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 article has great potential, but its structure is weak and lacking in care. To improve its structure, it needs changes such as: more quotes from the literature, presenting the methodology in a concise way, discussing the results, especially, confronting the latest literature. I also recommend using the following topics: Introduction, Study Area, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions. Be careful not to put elements of methodology into results and separate the topic results with the topic discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments	bstract: rethink about the keywords, do not use or expressions already contained in the title. Suggestions: precision irrigation, water preservation The introduction is well-paced and well-motivated. However, improvements are needed. Initially, it needs the addition of literature references especially between lines 29 and 57. I also recommend adding a paragraph that shows the importance of conscious irrigation and the question of the importance of water saving. Line 109: 119 - needs uniformity of section numbering. Line 120- "MATERIAL AND METHOD USED" change to: "Materials and Methods" The main problem with the methodology is the lack of detail about its training samples, such as: total number of samples, which were the parameters used to calibrate and validate, which validation metrics were	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	used (Pearson correlation, RPD, RMSE); As well as the presentation of these results in the results section and their discussion and comparison with the literature. About ANN Lack of justification for the choice of network architecture Why was 2 hidden layers chosen? I do not think it is necessary to explain the functioning of this ANN, it is an already consecrated network. This section should focus on the justification of its model and architecture choices, as well as important information such as: total training samples, validation samples, learning rate, activation function. On figure 7, modify the image so that the reader identifies among the input neurons which attributes were used (soil moisture, meteorological data, etc.). In results contains elements of methodology that have to be reviewed and this lack of discussion.	
Optional/General comments	Abstract: rethink about the keywords, do not use or expressions already contained in the title. Suggestions: precision irrigation, water preservation Line 129 - Place the equivalent of the cost value in dollars, euros or pounds in brackets.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Odílio Coimbra da Rocha Neto***
Department, University & Country	***Departamento de Engenharia Agrícola, Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC), Brazil***