Reviewer Comments _ Authors (V1)

Dear Authors,

I have carefully reviewed the manuscript _ *A Comprehensive Comparative Study on Evapotranspiration in Mainland Portugal Based on Climate Reanalysis Data*.
Overall, the manuscript is scientifically sound, methodologically robust, and well aligned with the scope of Atmosphere. The methodological approach is appropriate and clearly described. The figures and maps are informative, well designed, and effectively support the results.

- Points Requiring Minor Revision

While the manuscript is of high quality, a few points should be addressed to further strengthen clarity and atmospheric framing, these are:

- Conceptual clarification (Ep vs. ETo) - Although technically correct, the manuscript would benefit from more explicitly stating, particularly in the Abstract and Introduction, that ETo is interpreted as a measure of atmospheric evaporative demand rather than an agronomic variable.

- Atmospheric framing in the Discussion - Some parts of the Discussion and Conclusion place strong emphasis on hydrological management aspects (e.g., reservoirs, irrigation, water planning). These aspects are relevant but should remain secondary and clearly framed as consequences of atmospheric processes, to maintain a strong atmospheric/climatological focus.

- Physical interpretation of trends - The observed strengthening of ETo trends, particularly in summer and early autumn during the recent period (2002–2023), would benefit from a slightly deeper discussion of potential atmospheric drivers (e.g., increased net radiation, rising temperatures, persistence of summer circulation patterns).

Addressing these minor comments will further strengthen the manuscript and enhance its contribution to the literature on atmospheric evaporative demand.