

Interactive comment on “Optimum Coagulant Forecasting with Modeling the Jar Test Experiments Using ANN” by Sadaf Haghiri et al.

S.R Mounce (Referee)

s.r.mounce@sheffield.ac.uk

Received and published: 25 September 2017

General comments–

This paper presents application of MLP ANNs to optimum coagulant forecasting for water treatment. Two models are developed, the principle one being the prediction of optimal dose. R2 of 0.93 was achieved for this model. Four variables were used. A two year historical dataset was utilised (112 data points). A GUI was developed of the deployed model for operators.

This is a useful real world application of neural network technology, however the paper could be significantly improved and clarifications made.

The authors did not discuss the limitations of the data set they used, i.e. only 112 data

C1

point. In sections 2.2 and 2.3 little actual implementation details were provided. Such as parameter settings of the ANN model. They should reference what ANN software they used. Was it MATLAB ANN toolbox or other? What did they use for the SOM they used for splitting the data? Also, training, validation and testing results are not clearly provided.

'The Performed Experimental Researches' is a mishmash of lit review material that has already appeared, domain specific review and case study info. It needs restructuring and repetition removing, see below.

The authors do not mention latest developments in ANNs such as deep learning.

The conclusions need work, see below.

Specific comments and technical corrections–

p1 line 11. Suggest don't start an abstract with 'Nowadays'- 'Currently'?

p1 line 23 Which country?

p1 line 24-25 vague. Include some actual figures on accuracy/ performance

p2 First 2 paragraphs. Lack of references to set the scene

p2. Only deterministic or statistical? Data driven/ machine learning (such as ANNs) is not really a subset of statistical (you describe this as 'advanced statistical'). Different fields. I'd revise this into:

Deterministic Data driven. Subsets: classical statistical. Machine learning.

p2. line 23-26. Talk about data driven?

p3 line 1 'would;d'

p3 first paragraph change 'statistical' to 'artificial intelligence' or 'machine learning'

p3 Line 9 ref?

C2

p3 line 9. Isn't the Hornik ref more appropriate? Use the Maier & Dandy ref for talking about ANNs applied to water resources.

p3 line 17 ref for method.

p3 line 17 Remember you can use your ANN acronym since you defined it.

p3 line 18, 20, next 2 paragraphs. Education?! You mean 'training'

p3 lines 20-30. More commonly referred to as training, validating and testing in ANN usage. And actually, you use this on page 6 anyway

p3 Line 30. '-The Performed Experimental Researches' What is this section? A complete mix of the previous introduction, often repeating (quoting word for word) what we have already read, background on literature review and information about the case study. Very confusing, this needs correcting.

Have a new 'Background section' and finish with a paragraph containing the case study info?

p3 Lines 31-33 Repetition from introduction

p4 Lines 1-17 Repetition from introduction - but with different references!!

p4 Line 18 - p5 line 25 This should now be in 'Background'.

p4 line 27 change 'considerably' to 'consideration of'

p4 line 32 change 'A modeling' to 'Modelling'

p5 lines 11-24. Is this better in a 'case study' section? Perhaps an extra section in 2.

p5 line 16-17 - opaque sentence...

p5 line 24 change 'experiment now' to 'experiments that are now'

p5 Table 1. You should specify the units of measurement

C3

p6 Lines 7 to 12. Do you have high dimensional data here? There are 8 dimensions in table 1

p6 line 21 Specify how many input and output neurons

p6 lines 22-23. Confusing. Should it be 'was the model input'? Also, a full stop is missing. Also, what is the target output exactly?

p6 line 29 Specify how many input and output neurons

p6 line 29 Missing bracket '(produced by trial and error)'

p7 line 2 change 'of the both model' to 'of both models'

p7 line 5 - already introduced

p7 lines 6 to 8. Is R2 0.85 'accuracy'? Change to 'reasonable accuracy'

p7 line 8 change 'properly' to 'relatively'

p8 line 7 change 'accuracy s' to 'reasonable accuracy'

p8 line 6. Why is PH mentioned. Isn't residual aluminium the output?

p9 Figure 2. Make it clear what the variable is i.e. of real/predicted (I assume residual Aluminium)

p9. Table 4. Should provide train/ test results.

p10. Please correct the sentence "After the model has been the recommended dosage of coagulant (in this research Alum is the coagulant material) is achieved which are shown in Figure 5."

p10. Authors should be commended for providing a practical tool. You only need one screenshot though or it can start to look like a manual. I suggest you go with Fig 4 and not Fig 5. Could this be in a discussion & further work section? It is not a result per se.

p11. Add a short discussion section first including further work.

C4

p11. The conclusions are poorly written, not very readable and do not highlight the success of the work or results obtained. Please improve the whole section for further review. One example:

p11 line 15. "there were 112 recorded models used over a two-year period," 112 models? That is is not the case unless I have missed something.

p11 line 16 foward slash

p11 line 17 'outline data' I think you mean 'outlier data'

p11 lines 19 to 20 quantify etc.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2017-24>, 2017.