SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJAST_30934**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Hourly Real-Time Rainfall Estimation for Improved Smart Irrigation System Using Nearby Automated Weather Station**
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The document "Hourly Real-Time Rainfall Estimation for Improved Smart Irrigation System Using Nearby Automated Weather Station deals with the development of a low cost irrigation system implemented to take decisions. This paper presents an interesting topic, not only scientific but also social integrating system. The document is well presented, nevertheless some aspects must be considered: Abstract. It is well stated Introduction. Two of the main problems in this reviewer opinion, related to meteorological data involved are the next: Uncertainty in the prediction, and the need to have many years of measurement in order to be able to take decisions about mid-term aspects. Authors should explain in introduction how to manage with these problems. Material and methods. In this reviewer opinion, more information about the calibration process of the obtained data should be provided, in order to validate the decisions taken with such data. Any comparison with other stations? Errors are commented, but no figures are provided about these final errors in the proposed analysis Case study. It is well defined, but a more detailed	Majority of rainfall happens in June-Oct, due to this I had very little sample but they are working fine to demonstrate the desired idea. **Precipitation is spatiotemporal variable therefore with respect to time and space only few sample are required to train the neural network. These sample give estimation only for that particular time and space, the same sample can't be used for different estimate in different time and space. More details of estimation can be obtain in my upcoming paper titled "Reconstructing Missing Hourly Real-time Precipitation Data using Novel Intermittent Sliding Window Period Algorithm for Automatic Weather Station data of Indian Meteorological Data." Selected for Springer Journal "**Journal of Meteorological Research". **Net irrigation equation is added**

SDI Review Form 1.6

	information about the neural data finally implemented could be interesting, and some more explanation about the error estimation provided could inform the reader about the validation of the proposed methodology. Some conclusions are missing in this paper. Why is important this methodology? Which is the novelty in front of others?, applicability, strong and wake points and so on. In this reviewer opinion all this information must be clearly stated in the conclusions. In my copy of the document this epigraph is named as “1. Conclusion”… this must be an error.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		