

Interactive comment on “Dynamic versus static neural network model for rainfall forecasting at Klang River Basin, Malaysia” by A. El-Shafie et al.

D. Solomatine (Editor)

d.solomatine@unesco-ihe.org

Received and published: 23 September 2011

The reviewers have provided some suggestions on how to improve the paper. I would like to add more to this:

1. Logic of introducing any (new) approach/method is this: first, show the deficiencies of an existing method; second, introduce the new one; third, compare the new one to the old one and demonstrate the advantages. The suggested ANN model for weekly (monthly) RF forecast is purely autoregressive, so a comparison to a traditional autoregressive model is required. How does it compare to other traditional RF forecasting models? I think it is really necessary to provide such comparison.

2. It is advisable to test yet another model structure with the input data from the last year: typically a certain month/week is similar to what was observed in the same week/month in the past. There is enough data to do it. This will move the model from the class of autoregressive models and may improve the results.

3. It is recommended to explain what will be the use of the suggested ANN-based predictor.

4. Use of various types ANN in various forecasting problems is not new. It is necessary to demonstrate the novelty of the suggested method. What does this work bring to science and how will it improve water management?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 6489, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper