Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_117286**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Examining the Effects of Diverse Irrigation Regimens and Planting Timelines on Wheat Growth, Yield, and Yield Characteristics**
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**	**Yes.** The existence of such researches are extremely relevant for the period in which we live and are worthy of praise. Through the topic addressed, the authors were able to highlight the best sowing periods, the most optimal IW/CPE ratio that would lead to the improvement of wheat production per hectare. They pointed out the obstacles in achieving optimal productions, so that the work can represent a starting point for future decisions in wheat sowing on large areas. **Yes** **Yes** **Yes** **Yes and No. Introduction**. At the introduction you have a report: IW/CPE. Only from the context I deduced that IW can mean irrigation water but not what CPE means. The first time you talk about this report, also mention the significance of the abbreviations. In the same way, insert a legend under the tables. What statistical calculation was used? Should you mention in the Material and Method subchapter as I can't figure out how the SEM was obtained? I think that from each plot, randomly, several measurements were made to obtain these data. Do the values in table 2, 3, 4 represent the average? Is the SEM calculated as an overall value for the 4 lots? That's how it turns out. Although it wouldn't be right. Example of drawing up a table	

Treatment Details	n	**30 DAS**	**60 DAS**	**90 DAS**	**120DAS**
I1: IW/CPE (0.6)		mean±SEM	mean±SEM	mean±SEM	mean±SEM
I2: IW/CPE (0.8)					
I3: IW/CPE (1.0)					
I4: IW/CPE (1.2)					

In this way, comparisons can be made between different groups, at the same time interval

LEGEND:
n: Number of evaluated plants/group
IW:
CPE
DAS
S=significant

What does: Interaction (Main × Sub) or NS, S from Table 2,3, 4mean?
3.1 Plant Height (cm)
The authors explain the cause of the differences in plant height due to meteorological conditions that the reader can only believe. That's why as a suggestion, maybe a table with values of temperature, humidity, amount of precipitation could suggest with certainty the action of environmental parameters on plant growth.
The scientific work is of global interest, but the authors should rely on real facts not on probability ("This difference could be attributed to the delayed sowing....."). There should be a logical explanation resulting from their research.

Review Form 1.7

6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Hegedus Cristina**
Department, University & Country	**University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, România**