Response to Reviewer Comments

Reviewer 4:

We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's comments. The followings are our point-by-point responses:

Comments:

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

I suggest to do some corrections - e.g. (just a re-check by someone else inolved):

confirmed (line 356); solar instead of Solar (line 358), plants' height (or plant heights) line 419, modified (425), postivite (465) ...

Response: *Thank you very much sir. We have made the changes suggested.*

I saw different ways to write Pan (Pan Evaporation, Pan evaporation, pan coefficient) - pls re-check and adjust.

Response: We have made changes to and used same acronym/words throught the manuscript in the updated manuscript.

Decide whether you use 2 or 3 figures past the comma (line 366/367) Between weather (Figure 12)

Response: We have made the changes as suggested.

A cultivar is shown as 'xxx' OR cvar xxx (see line 372 - Swarn Shreya)

Response: *Thank you very much sir for suggestion. We have added the details of crop.*

Comments:

To my mind - there is too much focus of the underestimation of the Pan method. It occurs relatively often. A discussion why Penman-Monteith works out better might be helpful.

Response: *Thank you very much sir for your constructing comments. We have incorporated all the suggestions. We are indebted to you for time you have devoted to evaluate our manuscript.*