



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_32720
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparison of various Evapotranspiration Models for Estimating Reference Evapotranspiration in Sokoto, North Western, Nigeria
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	<p>The paper <i>A Comparison of various Evapotranspiration Models for Estimating Reference Evapotranspiration in Sokoto, North Western, Nigeria</i> was evaluated.</p> <p>It is a valuable paper, well presented, correctly written and provide good and practical results about the treated item.</p> <p>I have some observations and questions:</p> <p>1- You said in the beginning of the paper that the method of Blaney-Morin-Nigeria model is widely judged to be most suitable to Nigerian's conditions. Please justify why are you searching for another model? what are the limit of use of this model for Nigeria / other areas?</p> <p>2-Why did you choose these 6 models and not others like IVANOV, d'Eagleman (1967), Blaney-Criddle (1950).....? criteria ?</p> <p>3-Pages 4 and 5 : This is the procedure of ETo PM calculation, you may regroup all these equations into a Table as it was presented in FAO 56, so you make them clearer .</p> <p>4- Please see the following references: (Tunisia - North Africa)</p> <p>Sécheresse 2003 ; 14 (4) : 1–9 and</p>	<p>1. I only reported the study of the author. However, I observed that the Blaney-Morin-Nigeria model does not incorporate the input parameters like station's altitude, net radiation, extraterrestrial radiation, soil heat flux and sunshine hour. Hence, the motivation to search for other models with different or not exactly the same input parameters like the Blaney-Morin-Nigeria. No limitation of the model was observed or reported.</p> <p>2. The six models chosen covers the input parameters based on the available measured climatological data and each of them are in one way or the other found as an alternative as compared to the acceptable reference FAO-56 PM for estimating reference evapotranspiration in different part of the world as observed from different published studies. In Nigeria, these models have been widely used, in some cases two or three of the six models, with or without the Blaney-Morin-Nigeria model have been compared. The suggested models will be in line to be explored in the next study.</p> <p>3. Terms for each equation were clearly defined.</p> <p>4. The paper has been downloaded and incorporated.</p> <p>5. The meaningful and well suggested remarks that improved the quality and standard of the paper have been implemented. The colour of the map has been</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>American Journal of Plant Sciences, 2014, 5, 2094-2133.</p> <p>5- Other remarks are given in the text.</p>	<p>change, the table 1 having similar data information with figure 3 have been deleted and other suggested remarks given in the text have been implemented. However, your question and statement on</p> <p>i. How did you calculate these values? (Fig. 2). Answer- The question is on evaluation of ETo. It was calculated using equation (1) the FAO-56 PM</p> <p>ii. Monthly ETo-PM values represent please the bars to see variation between years. Answer- The variation found at the title on the horizontal axis has been changed to monthly values as rightly suggested, it should also be noted that the computation for the meteorological parameters is on monthly average daily basis over the period of study (1980-2010) so, the bars for the variation cannot be seen except the bar for each month for the period under study (Fig. 2).</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		