

### **Answer to the second round of comments from the editor and the reviewer**

We thank the editor for her final evaluation, comments and decision on the manuscript. We address the comments in this document, [the original comment is written in blue](#), while the response is in black font. For those proposed manuscript modifications, we upload a revised version of the manuscript and a tracked-changes version. [Some changes are highlighted in this answer in green.](#)

[Both the reviewer and me agree that the manuscript is improved and that the comments are addressed well. Please have a look at the last minor comment of the reviewer. Additionally, I noticed that you mixed the terms evaporation and evapotranspiration. After reading your introduction, you decided to go for 'evapotranspiration, ET', so please only use this term in case you refer to the sum of all evaporation fluxes \(interception + soil + transpiration\). In the current manuscript both are used. Furthermore, please carefully check the units in your graph. To avoid confusion I recommend to add the time dimension \(month, 3-month, etc\) to Fig 2, 3, 4, 6. Currently, this is not clear by either the legend, nor the caption.](#)

We are highly grateful to the editor for taking the time to read our answers, read the new manuscript and for highlighting where the manuscript needs improvement. We have implemented the suggestions.

We have checked and changed the word “evaporation” to “evapotranspiration” in the manuscript where it might generate confusion. Therefore, the title of the article was also changed from:

“An Atlantic influence on evaporation in the Orinoco and Amazon basins”

To:

[“An Atlantic influence on evapotranspiration in the Orinoco and Amazon basins”](#)

In the methods section, we specify some evaporation fluxes, and thus we kept them discriminated.

Regarding the figures, the legend has been changed to emphasise that values are per 3-month.

### **Answer to comments from the reviewer**

[1\) I appreciate the detailed and well documented treatment of my comments in the rebuttal. In my view the authors carefully considered all the issues raised resulting in an improved manuscript.](#)

[I did not have the time to read the manuscript again with the same level of detail as for the initial review. With a diagonal scan I recognize that all major issues have been addressed \(better justification of the work, much improvement presentation of the results and a more complete representation of the chain of physical mechanisms, which now includes local moisture recycling\) as well a wide range of minor issues \(e.g. the summary of data products in a table\).](#)

[Small comment on the branched chain of mechanisms that I suggested and that has now been adopted by the authors \(see Fig 7a\). In the moisture recycling loop, I would change “radiation” for “net radiation”, otherwise I don’t understand the mechanism behind the direct arrow going from Evaporation to Radiation.](#)

[Given the considerable input that both reviewers gave to the current version of the manuscript, I think that their efforts and content contributions deserve an acknowledgement even with the reviews being anonymous.](#)

I congratulate the authors with this work and recommend publication of the paper.

We greatly appreciate the reviewer's comment. We have implemented the change in figure 7a and also include the acknowledgement of their contributions.