



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_32452
Title of the Manuscript:	Selection of Appropriate Growth Model for Projections of Cotton Area, Production and Productivity of Tamil Nadu, India
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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	Materials and methods To explain to the reader the difference between the two coefficients of determinations, and what is the advantage of the adjusted R squared for the comparison of various regression models. To add relevant references. 2.1 Forecast through regression models - you can omit this title, it is not related directly with the content of the subsection. You need to detail and to explain here - what is Y, what is t? How you will use the results of the models estimation for forecasting? Section Data is absent. A few words in the beginning of Section Materials and Methods is definitely not enough for this empiric study. In a new section Data, please, add sources of data and how other researchers can use them; appendix?; statistical summary of the used data; visual presentation - you already give it - can it explain the choice of the statistical models? In section Results and Discussion the information of the used statistical tools for data processing is absent. In the same section, please, add in Table 3 significance of the models. Again, the name "3.1 Estimations" seems to be not necessary. Instead of this, you can explain the tables of the results with more details.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“All the iterative procedures require starting values of the parameters. The choice of good starting values can” - it looks like a part of the instructions for using statistical procedures. But you did not explain what statistical tools you used. From the other side, to give such fragments from instructions is not necessary in the article. Conclusion The text beginning from “Rajarithinam et al., (2010) worked in similar models ...” should be re-written. To explain in a more clear way that your results are in line with the results of other researchers. Can you conclude on possible policy implications? Some English editing is needed here.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract To edit: ... different non-linear viz., linear,...	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	An interesting study devoted to an important crop.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gregory Yom Din
Department, University & Country	Department of Management and Economics, The Open University of Israel, Israel