



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_21622
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of unsaturated hydraulic conductivity of agricultural soils using artificial neural network and c#
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	By considering the number of selected input parameters for ANN, 8 total data is too low to have an accurate model. Considering 3 data used for test of the model, only 5 has been left for training purpose. I recommend to run more tests. It can also be considered to reduce the number of selected effective parameters. Based on the data shown in Table 6, you can decide which parameters had less effect on hydraulic conductivity and may possibly not be included for next analysis.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The corresponding data of Figure 2 is not provided in the paper. I recommend removing this figure since it is not providing any information. • The intervals of the reading of water level during the mini-disc infiltrometer test should be specified and the reason for selecting them needs to be explained. • Order of the equation's numbers should be corrected. Equations 1 and 2 are misplaced. Also equation 12 is missing. • Please provide more explanation and a reference for equation 13. • Not all of the data provided in table 2 is clear. • In page 6, it says 9 data were gathered which should be corrected to 8 data.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The grammar of the paper needs to be improved. • Quality of some of the figures need to be improved.	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Milad Fatehnia</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Civil and Environmental Engineering department, Florida State University, USA</i>