



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In general, this article is ok, improve the next points: a) More explain why using a hyperbolic sine function. b) Using more recent bibliographic references c) Improve the wording of the conclusions, this confusing for some readers	We have looked into this by adding a statement on why we used hyperbolic sine function Oyamakin et al. 2013 & Oyamakin & Chukwu 2014 are recent papers. We have reframed the conclusion. Thanks a lot
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issues if any	None as the data used was collected from the growth and yield section of the Forestry Research institute of Nigeria, Ibadan