

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_123328</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Simulating Reference Evapotranspiration Using Weather Data Over Northern India and Its Validation With CROPWAT</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript provides a basic estimation of reference evapotranspiration using the Penman-Monteith equation and the CROPWAT model. However, it lacks a robust analysis of crop water requirements and relies solely on reference evapotranspiration without manually estimating crop coefficients for comparison. Additionally, the manuscript fails to clearly define "simulated" results, comparing two identical parameters, which weakens its scientific validity. Major revisions are needed for it to be impactful in the scientific community.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	No the article name is misleading as the term simulation usually involve some modelling of the real world conditions. Estimating water requirements Using CROPWAT for Northern India.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The output of an equation should not be compared with the model based on that equation. Rather the output of a model should be compared to an instrument for validation such as lysimeters.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Study area maybe defined using a GIS map. Methodology could also be shown as a flow chart.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript requires significant revision as it compares a parameter derived from the same equation—once manually and once through a model—leading to an inflated R value due to the inherent correlation. Additionally, the focus should shift toward analyzing crop water requirements, involving the manual estimation of crop coefficients, which can then be validated against values obtained using a lysimeter for a more meaningful comparison.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes for now they are sufficient but would be refined as the manuscript would.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the English language quality seems acceptable. However, in the last para of introduction it has been claimed to utilize the data of 18 years which seems to be 18 months. May be corrected.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nabeel Ali Khan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pakistan</b>