



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 TITLE CHANGED ACCORDING TO THE REVIEWER’S COMMENTS.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to final evaluator’s comments
I can not see that the quality of the paper has improved significantly after revision. In my opinion the paper is very similar to the first version.	RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS OF REVIEWER 3: AS PER THE SUGGESTIONS OF THE REVIEWER to try for different sized data sets, for verification purpose, we tested for a new data sets with 194 counties (2 states, Illinois and Indiana of the USA), and the conclusion of large data set is supported here as well. Hence, we believe 160 as the bottom line which has already been mentioned by Paez et al. Paez et al have not shown the comparative study using real world data set with different sample sizes, this is what we did. THE PUNCTUATION AND MINOR GRAMMATICAL ERRORS ARE CORRECTED. RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS OF REVIEWER 4: AS PER THE SUGGESTION OF THE REVIEWER, the title is changed to “Effect of Sample Size on the Performance of Ordinary Least Squares and Geographically Weighted Regression”. THE R VERSION is changed to 3.0.1. WE MENTIONED IN THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT THAT PRISM stands for Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model, a data base from PRISM climate Group. WE ADDED IN THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT THAT Moran’s I and Geary’s C for OLS model are statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. These are not significant for GWR model. This is addressed in manuscript (under the Table 1). I and C values in Table 1 for OLS are italicized to indicate the significance. GRAMMAR AND PUNCTUATION ERRORS ARE CORRECTED. WE BELIEVE, WE ADDRESSED ALL THE ISSUES OF REVIEWERS 1,3, AND 4. IF ANYTHING IS FOUND TO BE MISSING, PLEASE LET US KNOW, WE WILL BE HAPPY TO CORRECT THOSE. WE COULD NOT ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF THE SECOND REVIEWER AS WE COULD NOT AGREE ON HIS COMMENTS.