Dear reviewer,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and for your comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your suggestions.

Abstract

Abstract is not technically managed. Treatment plan is not included. Findings are not quantified. “Due to the fact that cv. ´Bohemia´, increases 26 during such periods of transpiration, so for this reason it is not suitable for dry 27 areas”?

Organized the keywords alphabetically.

Response: amended in revised version.

Introduction

This section is well managed.

Material and methods

The materials and methods section looks poor.

Line 98-99: Winter wheat plants were grown in 11 x 11 cm pots in a greenhouse experiment. What do you mean by 11 × 11 cm pots; dimensions are not clear, either height, diameter, width etc.?

Line 100: Remove space between temperature values and unit.

Line 112-113: 10 d?

Line 127: Add the name of scientist(s) before reference.

Line 128: Following were extracted, targets were taken? What language is it?

Line 142: 8-13 h CET?

At what stage the data were collected? Before moving to physiological or other parameters, emergence attributes are more important to explore the impact of water deficit.

Response: The Material and Methods have been supplemented and expanded. Data on developmental stages and germination parameters have been added.

Result

Regarding the result section, improve the reporting language and avoid jargon. Directly state the results. Authors must quantitatively report their results. Make the results section concise and specific. The figures’ quality is very poor.

Response: The results section has been revised. The results have been quantified and the figure graphics have been modified.

Discussion

The discussion section may be improved with citations of recent studies. Try to discuss results with recent literature with logical reasoning. It looks more like the result section. Improve this section with a logical and scientific approach. Rewriting of previous studies/results deteriorates the quality of manuscript.

Response: The discussion section has been edited and supplemented with additional citations of literature sources

Conclusion

Conclusion may be short, specific, and quantified.

Response: amended in revised version.

Reference

The authors need to work on the reference list according to the journal style and cross matching.

Response: amended in revised version.

Figures

Figure quality may be improved.

Response: amended in revised version.

Again, thanks for your great comments. Your comments helped us a lot to improve our manuscript and we appreciate your careful attention. We hope that the edited manuscript is now suitable for publication in Agronomy.

Sincerely yours,

Authors