



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3460
Title of the Manuscript:	Wheat Culture Water Needs Diagnosis Carried in the Sidi Bel Abbes Semi Arid Valley

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 7 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 "Abstract" should be revised including the findings and conclusion/ recommendation. - The "objective" should be more clear and straight-forward.	Fixed Fixed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Formula for "crop cultivation coefficient" should be added. - The formula for PET and Rg should be given in 'Method' section, not in 'Result ' section. - Now-a-days, PET is not commonly used (internationally), but ET0. - In Table-1, "Humidity" should be "Relative humidity". - There are ample scope to improve the readability/language throughout the paper.	We didn't evaluate crop cultivations but rather crop water needs in a semi-arid region. Fixed. Yes, it depends on the scientific "school" used. We tried the classical European point of view. Yes, we used humidity in percentage, that means relative humidity. Yes, but according to our point of view we used the best way and means to expose and explain our results.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		