

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_85556
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of soil water extraction and yield of cotton planted using solid and single-skip row configurations
Type of the 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The topic is interesting and addresses a current problem of water efficiency in agriculture. The work is well structured, with a fluid writing and with forceful results. However, the presentation of the results leaves a gap regarding interpretation, due to the omission of statistical indicators. We suggest adding letter differentiation to the corresponding tables and figures for developed means tests, this will help the reader to identify differences between treatments.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the first paragraph of the introduction, we suggest adding a bibliographic reference that supports the statements made.</li> <li>• We suggest rewriting paragraph 4, written in this way, it seems to be more of a discussion text than a text that contributes to the referential framework of the investigation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Materials and methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We suggest adding cartography of the study area for a better understanding of the international public.</li> <li>• You must specify the Means Test used (Tukey, Ducan, Scheffe, DMS).</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We suggest that section 3.1 Meteorological Conditions be presented in the Materials and Methods section, as a specification of the characteristics of the study area.</li> <li>• In Materials and Methods, the use of a means test is specified, however, in the results (Tables and Figures) these statistical indicators are not observed. We suggest adding letters per treatment to represent the statistical differences between the treatments</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alberto Santillán Fernández</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Colegio de Postgraduados Campus Campeche, México</b>