

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_102998
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Actual Evapotranspiration (ETa) of major crops of a distributary of Mahanadi canal command using CROPWAT 8.0 Model.
Type of the 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, But I do not see that he has done well, I really do not like the parts of the introduction, area of study and the discussions of the results and the conclusion</p> <p>2. No, the title of the manuscript is not suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is understood.</p> <p>4. More or less the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. No. I do not think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Not, the references are not sufficient and not recent, in this manuscript, It has only one bibliography reference, and that they have been placed in the bibliography part and are not mentioned in the text</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes. The language/English quality of the manuscript is quite suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	I see that the manuscript does not reach the level to publish it in this journal, so it has to do a serious major revision	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aziz Benhamrouche</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ferhat Abbas University Setif1, Algeria</b>