



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_9075
Title of the Manuscript:	Water-use efficiency and transpiration rate of wheat under irrigated and desiccated conditions
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language of the manuscript is very poor and needs serious revision with proper grammar check. • Alignment of the paragraph needs to be corrected • Bring the paper in right format of English with missing punctuation marks. • Mention the soil physical parameters of the study area. • What was the depth of irrigation at each level of deficit available soil moisture • Some serial numbers are given in the MS for mentioning different topics. But the numbers are very disordered. Correct it • Title of figures are not given • Why the two cultivars were used in different years • Why one cultivar was not evaluated for both the year • How statistical evaluation was done based on only one year data for one cultivar 	<p>I edit the problems and used good language and grammar</p> <p>Ok I did</p> <p>Thank you for observation</p> <p>The soil is andosol come from vocano and wrote what I know as the Japanese prof told me.</p> <p>I added water to be appropriate with the weight and field capacity for well-watered and desiccated pots holded after heading till harvest.</p> <p>I changed the number and arranged</p> <p>Under the figures you can find the</p> <p>Because the yield in Sakha 94 was not gived so we suggested to change the cultivar may the weather affectedon the grains</p> <p>As you see in my paper case, I depened on</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result and discussion was not explained at all. There was continuous repetition of same explanation for all the paragraphs. • The author tried to make it too general. Please elaborate each point separately with separate discussion. • Conclusion is too general and need to be correlated with each point explained in the result and discussions section. 	<p>statistical analysis in excel and has means and standard errors and draw graphs and regression equations and R^2</p> <p>OK, I did</p> <p>Yes, Thank you</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper shall be written in past tense but in the manuscript it is completely in the future tense with sentences like "It will be measured" and "Leaf and other parts of shoots will be put into 80°C oven" and "Plant parts will be reserved"..... etc and many more. • • Full forms of many abbreviations were not mentioned correctly (soil water content is designated both as SWC and W_s, which creates confusions) • • No Figure nos are given in the figure but then also the fig nos are mentioned on the text • Fig no. 1 missing 	<p>I changed you can check in the material and methods.</p> <p>I wrote the abbreviation</p> <p>Figured are arranged and numbered</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work done but more efforts to be done on the manuscript preparation. Need many revisions and can be accepted after the suggested revisions.	Thank you