub> (as in L38, L80, L150, L363). Check this concept to all other abbreviations during the text and correct when necessary.

**Response to comment no 4:** We did your valuable advice in introduction and all parts of our revised manuscript as it was possible.

**Comment 5:**

Table 3: Anions should be wrote correctly: SO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> , Cl<sup>-</sup> , HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> , CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>

**Response to comment no 5:** We did all proposed correction on Table 3 in revised manuscript.

**Comment 6:** Table 2: the unit of bulk density: ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$ ) not ( $\text{gr}/\text{cm}^3$ ), electrical conductivity: use EC not  $E_c$ , unit: used  $\text{S}/\text{m}$  not  $\text{ds}/\text{m}$ .

**Response to comment no 6:** We did the above mentioned correction in Table 2

**Comment 7:**

Table 5: All terms in the table should be clear for the reader, thus authors should describe also in the table (in the heading or as a footnote) what are the parameters (R, RMSE, MBE and t).

**Response to comment no 7:** We added the above mentioned suggestion as below after Table 5.

R = regression coefficients, RMSE= root mean square error, MBE= mean bias error ,t = t-statistic test

**Comment 8:** Results and Discussion

L245, L247, L366: still need to cancel 'the month of'

L253: needs the reference number for Jacovides (1997)

L265: use Table 5 not Table 4; use Figure 2 not figure 2

**Response to comment no 8:** In lines L245, L247, L366 we deleted (the month of) in our revised manuscript. In L253 we replaced the reference no for Jacovides (1997). In L265 we replaced Table 5 instead of Table 4 and we used Figure 2 instead of figure 2 as well .