

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

## Misbah Fida<sup>1</sup>

1 Chang'an University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Comments to the author(s):

The title accurately reflects the paper's subject, emphasizing the use of satellite multispectral imagery-driven vegetation indices for maize yield forecasting. The abstract is well-written and clear, effectively conveying the purpose and methodology of the study. The introduction provides a strong foundation for the study, highlighting the significance of maize cultivation in Bangladesh. The transition to the use of remote sensing technology is well-established, setting the stage for the research. A few suggestions could further enhance the manuscript's quality:

- 1. I observed that the literature cited is dated. It is recommended to include more recent references from the years 2021 to 2023.
- 2. The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors. It is advised to conduct a thorough review, including rectifying issues such as unnecessary capitalization of common nouns like "rice," "wheat," and "potatoes." Additionally, ensure correct spelling, as "publicly" is the accurate term, not "publically."
- 3. Revise the paragraph by condensing its length and dividing it into 2 to 3 smaller paragraphs, same as the introductory first paragraph.
- 4. The figure's boundary lines appear unclear. It is recommended to recreate Figure 2 for improved clarity.
- 5. To enrich the discussion, consider providing additional insight into the significance of the observed NDVI values and their correlation with maize yield. Offer interpretations or possible implications for agricultural management.
- 6. In conclusion section, consider restructuring the paragraph for better flow and clarity. Separating information about Landsat 8 and Sentinel 2A, and discussing their individual performance before the comparison, may enhance readability.
- 7. In conclusion section, the terms "closed to actual yield" might be clarified to "closer to the actual yield" for better grammatical accuracy.