



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38519
Title of the Manuscript:	Irrigation with Controlled Water Stress and its Effects on Physiology and Phenology of 'Navelate' Oranges
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	The figure shows no differences at each parameter measured between the 3 treatments based on the (probably) standard deviation or standard error shown therein. How do you mention differences in the Results? You write that measurements were taken every month. Why not present these monthly mean values on a line graph for each parameter? The means presented in the Table are very different from the values at the Figure. What are they? And again in most of the parameters the treatments do not differ. Table 1, L115-116: A and gs are similar to 3 treatments. How do you explain the increased Ci at 50% treatment? Of course it is not what you write. L113-114: A did not decrease! L119 which correlation? With this low data number, you did correlation somewhere? L130-131 where are the data on plant growth? L135-138 there are no data on fruit production and what production can be present in a very young plant (its age is not presented, but from the container used it must be small plant) L167-169 these are not correct conclusions! L171-172 these data are not shown and the young plants must have very low yield	The figure shows no differences at each parameter measured between the 3 treatments based on the (probably) standard deviation or standard error shown therein. How do you mention differences in the Results? Although the figure shows no visible differences, it can be observed from plant phenology responses that the differences in irrigation affected growth and yield in treatments submitted to water deficit, as can be observed in Table 2, where growth was affected and also yield fruits (Figure 2). According to Lawlor and Tezara (2009), during the periods of water shortage, plants keep their stomata closed in order to maintain favorable turgor pressures, an important characteristic for drought tolerance. Lawlor DW, Tezara W. Causes of decreased photosynthetic rate and metabolic capacity in water-deficient leaf cells: a critical evaluation of mechanisms and integration of processes. Ann Bot. 2009; 103: 561-579. You write that measurements were taken every month. Why not present these monthly mean values on a line graph for each parameter? It would be a possibility. The evaluations average indicates that in a determined period of time, plants of the different treatments respond in a way to respond the stress effects. However, when observing the phenological growth and production parameters it is noticed that Control plants exceed those submitted to water deficit treatments. The means presented in the Table are very different from the values at the Figure. What are they? And again in most of the parameters the treatments do not differ. Table 1, L115-116: A and gs are similar to 3 treatments. How do you explain the increased Ci at 50% treatment? Of course it is not what you write. The averages presented in Table 1 are different from those presented in Figure 1 because they are from different periods, as can be observed from March-August and August-March. A and gs present similarities, possibly due to the stress influence did not to have caused damage to the plant photosynthetic apparatus, hence the small variation in the values found. The Ci values of Table 1 and the discussion were removed. L113-114 values are correct. There was a reduction, as shown in Table 1. L119 which correlation? With this low data number, you did correlation somewhere? L130-131 where are the data on plant growth? L135-138 there are no data on fruit production and what production can be present in a very young plant (its age is not presented, but from the container used it must be small plant) L167-169 these are not correct conclusions! L171-172 these data are not shown and the young plants must have very low yield The word correlation was removed and the text modified (L113-114). L119: the text was modified according to the reviewer L130-13: It was added the Table 2 in the manuscript to elucidate L135-L138: it was used young plants in the experiment, but they were



SDI Review Form 1.6

		already producing fruits, it was added the Figure 2 to show what we mean L167-169: the suggestion was accepted and improved in the manuscript L171-L172: the suggestion was accepted and improved in the manuscript
Minor REVISION comments	L59-61 improve, some mistakes Table: change the Tukey's lettering in the last column L136 how is the reduction higher than 100%?	L59-61: it was reviewed We did not find the error of the Table, that is, the Second questioning "Table: change the Tukey's lettering in the last column". The value above 100% was typing error.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is a short incomplete trial with 3 young plants-replications per treatment and one experimental replication. The trial was done in young plants in a greenhouse and extrapolation to field-grown mature trees is unacceptable. The presentation of results is not based on the results presented in the table and figure containing the trial data. Results are written in a way that are not supported by the values shown. Thus, values on Ci cannot be explained from A and gs results and other obscure comments in the Results section. The conclusions are not supported from the results presented or not. Data on plant growth and yield are not shown but discussed, which is unacceptable after all the above misinterpretations of data. If the data were presented as function of time (monthly means) it could be possible to see the (any) differences between treatments.	This is not a short and incomplete test because it respects the statistical rules and has significant time duration, that is, one year. Even because these young plants produced fruits during the experimental period. The term "young" does not mean that they are plants without production, but plants that started to produce only a short time ago and the extrapolation with adult plants is possible since, like adults, the young plants of this experiment have already reached reproductive phenology, they could be considered adult. Ci values were removed because they did not present significant information to this study. Discussion and Conclusion were changed.