



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43194
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation of flowering models for classifying maize into maturity groups in the different Agro-ecologies of West and Central Africa.
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 suggest the manuscript is not accepted for publication. After 2 reviews, several major revisions remain. Moreover, the main feedback I gave in previous reviews (very weak statistical analysis) was not improved. Below some more comments. Introduction could be improved with better connection among paragraphs. Also there is still several grammar and spellings mistakes. On the results, the tables are not clearly described on the headings. For example, most of them miss information about what are the variables being presented. It is difficult for the reader to understand what is being presented on each table; they do not stand on their own. CV is of observed vs. the one for different models is used as to evaluate accuracy of the models. This is not a valid comparison (see this following reference for different validations approaches; Wallach, D., D. Makowski, and J. W. Jones, Eds., 2006: Working with Dynamic Crop Models: Evaluation, Analysis, Parameterization, and Applications. 1st ed. Elsevier Science, 462 pp.). Most important weakness of this work is that there is not a statistical comparison among models. Moreover, the statistics used to evaluate the models on their own, are not good. That leads the authors to use subjective evaluations of the quality of each model and to evaluate relative performance among them. For example, terms as “unrealistic”, “unreasonably”, “fairly close correlation” are used as to evaluate models performance.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Diego Cerrudo
Department, University & Country	Rwanda