

Review Form 3

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

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript attempts to simulate reference evapotranspiration (ET_o) in Northern India and validate it against CROPWAT estimates. While the topic is relevant to agricultural water management, the study falls short in several critical areas:</p> <p>Limited scope: The study covers only one location (SHUATS, Prayagraj) over a brief three-year period (2020-2022). This narrow focus severely limits the generalizability and impact of the findings.</p> <p>The methodology primarily applies existing models (FAO-56 Penman-Monteith and CROPWAT) without significant innovation. The study does not advance our understanding of evapotranspiration processes or modeling techniques.</p> <p>Insufficient context: The introduction fails to adequately situate this study within the broader literature on evapotranspiration modeling in India or globally. The rationale for this specific study is not compelling.</p> <p>Inadequate discussion of limitations: The authors do not critically examine the limitations of their approach or the potential sources of error in their simulations.</p> <p>Weak analysis of results: The discussion section is superficial, failing to provide meaningful insights into the implications of the findings or their relevance to water management practices.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is adequate but unexciting. Consider revising to better reflect the study's specific focus and findings</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is overly long and lacks focus. It should be rewritten to concisely present the key problem, methodology, results, and implications.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, following a standard scientific paper format. However, the discussion section could be expanded to provide more in-depth analysis of the results and their implications.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>While the basic methodology is sound, the manuscript fails to demonstrate how this study contributes new knowledge to the field. The statistical analysis, while comprehensive, is not leveraged effectively to provide meaningful insights.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are outdated and predominantly local. A more comprehensive and up-to-date literature review is necessary to properly contextualize this research.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is poor and requires thorough editing. Numerous grammatical errors and awkward phrasings impede clear communication of ideas.	
Optional/General comments	The study needs a major overhaul to be publishable. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expanding to multiple sites across Northern India• Extending the study period to at least a decade• Incorporating climate change scenarios• Comparing multiple ET_o estimation methods• Providing concrete recommendations for water management practices based on your findings• The figures and tables need improvement. They should be self-explanatory and more informative.• The conclusion is weak and does not effectively summarize the study's contributions or implications.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Praveen Kumar P
Department, University & Country	Anna University, India