



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14141
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>On Hyperbolic Monomolecular growth model in Height/Diameter growth of PINES</i>
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	Lines 29-42 , 58-69. There is a number of speculative self-praising sentences with no explanation or proof of connection with the method used. Lines 91-112. It is well known from textbook on statistics and can be removed from manuscript. Line 156. To correct. Line 160. It is not clear how was calculated AIC; what procedure for parameter estimation; are all parameters significant? Lines 169, 173, 177, 180. Figures 5 - 8 additional need an explanation of the axes (wrong titles). Figures 5,6 and 7,8 must be joined. Line 212. Used dataset is very very small.	I don't think there is anything wrong with line 29-42, and 58-69. I guess they are relevant to the study and well referenced. Yes it can be found in Drapers and Smith 1988 but the method supports estimation procedure of nonlinear models. AIC was calculated using the standard procedure which is $n \cdot \ln(\text{sse}/n) + 2k$, where n is the sample size, sse is the residual sum of squares and k is the number of parameter to be estimated. I don't think there is need for the figures to be merged because we studied two major variables i.e. height and diameter using the classical source and the proposed hyperbolic model. I believe tree data is a scarce one due to the number of years it takes to observe a noticeable change in them. Hence we can only use the data we have been able to get. At a later time we could also consider bootstrapping approach.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 76. To correct. Line 102. It's not a 'variable'.	Line 102 is not expressed as a variable but it's a function that defines how the residual sum of squares can be minimized. And common variable has been changed to common variance
Optional/General comments	Lines 246- 254. For better understanding of new developed model it is necessary to compare with other growth models traditionally used for growth modeling. The fit statistics of new developed model is better as was added one additional parameter.	Comparing it with existing growth models shall be considered at a later time