

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_92662
Title of the Manuscript:	PAN EVAPORATION ESTIMATION USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK (ANN) AND FUZZY LOGIC MODELS FOR RAICHUR REGION, KARNATAKA – A CASE STUDY
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The abstract in the second paragraph contains an extra punctuation mark (.....hours and wind speed. for the period of 30 years.....)</p> <p>References to the ninth source of literature were not found in the text</p> <p>The authors performed a proper statistical analysis</p> <p>In the article section: 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, the authors provide only the obtained data and there are no links to the results of other authors</p> <p>The article should end with a separate section: Conclusion in which the results obtained should be summarized</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>As a result of the study, the authors compared the models in order to choose the most suitable model for predicting pan evaporation.</p> <p>The study developed artificial neural network (ANN) models and fuzzy logic models to predict frying pan evaporation using various parameters. The authors of the article did a great job with the analysis of the 30-year period</p> <p>The materials and methods contain calculation formulas that can be used when repeating the experiment</p>	
Optional/General comments	The results are well illustrated	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maryna Bilan
Department, University & Country	Dnipro State Agrarian and Economic University, Ukraine