SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_46531**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Influence of Irrigation Depths in the Growth of Chrysanthemum, Cultivated in Pots, in a Greenhouse in the Northwest Region of Espírito Santo**
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	L 3 – 6 The Influence of Irrigation Depths in the Growth of Chrysanthemum, Cultivated in Pots, in a Greenhouse in the Northwest Region of Espírito Santo I suggest the topic be Influence of irrigation depths on the growth of Chrysanthemum under drip irrigation in green house pots, Northwest Region of Espirito Santo L13 – 14 The abstract is poorly written. The authors should re-write the abstract. Important results are missing in the abstract with the result reported in the abstract not more than two lines. This is poor L13 – 14 Again, the authors were mentioning drippers flowing. Water cannot flow in drippers, please be careful how you use terminologies. Discharge should be used instead L21 – 62 Enough literatures were not referenced on past work done on this work. Are the authors the first to work on the flower under irrigation. If there are limited work, it should be cited and your justification for doing the work can emanate from this perspective as well. L21 – 62 Research gap not mentioned L21 – 62 There is a need to improve the logicality of written L 71 The experiment was carried out from 04/08/2018 to 07/06/2018. Please, check this L 91 The cultivar of the chrysanthemum chosen was the Puritan. Justify why this cultivar was choosen L 114 -117 The crop evapotranspiration (ETc) was determined daily through six selected pots by the drainage lysimeter method. At the end of the day, a known volume was added in each pot and after the drainage was complete, the stored volume, which corresponds to the crop evapotranspiration (ETc), could be determined by Equation 2. $ETc = \frac{Av - Dv}{A}$ (2) L 114 – 117 Please give a reference. For equation 2 L 114 – 117 How did you calculate the irrigation depth. This information is missing (1)Moreso, no information on the soil properties before and after the experiment. This is poor (2) No result on soil moisture content measured The paper need total overhauling.	The objective of this work is to evaluate the influence of the irrigation depths on the culture, grown in pots. The irrigation system need not be highlighted in the title. Corrections made. We have reviewed the suggestions of other reviewers and believe that there is no need to make further changes to the introduction. Changes made. "The experiment was carried out from April 08 to July 06, 2018, in an agricultural greenhouse …" The Puritan cultivar was chosen because it is the one with the highest demand in the region. applied volume (L) - drained volume (L) = required volume Because it is a formula of common knowledge, we do not see the need to reference it, in the same way as calculating the irrigation depth: (mm) = (Volume / Pot Area).
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The work is poorly presented in all sections of the manuscript. It is not well written. See my attached review comments and note attached for this review comments that make me arrive at this conclusion	**All changes have been made.** **Thanks for the suggestions.** **We made the corrections that the other brokers requested and we believe that the work has become clearer and easier to understand.**

SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	