

Editor's Comment:

I have reviewed the manuscript. Based on my comments below, I would recommend rejecting this manuscript.

1. Please define the abbreviation "MAP" in the abstract as readers may not have time to read the whole manuscript.
2. The following sentence in the abstract is vague: "The drip technology can boost the productivity and overall production of tree crops in addition to improvement of soil and tree health especially in problem soils." The authors do not have data to prove that the soil and tree health, especially in problem soils, have been improved.
3. Please use m³ but not "cubic meters" for the unit.
4. There are something missing in the Material and Methods Section. What is the size of each tree plantation? Do the authors conduct any repetition for each tree species treatment?
5. Sections 2.1 to 2.4 each has only one sentence. The authors should combine them together into one section.
6. The Results and Discussion Section is very shallow.
7. The Conclusion Section stated that "...it also plays a major role in water as well as weed management". What is this meant? Do the authors have any data to convince readers on water and weed management improvement?

Editor's Details:

Dr. Ying Ouyang
United States Department of Agricultural Forest Service, USA