

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_83948
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of Chemical Production Based on Neural Network
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.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/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 article describes basics of ANN algorithms, and its history. It further introduces multilayer perceptron, back propagation, and recurrent neural networks.</p> <p>3 case studies namely, electro dialysis desalination, particle size by cyclone separator, and risk prediction of hazardous chemical production are studied.</p> <p>Section 4.2.2 indicates the use of L-M algorithm, quasi Newton algorithm, Bayesian regularization for comparison of prediction performance. It needs to be elaborated, as the subsequent paragraphs does not mention the results specific to this.</p> <p>In all 3 case studies, backpropagation method is used, it would be nice to compare the different algorithms of ANN</p> <p>Section 4.3.2. is not fitting well with the general flow of the document. As it explains the ANN design procedure in one of the case studies. Either it should be moved to a better suiting part of the manuscript or it should be made more relevant for the case study.</p> <p>The results and conclusions section should be made more objective. Section 5 is written in a very general tone. For example, the last sentence states "ANN has broad development prospects", which is too general for a research paper.</p> <p>The results from hazardous chemical case study does not have results in the form of figures, charts, plots, or tables. Please provide any and explain them.</p> <p>All 3 case studies should be compared side by side in results section to better understand the choice of parameters and their influence</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ananth S. Iyengar
Department, University & Country	Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences, India