Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number KNOSYS-D-10-00157R1

Prediction of ozone concentration using a novel hybrid model in semi-arid areas of China

Revision Number 1
Akira Imada (Reviewer 3)

[Back]   [Edit Review]   [Print]   [Submit Review To Journal Office]

Recommendation: Major Revision   **Overall Manuscript Rating (1-100):** 20

Reviewer Blind Comments to Author:
First of all, we have to apologize that reviewer has to be changed for some reason. Sorry to say but, as such, most of what the 2nd reviewer is now writing should have been already pointed out in the first review. What was pointed out as for BP neural network in the previous review is now OK. It was corrected. But new reviewer found that the paper is still far from very good for publication.

In a scientific article, it is one of the essential rules that author should clearly distinguish what are author's claims from other's already published claims. As shown in the attached memo, this paper definitely failed this principle. In addition, the methods are described quite precisely this time, but there is still a big gap between the described methods and how the authors applied them to their own problem is beyond reviewer's imagination.

In conclusion, the topic could be a good one if the author further elaborate the paper in the future, but at this stage, the paper is not mature at all. Let me take an example, to be more specific, some explanation is too basic to be in a scientific paper. For example "The mean absolute error (MAE) is the average absolute value of these residual values and the root mean square error (RMSE) is the square root of all squared residuals." This is more like an explanation in a textbook. Whilst others need to be explained more specifically. An example is, "A careful and systematic approach asks whether..." What exactly is this approach?

As for expressions in English, Some parts are quite good while others are terrible. Sometimes, redundant, sometimes unclear, sometimes English is incorrect. Etc. Even lots of typos and careless mistakes are ubiquitous. So impression is, this is like an authors' first draft before proofreading. The authors should take a long time to carefully proofread their paper, or ask others, hopefully native speaker of English, to proofread so that reviewers can avoid spending unnecessary time.

I'll attach my memo as for expression and as for typos. But please notice that those are just a memo taken by reviewer while reading the paper. So not exhaustive at all.

Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor:
For each question, please use the following scale to answer (place an x in the space provided):

"To what extent does the article meet this criterion?"

0   Fails by a large amount

The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.

4

The information presented was new.

3

The conclusions were supported by the data.

1

Is there a financial or other conflict of interest between your work and that of the authors?

YES ___ NO x

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article:

In conclusion, the topic could be a good one if the author further elaborate the paper in the future, but at this stage, the paper is not mature at all.

Review Attachment(s):

Action	Description	File Name	Size	Modified Date
Download	Exopressions-and-typos	expression.txt	7.4 KB	Sep 19, 2010

[Back]   [Edit Review]   [Print]   [Submit Review To Journal Office]