



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44582
Title of the Manuscript:	Irrigation scheduling optimization in olive groves
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 research findings in the article are an interesting contribution in the field of irrigation management in olive production under Mediterranean conditions. - According to the JEAI page, the subject of this study is within the scope of the Journal. However, there is a lack of experimental data to make the findings more valuable in an "Experimental Agriculture" journal. - In fact, although the data and methodologies presented appear sound, only meteorological data are presented. All the other values for the simulations performed were not measured and this is a weakness of the study. That is, the materials and methods, and the results sections should include calibration/validation of the model in the Calabria predominant conditions. - Recognizing, however, the importance of the knowledge of irrigation management for the olive production sector, I consider that, after providing <i>in situ</i> data and model validation, and making the corrections that are suggested below, the article is acceptable for publication.	See point 3 We added some sentences on the measurement/estimation of some soil and crop characteristics (see L. 141 and 163-167). All the other values are the most common in the area studied and in many olive orchards grown in Mediterranean conditions. The WB-ET model is a robust model tested in many areas of the world during almost the last 40 years. However, the calibration/validation of the different scheduling strategies are in progress, but they will constitute a new, different manuscript. For the corrections of the points 5-15 see the following part
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 22 - suggestion: replace generally by often. - Line 29 - suggestion: add ... and maximize profits in several crops. - Line 49 and 50 – suggestion: rephrase this period. - Table 1: please provide references for the values used. - Line 139: please provide a brief explanation on the determination of the K_f value. - Line 224 to 225 – suggestion: rephrase this sentence . - Figure 1: y-axis scales should be equal in all the graphics to better illustrate the differences between years. - Lines 267 to 272: the sentences give the same information. Please rephrase. - Figure 2: please correct the title according to lines 358 to 360. - Line 494: replace Mediterranean environment by Calabria or Southern Italy - Line 494 to 496: please delete the sentence (it is not accurate to say that 2 years of meteorological data and 17 years mean values can support the generalization of the results)	Done, L. 22 Done, L.29-30 Done, L. 49-50 Done Done, L. 139-141 Done, now L. 234-235 Done I eliminated the redundant sentence (now L 272-275) Done Done, now L 496 We know 30 years at minimum are necessary to be representative of the climatic conditions. But, we think two recent years so different and a mean of 17 recent years should be significant due to climate change. However, we deleted the sentence as suggested by you. Thank you very much for your suggestions
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	