

IEEE POWERENG15 Manuscript Submission System

Comments from Reviewers Regarding Your Manuscript

LD-000477

Manuscript Information

[View the submitted manuscript](#)

Contact Person

Name (first, last): **Mr. Linas Gelažanskas**
 Affiliation: **Lancaster University, United Kingdom**
 E-mail: gelazanskas@gmail.com
 Address: **Mr. Linas Gelažanskas**
Research Students, Engineering Department
Lancaster University, Bailrigg
LA1 4YU
United Kingdom
 Telephone: **+37068210215**
 Facsimile:

Manuscript

Title: **Forecasting Hot Water Consumption in Dwellings Using Artificial Neural Networks**
 Authors: **Linas Gelažanskas, Kelum Gamage**
 Technical Track: **TT Smartgrid Technologies & Applications**
 Main Keywords: **CC-44. Neural Nonlinear Systems PE-33. Interfacing and control of Energy Storage Technology CC-95. New Control Applic**

Author Database

1st author: **Mr. Linas Gelažanskas, Lancaster University, United Kingdom <gelazanskas@gmail.com>**
 2nd author: **Dr. Kelum Gamage, Lancaster University, United Kingdom <k.gamage@lancaster.ac.uk>**

Technical Details

Transaction Number: **LD-000477**
 Data Type: **pdf**
 Date: **1418741830**
 Origin: **78-60-80-144.static.zebra.lt/78.60.80.144**
 Status: **OK - submission completed**

Feedback from the Reviewers

- **C. Clarity of presentation:**
 - English grammar and spelling are proper ----- [4 - I strongly agree]
 - Mathematical symbols and equations are easy to understand ----- [4 - I strongly agree]
 - Figures and tables are well constructed and informative ----- [3 - I agree]
 - The paper is well organized ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Considering the issues above, the paper is readable ----- [3 - I agree]

- T. Technical innovation and relevance**
 - The authors cite other relevant publications ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Authors describe relevance of work to the research field ----- [3 - I agree]
 - The authors apply sound technical approaches ----- [3 - I agree]
 - New ideas are convincingly and logically described ----- [2 - I am neutral]
 - Results are convincing ----- [2 - I am neutral]
 - Considering the issues above, this work should be presented ----- [3 - I agree]

Comments:
 Straightforward approach on the modeling of the hot water demand. The dataset used for model is reported to be gathered from 112 households within one year which seems adequate.

Fig. 6 describes the average consumption of a household in liters/min. What is the water temperature assumed for the average consumption?

It seems quite clear that the weekdays and weekends water consumption timely profile would differ. Here the ANN models seem to use the general weekly model. It would be a valuable

to add comment and comparison, is the weekly prediction approach better than the weekday and weekend modeling as separate trends?

In Fig. 9 "average hourly consumption profile" is specified as input value. How does it differ from the volumetric estimations that are given in the output?

- C. Clarity of presentation:
 - English grammar and spelling are proper ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Mathematical symbols and equations are easy to understand ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Figures and tables are well constructed and informative ----- [3 - I agree]
 - The paper is well organized ----- [2 - I am neutral]
 - Considering the issues above, the paper is readable ----- [3 - I agree]

- T. Technical innovation and relevance
 - The authors cite other relevant publications ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Authors describe relevance of work to the research field ----- [3 - I agree]
 - The authors apply sound technical approaches ----- [3 - I agree]
 - New ideas are convincingly and logically described ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Results are convincing ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Considering the issues above, this work should be presented ----- [3 - I agree]

Comments:
paper with good scientific background. missing conclusion or research summary.

- C. Clarity of presentation:
 - English grammar and spelling are proper ----- [4 - I strongly agree]
 - Mathematical symbols and equations are easy to understand ----- [4 - I strongly agree]
 - Figures and tables are well constructed and informative ----- [3 - I agree]
 - The paper is well organized ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Considering the issues above, the paper is readable ----- [3 - I agree]

- T. Technical innovation and relevance
 - The authors cite other relevant publications ----- [4 - I strongly agree]
 - Authors describe relevance of work to the research field ----- [4 - I strongly agree]
 - The authors apply sound technical approaches ----- [3 - I agree]
 - New ideas are convincingly and logically described ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Results are convincing ----- [3 - I agree]
 - Considering the issues above, this work should be presented ----- [4 - I strongly agree]

Comments:
no comments

Accepted or Rejected?

- The manuscript is on the list of accepted manuscripts.
- The manuscript is not on the list of rejected manuscripts.
- The manuscript is not on the list of withdrawn manuscripts.
- The manuscript is not on the list of registered manuscripts.

Done Viewing

