

## Review Form 1.7

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

### 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | <p>Indeed. I found the paper to be extremely interesting given my years of experience working with the Penman ET model.</p> <p>Title is fine</p> <p>The abstract is fine.</p> <p>No problem at all for such a short paper</p> <p>Yes. No problem at all.</p> <p>The references are fine for this length of manuscript.</p>  |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | Very well written   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Thank you for providing me the opportunity to review the paper on potential evapotranspiration estimates in India. I enjoyed the paper and I found the manuscript to be well organized and very well written. The key references are cited, the abstract is informative, the length is fine, the methods are appropriate, the graphics are publishable (more than publishable – they are very nice), and the results are interesting. I found the entire effort to be of the highest quality. |   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                      |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Robert Balling</b>                |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Arizona State University, USA</b> |