

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104859
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantifying Maize Crop Evapotranspiration Using Eddy Covariance Flux Tower Weather Data
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1-Yes, This research is important for the sustainability of agriculture in the L region, where limited water availability is a constant concern. Efficient use of water in agriculture is essential to ensure food production and economic development of the region. In addition, this methodological approach can be replicated and adapted in other areas with similar water scarcity challenges, contributing to food safety and sustainable use of water resources worldwide.</p> <p>2-Yes 3-Yes 4-Yes 5-Yes</p> <p>6- Adding more recent references is recommended</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It is highly recommended to have the paper grammar-checked and undergo stylistics and editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article entitled "Evaluation of Evapotranspiração of Corn Culture Soberent Irrigation Treatment" describes a study conducted at the Corn Research Center, Institute of Agricultural Research Agricultural Agrust Agustado Agutra Jundranar, Hyderabad, between November 2022 and Mark 2023. O objective. From the study was calculating an evapotranspiração of corn crop under two different irrigation treatments, using generated meteorologic given) The two treatment is to program in irrigation in dissenting soil moisture deppletion (DASM), a saber, T1: 20 % Dasm and t2: 40% dasm.</p> <p>During the crop growth period (30 to 100 of the), biophysical parameters were recorded such as plant height and leaf area index (LAI) at 15 -day intervals. These parameters were analyzed statistically by testing two samples with equal variation. The rise of plants increased from 35 to 198 cm without treatment of 20% DASM and from 36 to 180 cm without treatment of 40% DASM. Likewise, LAI increased from 0.72 to 3.9 and from 0.77 to 3.2 in the treatment of 20% and 40% DASM, up to 90 and later decreases the harvest. The results highlight the positive influence of optimal moisture availability in the root zone in plant growth parameters.</p> <p>Used to calculate FAO's penman-monteith equity using the meteorological given generated from the EC flow tower. Etga Etc Stata by the SWB method (340 and 280 mm) and the FAO Penman-Monteith method (350 and 295 mm) in the 20% and 40% DASM treatment showed a deviation of +10 and +15 Respective In addition, the study concludes that the FAO Penman-Monteith Method can withdle with ET with recision using meteorological data measured by the EC flow tower, with minor divergences in reporting the method. In addition, an etc estimated by FAO's penman-monteith method formed a positive 2% auplete to the SWB method.</p> <p>In terms of conclusions, the study suggests that adopting the 20% DASM irrigation program is</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>feasible for a corn crop, supported by the 10-20% increase in plant growth parameters, such as height. The supply of 21% plus irrigation water compared to 40% of DASM. In addition, the treatment of 20% of DASM recorded a seasonal etc.6% and 15.7% higher than 40% of DASM in the SWB and Penman-Monteth FAO methods, respectively. None, however, an etc estimated by the FAO Penman-Monteith method showed a positive 2% aupleto compared to the SWB method.</p> <p>The article presents abstract and word -clove and reflects its content, indicates the objectives and methodology of the research, presents the problem, hypothesis and central theme of research, justification and importance of research conducted. The theoretical structure is adequate to respond to problems. References are updated and cover the relevant literature on the subject, the research conducted has a complexity and depth compatible with the scientific character of a scientific article, the structure and language of the article are clear and adequate to achieve research objectives, the methodology used proved to be adequate to respond to the problem faced by the research. The conclusion presents a response to the research problem, it is shown that the research hypothesis has been confirmed, the conclusion is adequate to the objectives indicated in the introduction.</p> <p>As for the methodology presented in terms of new theories, innovations and technologies, the article does not add anything to the scientific environment, as it is a dominated methodology. We recommend publication without corrections</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amaury de Souza
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil