



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_37339
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of shade regimes and varying seasons of irrigation on survival, developmental pattern and yield of field grown cacao (Theobroma cacao).
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>.- abstract must be reducing it is too long</p> <p>.- Are needed hypothesis of these manuscripts, . - introduction must be rewriting with focus, including objectives and question will be answer.</p> <p>.-there is not a clear hypothesis of work</p> <p>.- The drought treatment should be clarified well. it is not clear,</p> <p>.- the statistical analysis should be clarified. It was a two-way analysis of variance performed?</p> <p>.-I consider that the number of tables presented is unjustified (10 in total), they could show some graphics..</p> <p>.-Table 1 , 2 and 3 must be left out that information are shown also on table 4 and 5. ANOVA of Two way should be done.</p> <p>.- The major flaw is that the amount of radiation incident in each shade treatment is unknown throughout the day, and we do not know neither whether the drought treatment affected the cacao physiological performance, since the water status of the plants was not evaluated</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>.- The first 4 lines of the abstract are exactly the same as the first 4 lines of the section materials and methods. evade this type of repetitions</p> <p>.- Authors must be rewrite the results more concretely</p> <p>.- reference should be written in a homogenous style, that is, the one requested by the journal</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I consider that the work has good results but they must work more on it before manuscript become accepted</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilmer Tezara
Department, University & Country	Botánica Departament, Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela