



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 WE CHANGED THE TITLE ACCORDING TO REVIEWER'S SUGGESTION. |

PART 2:

|                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)<br>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. | <p>Authors’ response to final evaluator’s comments</p> <p>RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS OF REVIEWER 1:</p> <p>English writing and the tenses are checked throughout the whole paper.</p> <p>As Paez et. al. (2011) declared via simulation studies, GWR is not recommended for data sets where sample size is less than 160. We tested a data set with 194 counties (2 states, Illinois and Indiana of the USA), and reached the same conclusion of larger data here as well. It is now mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>We mentioned that one should be cautious while drawing conclusions. However, since GWR is an exploratory process (Bivand et al, 2008), it is more preferred for exploratory process rather than drawing statistical inferences.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <p>Lines 5-7 are rewritten, and application of the data is mentioned before the results.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Application of the data is mentioned before the results.</p> <p>We deleted “as” and “is”, as mentioned and sentence is re-written.</p> <p>Rewritten the sentence in the line 146-147.</p> <p>We use “than” after a comparative adverb to introduce the second element of the comparison. We believe this is correct in line 164.</p> <p>Tense are checked in the whole article.</p> <p>Tables and references are re-formatted.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <p>WE DID NOT ADDRESS MOST OF THE COMMENTS OF REVIEWER 2 BECAUSE WE DID NOT AGREE ON HIM ON THOSE COMMENTS. HERE ARE A FEW EXAMPLES:</p> <p>THE REVIEWER SAYS THAT “the comparison with OLS regression is not a fair one in my opinion”. WE COULD NOT AGREE ON THIS, IT IS PERFECTLY FAIR PRACTICE; PLEASE SEE THE REFERENCES GIVEN IN THE RESPONSE TO VERIFY THIS. HE ARGUES THAT GWR IS A NON LINEAR METHOD, AND HE FURTHER CLAIMS THAT OUR DATA IS NONLINEAR. We believe gwr is not a nonlinear model, and our data is not nonlinear either, our data is a spatial data with two predictors, and a response. Hence we cannot compare gwr with the methods he suggested.</p> <p>HE ASKED US TO WRITE A FITTED MODEL IN GWR. WE BELIEVE, IT IS NOT PRACTICAL TO GIVE THE FITTED MODEL FOR EACH SPATIAL LOCATION. WE CHECKED THIS WITH THE EXPERTS WHO DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF GWR, AND WE ARE FOLLOWING THEIR SUGGESTIONS.</p> <p>We mentioned that we have not taken polynomial (quadratic, or interaction) terms into account in the regression here. We mentioned in the manuscript that imputation technique was used to handle the missing data. No further pre-processing was done.</p> <p>RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS OF REVIEWER 3 AND 4 ARE IN THE NEXT FILE:</p> |