

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95148
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of different methods in estimating potential evapotranspiration at Gaya District of Bihar
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes. Suggestion was made according to the attached file. Yes No. Some suggestions were made according to the attached file. No. Some suggestions were made according to the attached file. No. According to the attached file, reference updates were requested.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The topic addressed in this study is of great relevance. However, the writing of the manuscript is very simple, basically only one statistical indicator (Pearson correlation) is used to compare five methods of estimating ET _o with the standard Penman-Monteith method. The few results of the present study were not well interpreted, as well as there was no discussion in the light of the literature. For a possible publication in this Journal, many suggestions were given in order to improve the quality of the work.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mairton Gomes da Silva
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Recôncavo of Bahia, Brazil