

Response to editor (bg-2017-103)

Comments to the Author:

This paper describes an experiment to examine the water stress on corn yield so as to determine the economic feasibility to irrigate the crop with groundwater. It is a concise paper with useful information to the corn producers and researcher as well. However, at its current status, it has not satisfied the level to be accepted to be published in the Journal because of multiple reasons.

(1) There is a great room for improving this paper by intensive English editorial work. There are several cases where the entire section is not well presented in fluent English. Some minor grammatical errors can be found in several locations as well.

Response: Thank you for the comments. We thoroughly revised whole text, especially for language and grammar.

(2) Suggest to separate discuss and conclusion so that the value of the paper in science and production can be fully demonstrated. In particular, the scientific value of the paper has been less focused, which should be added.

Response: We totally agreed. We separated discuss and conclusions, also revised the text accordingly.

Some specific comments have been attached.

Introduction is generally well presented but need some as commented in the attached file.

Response: All comments including in attached PDF file have been revised accordingly.

Material and methods are well described to a proper level.

Result

3.2 Has no information about study period which makes the current data lack value. In addition, the comments from discussion should be carefully addressed.

Response: We added the information during study period. The discussion was revised accordingly.

Non-public comments to the Author:

This paper describes an experiment to examine the water stress on corn yield so as to determine the economic feasibility to irrigate the crop with groundwater. It is a concise paper with useful information to the corn producers and researcher as well. However, with its current status, it has not satisfied the level to be accepted to be published in the Journal because of multiple reasons.

(1) There is a great room to improve this paper by intensive English editorial work. There are several cases where the entire section is not well presented in fluent English. Some minor grammatical errors can be found in several locations as well.

Response: We thoroughly revised whole text according to the comments and especially pay great attention to the English writing.

(2) Suggest to separate discuss and conclusion so that the value of the paper in science and production can be fully demonstrated.

Response: We totally agreed. We separated discuss and conclusions, also revised the text accordingly.

Some specific comments have been attached.

Response: All comments including in the attached PDF file have been revised accordingly.