



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.

This paper was typed in such a sloppy way it should never has been sent to a reviewer in the state it was submitted. I did however review it in spite of its submission state. I do not think it fits for publication in an international journal. The basic data and findings are well known. It might be of information value to a local growers journal.. Physiological explanations are cited and related as facts without any related analysis based only on a tow year horticultural data. There was no attempt to verify the published theories by experimental work within this study. This would be a must as various data such as timing of stone grows and oil accumulation contradicts well established concepts.

The experimental design of the study is clear though tow years are not really enough for some of the obscure consequences deducted. Still, the data might be of local significance. Thus, as I indicated earlier the paper might be interest for a local horticultural journal publication. Regarding stone size I think there are some unclear indications of significance via the lettering.



SDI Review Form 1.6

This paper, **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 writing of this paper is sloppy. I did review it although it should have been returned to the authors for re writing before sending it to reviewers.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The scientific new data not published earlier in this paper. It might be of value for the local extension service and could be published after retyping and language editing in a local journal.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer