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)

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 discussion should be organized for each parameter of the study such as the stem diameter, plant height, dry and fresh weight …..etc	We believe that dividing each parameter will make discussions of the work very repetitive, with the original form being best.
Minor REVISION comments	The author/Authors show the average of the 20 replicates in the figures. It is preferable to shown the 20 replicates for the 6 treatments. It gives better regression for statistical analysis	We believe there is no need to show all 20 values. The mean is sufficient and the coefficient of variation (CV) of each variable is in Table 2.
Optional/General comments	The measured parameters of the plants for different treatments should organized in sub items under results and discussion.	We believe that dividing each parameter will make discussions of the work very repetitive, with the original form being best. 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.

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)*	