



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	Figs are not clear.	Thank you for your suggestions, we have proceeded as follows. In Fig. (1) (Section 2) a description was added in the subtitle of the same Fig. The title of Fig. (2) was modified, additionally, a text was added in lines 109 - 114 (section 2.1) complementing information of said figure. The text was added in lines 204 - 207 (section 2.2.3) in order to explain how Fig. (4) was obtained. The charts in Fig. (5) were identified as (a) and (b) and additional information was added in lines 256 and 257 (section 2.4). The charts in Fig. (6) were identified as (a), (b), (c) and (d) and additional information was added on lines 284 and 285 (section 2.5). Additional information was added for Fig. (7) in lines 316 - 319 (Section 2.6). The title was modified of Fig. (8) presented in Section (3). The charts were identified as (a) and (b) in Fig. (9) and additionally a text was added in lines 354-357 (Section 3.1). The charts were identified as (a) and (b) in Fig. (10) and additionally a text was added in lines 371-374 (Section 3.2). The charts were identified as (a) and (b) in Fig. (11) and additionally a text was added in lines 395-398 (Section 3.3).
Optional/General comments		

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