



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_44836
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Analysis of Bagging Feed-Forward Neural Network for Forecasting Building Energy Demand
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Abstract. The author describes the problem and the way the research will be conducted. Data collection was discussed. Energy crises is an important area from research. Introduction. This part contains a brief introduction about the said area supported by the literature. Methodology is given in detail. Data collection is explained. Results and discussion. This portion is explained with the help of figures. Conclusion. AI is used in this research to forecast the building energy demand. References: Given in the text and in the last.	Thank you for your suggestions, we have proceeded as follows. Abstract The first three lines of the summary were modified, which briefly describe the problem and purpose of the work. The methodology is presented in section (2). The text of lines 109 to 114 was added in section 2.1. It's referring the method used to obtain the sample of Fig. (2), also agreeing with the other reviewers. The results and the discussion are presented in Section (3). Some adjustments were made to improve this section and they are presented below, also agreeing with the other reviewers. Lines 170 - 174 (Section 2.2.2) were restructured to reference Fig. (3) and explain better the Eq. (2). The text of lines 182-187, 191-197 (Section 2.2.3) was restructured to explain Eq. (3). The text of lines 206-2017 (Section 2.2.3) was added to explain the development of the forecasting methodology for the example in Fig. (4). The conclusions are presented in section (4). The text of lines 433-436 were restructured with an emphasis on AI methods.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	The authors state that there are not ethical issues in this manuscript.