

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111555
Title of the Manuscript:	Machine Learning Models for Prediction of Meteorological Variables for Weather Forecasting
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 1.7

## 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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></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><b>Yes the manuscript is of importance in the scientific community as it deals with climate and weather changes which are global threat.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes based on the methodology applied and the result gotten. Though this is a research and it can be improved in further research</b></p> <p><b>The author(s) are advised to add more recent references between 10-15</b></p>	<p>It has been corrected</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p><b>The authors should have used a more recent dataset and probably use a 2-3 year data range in order to ascertain predictability of the models as more data will give more reliable prediction. Moreover is the source of the data the only one in the country. There is also a possibility that the sensors employed are not sensitive enough or out-dated or not upgraded. The height of the probes is also of concern. Why the choice of 2, 4,6m. These observations should be addressed in order to reduce doubts and to increase the integrity of the dataset</b></p>	<p>Why did this reviewer conclude that the sensors used in this study are out-dated or not upgraded, without providing any concrete evidence from the manuscript? This is clearly unprofessional.</p> <p>The height of the sensors are due to obstructions. All meteorological sensors cannot be mounted at the same height in order not to obscure each other. This same dataset have been used in other studies and it was also referenced in this manuscript.</p> <p>Also, the authors mentioned that the dataset was gotten from the meteorological station of a named accredited university, a university that is one of the best in the country.</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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	