

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_87315
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) to irrigation scheduling and nutrient management
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The article meets all the requirements of a scientific research. The article deals with the strongest factors for increasing crop productivity – irrigation and fertilizing. The abstract notes the norms of one factor (irrigation), but the other (fertilization) is not reflected. If the rates of one factor are listed, they must be listed of the other. Abbreviations are also not accepted in the abstract. Also, the abstract should indicate the aim of the study. In the introduction, the problems for both factors are discussed in depth. At the end of the introduction there should be a clear aim of the study, while the aim is stated in materials and methods. Although the presented data are good and with proven effect, data from one growing season cannot be accepted as a significant. For the fertilizer factor it is not clear which variant is a control. It is also not clear whether irrigation is combined with fertilization. The results are plain presented. The obtained results are sufficient comparing with previous studies. Table 3 (Economics of different treatments under barley crop) presents the interaction of the two factors by variants – $I_0 \times F_1$; $I_0 \times F_2$; $I_0 \times F_3$; $I_0 \times F_4$; $I_1 \times F_1$; $I_1 \times F_2$; $I_1 \times F_3$; $I_1 \times F_4$; $I_2 \times F_1$; $I_2 \times F_2$; $I_2 \times F_3$; $I_2 \times F_4$. Table 1 (Effect of irrigation scheduling and fertilizer application on growth and yield attributes of barley) and Table 2 (Effect of irrigation scheduling and fertilizer application on yield parameters of barley) do not show the results of these variants. The same tables show only the relationship between irrigation x fertilization (I x F) of the total dispersion. The results of the interaction of different irrigations and different fertilizer treatments would provide valuable information on the impact on the studied traits in intensive agriculture. Moreover, the conclusion reflects the most effective version of the interaction of the two factors, but this is not visible from the tables. I recommend the author (s) to pay attention to the references. There are abbreviations without the necessary sign; in italics, where it is not; there are no spaces; there are no initials of the first names of some authors, etc.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The topic is current. The strongest factors influencing crops have been tested at various rates. These attempts are time consuming. Therefore, their results are especially valuable. I recommend the author (s) to continue the research and publish data for several years. A study conducted over several years provides an answer to the impact of the tested factors in different weather conditions. I also recommend that after there is a control without irrigation, the control without fertilization should be included.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stefka Stefanova-Dobрева
Department, University & Country	Field Crops Institute, Bulgaria