



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. They keep on presenting differences when they are not statistically present and they try to support it with various references. 2. The authors mention measurements in Fig. 1 and Table 1 from August 2014 to March 2015 (spring and summer) and from March 2015 to August (fall and winter), but the measurements ended on May 2015. Based on what is written, measurements were not taken from June to August 2015 3. In the table and the last column the means are followed by NS, when in the rest of the columns there are letters to distinguish differences per column. I had asked to change the NS to a 4. L70-75 again you do not show what the bars are. The differences are not present to my opinion, as long as you have these SDs or SEs. Also 1C is not WUE, it is 1E L109 there is no tendency to reduced E! 5. L118-119 and legend Table 1: there is no internal CO₂ and A, g_s and WUE do not differ in the 3 treatments. 6. L123 treatments 7. L128-130 this is all wrong. There are no differences! 8. L133-137 these statements are not correct, as well. There are no differences believe it or not, based on the letters for statistical separation per column presented. 9. In Table 2 there is no statistical analysis, how can we understand which is different from the others? 10. L231 the reproductive period was from March to August and you actually found no differences in the physiological parameters. 11. Once again, I believe the conclusions are not based on the data. The authors hoped to find what they say, but the means of objective parameters show no changes in leaf physiology due to water stress, as they are presented. And all this is due to only 3 replications used.	1. The absence of statistical difference does not necessarily imply in study without value or null hypothesis. It is a finding that presents the cultivar, as tolerant, until a certain moment, where the physiological evidences do not show the differences, but these are perceptible in phenology data where the irrigated plants produced fruits, unlike those under water stress. 2. The adjustment was made. The period indicated in the methodology really differed from that presented in Figure 1 and Table 1. 3. Sorry. We had not understood your remark. It has now become clear to us and we have already proceeded with the amendments. 4. We made the correction. With regard to L109, we understand that it is a trend, so other differences can be justified as the reduction or non-reduction of E, so in the observed period the trend indicates for a possible reduction. 5. Text has been changed. 6. Text has been changed. 7. L127-129 were removed. 8. We agree when the question of differences is mentioned, but we present the result in terms of the photosynthetic rate reduction. We made changes on the paragraph. 9. Statistical data were added in Table 2. 10. Differences were observed mainly in phenological parameters. Although the physiological differences were not perceptible, changes in reproductive phenology were observed. 11. We made the changes to make the conclusions clearer and suitable with the results found in this study.