



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		
Minor REVISION comments	1)Talk about the evapotranspiration (ET) and give the definition of the ET in introduction section. 2)Give in the figure of location map of the experimental area of Cerrado environment in material method section (Change figure 1). 3) The unit of Precipitation values are mm month⁻¹ in fig 2.A (not mm mes⁻¹). 4) The unit of Eto values are mm day⁻¹ in fig 3 (not mm dia⁻¹). 5) The unit of Eto values are mm day⁻¹ in fig 4 (not mm dia⁻¹).	1) Made 2) Made. Obs.: The authors decided to remove the location figure of the weather station. This decision was obtained because, as well as the indication made by the reviewer, the other reviewers suggested that it would be better to take the figure because it is already widely understood the organization of a weather station. Even so, we hope that the reviewer agrees to this amendment. Respectfully 3) Made. Thank you 4) Made. Thank you 5) Made. Thank you
Optional/General comments	The data series used in study short period.	The authors understand that the data series refers to a narrow temporal set, however, as highlighted in the methodology of the work, it is already almost unanimous among the researchers of the area that works that aim to evaluate methods of evapotranspiration can be done with data of two years. It is also worth mentioning that such databases are available in the databases that used a smaller set of data. However, we note that we are fully open to any clarifications that may be requested by the reviewer.