



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_46902</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of different irrigation levels on vegetative parameters of Sweet Cherry grown in a high density planting system</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research papers</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1- I tried to find this equation" <math>ET_c \text{ or } WR = DE \times KC \times AA \times PC \times AC \div IE</math>" in FAO documents I could not. Would you mind please add reference to this equation! Another issue is that it is known from FAO that <math>ET_r</math> for pan is equal = <math>PC \times ET_p</math> where <math>ET_r</math> is reference evapotranspiration, PC Pan coefficient and <math>ET_p</math> pan evapotranspiration Or <math>ET_c = K_c \times ET_r</math> where <math>ET_r</math> is reference evapotranspiration and <math>K_c</math> is the crop coefficient. In that case the equation for crop ET is equal to <math>ET_c = PC \times ET_p \times K_c</math> Add to that how the authors calculated the PC it is known that PC for class A pan is equal to <math>PC = 0.108 - 0.0286 u_2 + 0.0422 \ln(FET) + 0.1434 \ln(RH_{mean}) - 0.000631 [\ln(FET)]^2 \ln(RH_{mean})</math> For green fetch Or <math>PC = K_p = 0.61 + 0.00341 RH_{mean} - 0.000162 u_2 RH_{mean} - 0.00000959 u_2 FET + 0.00327 u_2 \ln(FET) - 0.00289 u_2 \ln(86.4 u_2) - 0.0106 \ln(86.4 u_2) \ln(FET) + 0.00063 [\ln(FET)]^2 \ln(86.4 u_2)</math> <math>u_2</math> average daily wind speed at 2 m height (m s<sup>-1</sup>) <math>RH_{mean}</math> average daily relative humidity [%] = <math>(RH_{max} + RH_{min})/2</math> <math>FET</math> fetch, or distance of the identified surface type (grass or short green agricultural crop for case A, dry crop or bare soil for case B upwind of the evaporation pan) Check FAO documentation.</p> <p>2- It would be better use graphs instead of tables 1,2,3,4 and 5</p> <p>3- What is Epan in discussion section never mentioned before</p> <p>4- Conclusion is very concise and need to be expanded with a short and brief explanation about the different experiments results</p> <p>5- You need to use an up to date references the newest one is 2010 The following reference must be discussed compared and added to references Cigdem Demirtas, Umran Erturk, Senih Yazgan, Effects of different irrigation levels on the vegetative growth, flower bud formation and fruit quality of sweet cherry in western part of Turkey, April 2008, Journal of Food Agriculture and Environment 6(2) Add more recent and up to date related references.</p> <p>6- English language of the manuscript needs improvement</p>	<p>1.corrected</p> <p>PC is pan coefficient of class A pan evaporimeter which has been already calculated its value is 0.7 it has been already defined by FAO and we need not to calculate it , it is a constant equal to 0.7, it is mentioned on pan evaporimeter that has been installed at agrometrological station os SKUAST-K.</p> <p>2. i think tables are more explanatory and quick to understand , as the results involve the interactions it would be more complex to understand them from the graphs.including the graphs will change the whole manuscript.</p> <p>3. Epan values and DE i-e daily pan evaporation data are same highlighted in manuscript.</p> <p>4. conclusion explained wrt experimental results.</p> <p>5. references added.</p> <p>6. language improved.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1- In the title I suggest to use physical instead of "vegetative" word</p> <p>2- In the abstract first line, what do you mean by four year old? Is it planted 4 years ago ? if it is not the case change the sentence</p> <p>3- It is better to say a simple sentence for the sweet cherry type and location i.e "four year old plants of two types sweet cherry in an agricultural area in Jammu and Kashmir. The period of experiments cover the years from 2016 to 2018. The experiments ...</p> <p>4- Change "non significant" to "insignificant"</p> <p>5- No need for competing interest in the paper may be an acknowledgement is better</p>	<p>1. i think vegetative is more appropriate term as word physical includes flowers and fruits as well but in this paper they have not been discussed</p> <p>2. yes they have been planted in 2013 and research was started in 2016 -17 at that time they were 4 yrs old</p> <p>3. sir these are not two types of sweet cheery plants, it is only one variety/ cultivar on which the research was conducted , the name of sweet cherry cultivar on which the research was conducted is Regina, also the research has been carried out in the main campus of the university</p> <p>for the period of 2016-17and 2017- 18 has been replaced by the.period of experiments cover the years from 2016 to 2018.</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

		<p>4. Non significant has been changed to insignificant.</p> <p>5. Competing interests removed.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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