

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129249
Title of the Manuscript:	Remote Sensing and GIS Based Approach to Estimate the Monthly and Seasonally Evapotranspiration (ET) For Kharif Maize Using Landsat 8 Data and the QWaterModel Plugin
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important in that it applies the tools of Geomatics to agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Remote Sensing and GIS Based Approach to Estimate the Monthly and Seasonally Evapotranspiration (ET) For Kharif Maize Using Landsat 8 Data and the QWaterModel	
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.	The abstract is good but there are too many key words. Limit the keywords to 5 and I suggest the following: Evapotranspiration (ET), LST, Maize, QWaterModel, Panchmahal (India)	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language English is quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	<p>I don't see the importance of point 2.3 "Ground Data". This section could be deleted to avoid duplicating the location of the study site.</p> <p>I find that the results have been presented but not discussed. It would be very interesting to discuss the results obtained by comparing them with the results of other studies.</p> <p>I also find that figures 3 and 4 are double-titled, 1 at the top and 1 at the bottom.</p> <p>In terms of methodology, Table 1 only shows the bands used (e.g. Band 4, 6 and 10). Those actually used and involved in the study)</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:	Kafando Halidou
Department, University & Country	Universty of the Gambia/ WASCAL, Gambia