

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_97873</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>TREND ANALYSIS AND PREDICTION OF RAINFALL USING DEEP LEARNING MODELS IN THREE SUB-DIVISIONS OF KARNATAKA</b>
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is a machine learning application with real and regionally important data, and may be a reference for further investigations in this application domain.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No. The Discussion chapter does not present an actual discussion. It is expected that the results achieved will be compared with the state of the art, and compared with the conventional methodologies that local professionals use, all with due citations and references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>* Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4 are not referenced. Were they not based on works to be cited? The tables also lack fonts.</p> <p>* The results chapter presents methodologies not presented in the previous chapter. The methodology chapter focused only on machine learning, but the results chapter presents NIK, SIK, statistical methods and others. This is because there is no focus on the proposed objective. I suggest rewriting the methodology chapter so that they are informed how each specific objective will be achieved, and then explaining the methodological tools for this, with the results chapter presenting the results of this methodological application. With this it will be observed that the description of the data is not part of the results, as it is, as they were not produced by the authors. The results chapter should present only the result of the methodological application made by the authors, with the methodological framework that was not made by the authors in the previous chapter.</p> <p>* The evaluation indicator is limited to the RMSE. However, only this indicator is limited. I suggest including and analysing the comparison of RMSE with MAE, and thus, according to their differences, observe: uniform errors when <math>RMSE = MAE</math>, small variances with small difference between with <math>MAE &lt; RMSE</math>, or the presence of outliers with much higher RMSE what mom. Among other issues, because in a first observation, the RMSE seem quite high, and alone it is not possible to guarantee the quality of the results presented.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Italo Flexa Di Paolo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pará State University, Brazil</b>