



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_34898
Title of the Manuscript:	METHODS OF ESTIMATING REFERENCE EVAPOTRANSPIRATION FOR CERRADO ENVIRONMENT, BRAZIL
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: Recast the title to reflect the objective of the study or reframe the objective in line with the title of the study. Abstract: Reframe your abstract to include; the aim of the study, brief methodology, results findings of the study and conclusion. The sentence starting from line 10 "It is used a biannual set of daily data..." is not correct. Check and recast. The abstract has no results. Keywords: Arrange in alphabetical order. Introduction: The objective of the study is not clear. Methodology: Figure 1 is not necessary here. No reference is made in the result presentation and discussion. Results and discussion: Results are not quantitatively presented and discussed. The results were merely interpreted. Your results has to be presented, interpreted and discuss the major findings. Compare your results with other results reported by previous authors. Conclusion: reframe to reflect the title and the objective of the study. References: Present your references according to the Journal's format guidelines with respect to the new APA style. The reference, "FAO, 56" in lines 9, 17, 58, 76, 188, 190, 237, 240, is not referenced in the reference section.	The authors kindly thank the important suggestions made by (a) reviewer (a). In this context, the authors decided to carry out all the changes suggested by the reviewer. We are sure that all the suggestions proposed have provided a better understanding of the work and facilitated diffusion in the Brazilian and world scientific environment. Below are all the changes that were made, in addition, the manuscript is with all the changes made highlighted in yellow. Title: MADE Abstract: Made Keywords: Made Introduction: Made Methodology: Made Results and discussion: Made Conclusion: Made References: Made



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The reference in lines 29 (Oecd, 2015), 34 (lbge, 2016), 103 (Willmontts, 1985) and line 149 (Souza et al., 2013) are not referenced. The references in line 257, 264, 286, 292 and 309 are not cited in the text. The references in lines 255, 290 should be arranged in the alphabetical order.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Your figures 2, 3, 4 should be change to figures 1, 2, 3 respectively.	Made
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		