

# Review of: "Determination of Evapotranspiration and Crop Coefficients of Irrigated Legumes on Different Soil Types Using the FAO56 Approach"

Dr. Sanket More<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Directorate of Onion and Garlic Research

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript titled "Determination of Evapotranspiration and Crop Coefficients of Irrigated Legumes on Different Soil Types Using the FAO56 Approach" to Qeios.

My comments are as follows.

1. **Lack of Continuity in Introduction:** The introduction section of the manuscript lacks a cohesive narrative flow, making it challenging for readers to follow the logical progression of ideas. The disjointed presentation hinders the manuscript's overall coherence and clarity, which is essential for engaging and informing the reader.
2. **Lack of Scientific Technicality in Writing:** The writing style employed in the manuscript lacks the necessary scientific technicality required for scholarly communication. Key concepts are not articulated with the precision expected in academic writing, diminishing the manuscript's potential impact within the scientific community.
3. **Lack of Justification of Given Statements:** Several statements in the manuscript lack sufficient empirical support and justification. The absence of rigorous evidence and references weakens the credibility of the study. A scholarly manuscript should provide robust justifications for its claims, ensuring the research is firmly grounded in existing literature and methodology.
4. **Language Can Be Improved, Needs Serious Revision:** The language used in the manuscript requires significant improvement. Instances of unclear phrasing, awkward sentence structures, and grammatical errors are pervasive throughout the document. A more polished and professional language is essential for effective communication and comprehension among the scientific readership.
5. **Inappropriate Statistical Design:** The manuscript exhibits a fundamental flaw in its statistical design. The chosen statistical methods may not be suitable for addressing the research questions or may lack the necessary power to draw meaningful conclusions. An appropriate statistical design is crucial for ensuring the validity and reliability of the study's findings.
6. **Given the extent of these issues, it is my collective judgment that the manuscript, in its current form, does not meet the standards required for publication in the journal and hence should be rejected. However, I encourage you to carefully address the outlined concerns and consider seeking the input of experts in the field during the revision process.**  
Substantial improvements in the areas of continuity, scientific technicality, justification of statements, language quality,

and statistical design are essential for reconsideration.

I appreciate the effort you invested in preparing and submitting your work to Qeios. I

understand that revising a manuscript can be a challenging process, but I believe that with careful attention to the feedback provided, your research has the potential to meet the high standards expected for publication.

Best wishes

Sincerely,