

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_85886
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH RATE, TREND IN AREA, PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY AND ALSO FORECASTING TECHNIQUE ARIMA MODEL FOR PRODUCTION OF COTTON CROP IN BALLARI DISTRICT OF KARNATAKA
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>)

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	<p>1/ Some critical “key words” have been omitted in the abstract.</p> <p>2/ Sentence construction needs improvement.</p> <p>3/ Any citation must include the timing the author carried out the research.</p> <p>4/ Before the methodology, state the objective of the study and the statement of the problem? There has to be a common thread right from the introduction to the conclusions.</p> <p>5/ State whether the whole population or a sample of the population was used for the study. If sample, explain how this was selected.</p>	Corrected
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1/ When examining the views of other authors, critique their articles (are the arguments logical? Do you agree with them – if not, why not? Does the author omit arguments that you regard essential). This helps to formulate your own stance.</p> <p>2/ What discourse does this study reflect?</p> <p>3/ Who are the parties to benefit from this study (government, farmers, researchers, extension officers, seed producers, etc, etc)?</p>	Noted
Optional/General comments	<p>1/ This study mirrors one that I reviewed from Turkey, although of a different crop. It is acceptable in its present form and region of the research.</p> <p>2/ Secondary data may not necessarily provide views of the farmer(s) which could distort the mechanistic estimation models of growth rate, production, productivity, etc.</p> <p>3/ What know gap has been plugged?</p>	Noted

Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	