Review of: "Yield Forecasting Model for Maize Using Satellite Multispectral Imagery Driven Vegetation Indices"

Chandrashekhar H. Patil

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The author demonstrates a keen analytical insight into the reviewed works, offering valuable interpretations and connections.
2. The abstract is engaging, succinctly summarizing the main objectives, methodology, and findings of the review.
3. The paper makes a meaningful contribution to the academic field by synthesizing and evaluating existing literature.
4. Author critically evaluates existing studies, demonstrating a deep understanding of strengths and limitations.
5. Successfully identifies gaps, paving the way for future research opportunities.

Still the following major corrections are required in the paper.

1. Figures and Tables: Ensure figures 1 and tables 2 and 3 are labelled, and it must be directly relevant to the content.
2. Clarity of Expression: Clear and concise writing style is required, though minor grammatical edits could enhance professionalism.
3. Conclusion and Future Directions: Provide a concise summary and suggests meaningful directions for future research.
4. Adherence to Guidelines: Confirm that the paper aligns with the specific guidelines outlined by the journal
5. Check for Typos and Errors: Review the paper for any typographical errors, misspellings, or grammatical issues.
6. Consistency in Citation Style: Ensure uniformity in citation style and reference formatting throughout the paper.
7. Language Clarity: Ensure that the language used is clear, precise, and adheres to academic writing standards.
8. Unclear Methodological Approach: The methodology description lacks clarity, making it challenging to discern the exact process of literature review and selection criteria.
9. Abstract Redundancy: The abstract appears slightly redundant, echoing information found in other sections rather than providing unique insights.
10. Limited Critique: The paper falls short in providing a critical analysis of the reviewed literature, missing opportunities to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of existing works.
11. Formatting Inconsistencies: There are inconsistencies in formatting, such as inconsistent font styles or spacing, which may affect the overall presentation.