



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6050
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Crop Residue Yield Potential using Geographically Weighted Regression
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The author should carefully check English writing and the tenses through the whole paper. 2. In this paper, the author compares OLS and GWR which are used for geographical analysis, this paper compares the performances of these two methods for Crop Residue Yield Potential which show certain novelty. Since OLS and GWR are widely used methods, the novelty seems insufficient for methods. More importantly, the author declare that “ it was demonstrated that the data set would have to be large enough for the individual parameters of GWR models to be spatially heterogeneous”, it was not sure when only the small dataset (66 countries) and large dataset (743 countries) are compared, and more experiments should be explored to obtain this result, the conclusion needs to be more cautious.	English writing and the tenses are checked throughout the whole paper. As Paez et. al. (2011) declared via simulation studies, GWR is not recommended for data sets where sample size is less than 160. We again tested for data sets with 194 counties (2 states, Illinois and Indiana of the USA), and that the same conclusion of larger data is supported here as well. It is mentioned in manuscript now. Yes, as you said, we mentioned that one should be cautious while drawing conclusions. However, since GWR is an exploratory process (Bivand et al, 2008), and it is more preferred for exploratory process rather than drawing statistical inferences.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 5-6 rewrite this sentence because it is not smooth Line 6-7 to my knowledge, GWR was not a new approach, and it was not suitable to state that GWR was new compared with OLS. Line 11-20 The results presented in line 11-20 was obtained by the real world dataset, and the application of the real world dataset in line 20-23 should be mentioned before the results.	Lines 5-7 are rewritten, and application of the data is mentioned before the results. Thanks for pointing this out. We have used, for example, Brown et al. 2011 and Tu et al 2008, as reference to this, which state that GWR is relatively a new approach, compared to OLS model. We have changed it to “recently developed” in the manuscript now. Application of the data is mentioned before the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 42 delete “as” line 78 delete “is” line 146-147 rewrite this sentence line 164 check “than” In the abstract part, the author uses the present tense and the past tense, the author should carefully check the tenses used in this part and the whole article. Tables in the paper must follow the author instructions. The references form must follow the author instructions	results. We deleted “as” and “is”, as mentioned and sentence is re-written. Rewritten the sentence in the line 146-147. We use “than” after a comparative adverb to introduce the second element of the comparison. We believe this is correct in line 164. Tense checked in the whole article. Tables and references are re-formatted now.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Thanks for helping us improving our article.