



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48617
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity and nutrient supply in 'Gigante' cactus pear with regulated deficit irrigation using wastewater
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>59 – please state the average ET rate and the soil type            70 – 6 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> – suggestion, give the amount of nutrient in kg m<sup>2</sup>            74 – use superscript as it is recommended in authors guidelines (30 m<sup>2</sup>) and further in the manuscript            92 – which invasive plants and how did the authors controlled it (chemically or mechanically?)            127 – authors have stated “and Da were used to do the Crop Water Balance”, the abbreviation Da is not clear enough            158 – please check the instructions for authors regarding the citing and references (and further in the manuscript)            160 – FC is 15%? Please state the main soil physical characteristics (sand, clay, organic matter content, water and air capacity)            178 – authors have stated: In the non-irrigated treatments, the yields were lower than in the remaining treatments. Please give the % in compared to other treatments since it is easier to reader to understand the result.            191 – please check the author guidelines for writing the formulas            196 – authors have stated “On the other hand, the treatment with organic fertilization and water supplementation with common water (1.2 L week<sup>-1</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>) (T5) had the highest productivity”. Please give an explanation for this result.            391 – what about compared with waste water treatment?            398 – fertilized (type mistake)</p> <p>What would be the general conclusion or recommendation?</p> <p>Please adjust the reference list according the authors guidelines</p>	<p>The Field Capacity (FC = 15%) and the Permanent Wilting Point (PWP = 6%) were measured by determining the moisture at 1 kPa and 150 kPa tension, respectively. The texture (sand, loam, clay, organic matter contents) and the water and air capacity were not measured.</p> <p>All other suggestions were accepted.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I enjoyed reading this manuscript. It is very well written, easy to read and it was easy to follow all of the methods and the results in the manuscript. Some minor suggestions are given above.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.</p>

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>