



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_44365
Title of the Manuscript:	Predictive models for Pigeonpea in Northern Hills of Chhattisgarh
Type of the Article	Short communication

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In this paper authors have made analysis of the Pigeonpea for the three districts; Sarguja, Koriya and Jashpur using three models of Linear and Quadratic Models. The authors claim that this study is found useful for understanding the growth trends and magnitude of fluctuations in crop production, but are also useful for scientific planning and effective implementation of agricultural developmental at different levels considering periods of 1979-80 to 2012-13. It is also found that Chhattisgarh is an important State as it contributed about 5.72 per cent of the total annual pulses area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study is found interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly and linguistically needs improvements.</li> <li><b>4. Conclusion:</b> <i>It should be re-written points wise with percentage improvement in the crops of total pulse area of all three districts under considerations.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Ok I agree with you sir Thank you for your valuable suggestion It is helpful for preparing a quality paper</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><i>The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.</i></p>	Agree

**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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> I don't any ethical issues in the article.</p>	