



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_43886
Title of the Manuscript:	Predicting Maize Performance Using Normalized Difference Vegetation Index and Nitrogen Application
New title:	Prediction of Nitrogen Application in Maize Based on the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I made comments in their responses. I was hoping the authors would make some significant changes to the manuscript but they did not. There was no explanation of why biomass calculated from cob harvest index and cob weight gave a different result than when biomass was calculated from grain harvest index and grain yield. The biomass calculated should be the same. The authors refused to list the F values of the treatments and interaction (cultivar, N, cultivar x N) or the significance level of the LSD's. There were 45 treatment combinations and with no significant overall treatment effects (F values) there could be four significantly different treatments effects, at random, using an LSD (10% significance level). Since neither the F values nor the LSD significance values were provided I can only assume that a large proportion of the positive LSD values are Type I errors. Though there were significant correlations of NDVI to grain yield the correlation coefficients were very low (0.23). This is not as useful as a coin flip ($r = 0.5$). I don't see any value in NDVI measurements based on these data. The fact that biomass was not presented whereas less relevant measurements such as plant height, cob weight and leaf number were presented that the authors are trying to hide the poor association of NDVI to biomass which it is suppose to estimate. I think the authors have some non-technical ulterior reason to promote this technology.	Thank you for your attention, these have been attended too. HIC and HIG initially presented were wrongly presented. The F-values for each parameter has been equally included.