



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3348
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal time of supplemental irrigation during fruit development of rainfed olive tree (OleaEuropea, cv.PicholineMarocaine) in Morocco

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The work identify, with experimental studies, the best choice of supplemental irrigation on olive orchard usually cultivated under rainfed conditions. The aim of this work may be attractive given the oil production importance for many Mediterranean areas. The work has some format problems: a lot of single spaces missed between different words (see my original manuscript corrected copy) This lead to a very difficult reading. In general, I believe that the work is robust as scientific data and relevance of the experiment, but it is not well written and some parts should be implemented. to strengthen the paper. Pag. 2, row 84: please explain which meteorological station was used. The methods are sufficiently detailed. Result-Vegetative growth: Figure 3 is not readable consequently it is not possible to interpret the results described. Please, change the figure with clearer curves and greater characters. Furthermore, the calculated percentages of Increasing of shoot length could be explained in order to verify the obtained results. Results: yield and water user efficiency: also in this	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	case it is not clear how the different percentage in the text were obtained; in addition Table 2 is not clear: how does it mean the single letters close to the number?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some English word are no adequate in the context they are underlined. Fig. 1: y axe explanation is missed Fig. 2: both y axes explanations are missed Some corrections on the text, please look to the spaces between the single words.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr. Marianna Nardino
Department, University & Country	Institute of Biometeorology, National Research Council, Italy