The authors introduce their R package "spsur" which provides a range of spatial seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) methods. The topic would be of interest for JSS but both manuscript and software are not of sufficient quality to be considered for full review. Some more details are discussed below.

--- Software ---

- The user interface of spsur has quite a few problems: It does not support

all standard arguments, uses non-standard naming conventions, and provides only a summary() method but no further S3 methods. Other functions in the package have similar problems.

- For formula interfaces argument name "formula" rather than "Form" would

be standard. Also, "na.action" should be added, possibly also "subset".

Esto no creo que sea problema incluirlo en una nueva versión del paquete

- Furthermore, mimicking spdep's interface would probably help users to

adopt spsur, e.g., support a "listw" argument etc.

No se cual es la ventaja de usar W en formato listw frente a matrices sparse.

- Note also that the model-fitting infrastructure in spdep is currently being moved to: [https://github.com/r-spatial/spatialreg](https://mail.em.ucla.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=QLWxYLBWB77HSWXk-_D-MmxozCHqVUcXzRpK1SJm7X32JTAdsrfWCA..&URL=https%3a%2f%2fgithub.com%2fr-spatial%2fspatialreg). It would seem to make sense to follow that new implementation directly.

No creo que sea un monopolio. La ventaja de un software libre es que el usuario puede elegir entre distintos paquetes con funcionalidades similares.

Hasta donde se spdep solo se encarga de crosssections no de paneles

- Why do you introduce your own impacts() function rather than supplying a method to the generic in spdep, now spatialreg. This seems clumsy compared to splm and sphet, which use the sampling framework in spdep now spatialreg. sphet uses spdep/spatialreg::intImpacts().

Esto no lo entiendo bien

- The use of Matrix::determinant()$modulus on a dense matrix: if (class(W)

!= "matrix") W <- as.matrix(W); W <- Matrix::Matrix(W) seems distinctly inferior to the use of the methods used in spdep/spatialreg and used by splm (using sparse matrices except for small/moderate n). See:

@Article{,

   title = {Computing the {J}acobian in {G}aussian Spatial Autoregressive

     Models: An Illustrated Comparison of Available Methods},

   author = {Roger Bivand and Jan Hauke and Tomasz Kossowski},

   journal = {Geographical Analysis},

   year = {2013},

   volume = {45},

   number = {2},

   pages = {150--179},

   doi = {10.1111/gean.12008},

}

This approach initializes an environment called through do\_ldet() every

time the log determinant is needed for new values of \rho in log(det(I -

\rho W)) providing a wide choice of methods avoiding the time cost.

Desde mi punto de vista es lo mas interesante del report.

Esto podemos mirarlo a ver si podemos optimizar el cálculo de ese determinante.

Usar por ejemplo la aprox de Ord (75?) no sería gran problema a priori

- Note also that there is an unreleased package doing a good deal of the

work necessary for spatial SUR estimation is on R-Forge:

[https://R-Forge.R-project.org/projects/spse/](https://mail.em.ucla.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=D3N_K1fbnIrmy01l71GeNGOwVl8AA0K6dO_-Bh495p72JTAdsrfWCA..&URL=https%3a%2f%2fR-Forge.R-project.org%2fprojects%2fspse%2f) which uses the do\_ldet()

framework, but does not yet have impact methods in place. It is by the

co-authors of spdep/spatialreg, sphet, and splm. Given that all authors

have been open to various collaborations in the past, **we strongly**

**encourage you to get in touch with them to see whether forces can be joined.**

¿Nos juntamos?

--- Software details ---

- For the "default" interface (rather than "formula" interface) lower-case

"x" and "y" are more common. Also, this could be separated into a dedicated S3 method.

Vale, se cambia fácil.

- Returned objects must be improved. For example, lrtestspsur() prints

something at the end of the function call, but then returns an unclassed

list. This is very inconvenient and un-R-like. It would be better to return

a classed object and have a print method printing this output.

Vale, se cambia fácil.

- For functions returning test statistics and p-values the standard return

objects would either be "htest" (e.g., as used by t.test()) or "anova"

(e.g., as used by anova() or also lrtest() and waldtest() in package

"lmtest").

Vale, se cambia fácil.

- For model objects like "spsur" all standard methods should be supplied.

Currently, there is only a summary() method. Desired would be print(),

plot(), fitted(), residuals(), predict(), logLik(), vcov(), coef(),

model.matrix(), terms(), etc.

Vale, se cambia más o menos fácil (Román).

--- Manuscript ---

- Currently the manuscript introduces the functions in a very manual-like

style. However, a more realistic example along with motivation, model

setup, and output interpretation is lacking.

Vale, pero el objetivo es presentar el paquete no contar una historia.

- The manuscript only partially follow the instructions from JSS's style

guide (see [https://www.jstatsoft.org/pages/view/style](https://mail.em.ucla.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=FFvv7T5dtU6WWFifO7yZEpXNF0YYNPpDONSLQszgvTv2JTAdsrfWCA..&URL=https%3a%2f%2fwww.jstatsoft.org%2fpages%2fview%2fstyle)).

Pues nos hemos pegado un curre de la ostia para ponerlo en formato. Pensé que eso podría encargarse la revista ya que le cedemos todos los derechos.

- Some parts of the manuscript are somewhat confusing due to language problems. As this can actually distract from the content of the manuscript or lead to misunderstandings, we recommend to consult a native speaker for improving the manuscript.

Pasarlo por revisión

As incorporating all of these issues requires substantial rewriting of the software, we have decided not to consider this submission. However, **making a new submission on this topic to JSS is possible in the future** provided that the software has been substantially improved and the manuscript follows the JSS style guide in detail. Ok