SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_41516**
Title of the Manuscript:	**STRATEGIES FOR TARO (Colocasia esculenta) IRRIGATION**
Type of the Article	**Short 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 paper falls into the scope of the Journal of Experimental Agriculture International. The objectives and experimental procedures followed in the study are not clear. The paper is not well organised. Even though high quality of results was obtained in the study, in terms of experimental treatments, irrigation and soil water measurement, the text is weakly structured, contains many repetitions and exhausted phrases. Results are not clearly presented, not every piece of result is important enough to be mentioned. Values of the figures should not be repeated in the text as this makes the paper unnecessary long and boring. The most of references were not given writing rules of Journal. I consider the article not suitable for publication in of Agriculture and Ecology Research International for the following reasons:	
	1- In the abstract, experimental treatments and experimental year should be explained briefly.	Done
	2- Some keywords (yield; efficiency) are not compatible with article contents. It could be added other keywords.	Done
	3- In the introduction, there are many literature in the introduction some can be deleted and it should be reduced including only the most relevant.	I think it is necessary to contextualize the importance of this study. Thus, I decided to maintain these literature.
	4- In material and method, the climatic data should be given experimental years and long term values. What is the average annual rainfall of this area? How much of the total rainfall fell during the growth stage of Taro in the experimental year. It should be explained briefly.	It was included a new Figure (Figure 2) to show the meteorological variables during the experiment. The values were presented in the text.
	5- Description of experimental soil on a profile base provided. Some physical properties were given; such as soil texture, volumetric water contents at field capacity and wilting point, bulk density. Also, available soil water holding capacity, (mm) should be provided in the rootzone depth.	Included in the text.
	6- In material and methods, sowing time, fertilizer and harvest date, growing stages of	

	taro should be provided in the text. The growth stages of taro was monitored under different treatments or not?	Included in the text.
	7- In material and methods, crop evapotranspiration (ETc) and Water use efficiency (WUE) for taro crop was assessed using the equation of Mantovani et al. (2017); Vieira et al., (2015). There are no results related to ETc in the text. The water use efficiency (IWUE) values can be re-calculated in the text. Also, irrigation water use efficiency (IWUE) values should be calculated as following lines. Water use efficiency (WUE) and irrigation water use efficiency (IWUE) should be calculated as seed yield divided by seasonal ET and total seasonal irrigation water applied, respectively (Howell, 2001). Howell T A (2001). Enhancing water use efficiency in irrigated agriculture. Agronomy Journal; 93(2):281-289.	We included an explanation how we calculated the Etc, in the text. Included in the text.
	8- Results are not clearly presented, not every piece of result is important enough to be mentioned. The manuscript should be improved in the results and discussion part particularly. Results and discussion needs rewriting. In some cases, data reported in figures are exhaustively described in this section. Sometimes, the description of the obtained results is meaningless.	We did new discussion and rearranged the results.
	9- In results and discussion, profile soil water content was measured in all treatments during growing season of taro. But, from the information provided in the text, we do not know what was the soil water content in the root zone relative to field capacity and wilting point in different treatments. I think, providing the soil water content variation throughout the growing season would increase the value of the manuscript. It is feasible for explanation of water stress degree of treatments.	Done
	10- In results and discussion, evapotranspiration, water use efficiency and irrigation water use efficiency values of treatments should be calculated and given in Table.	
	11- In results and discussion, how many irrigation was made during the all growing season of taro? When did you start irrigation and stop last irrigation? This should be clarified in the text.	Done

	12- The Figure 1 should be removed from the article. The experimental area (latitude, longitude) wass defined in the text. 13- In the references, the most of references were not given writing rules of Journal. 14- In the references, the references, Should incorporate sufficient studies that were related with this experiment but don't use so many old references to support one statement. 15- An economical analysis should be made in order to suggest the optimal treatment. 16- A small conclusion text should be added. 17- The authors did not provided new information concerning the current topic, The data presented are not sufficient for a paper in Journal of Experimental Agriculture International.	Done Done Done Done I think it is important, but was not the focus of this study. Done We presented more data to provide more information about the study.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		