

Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2021-7-RC2>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## Comment on dwes-2021-7

Martijn Bakker (Referee)

---

Referee comment on "Implementing and evaluating various machine learning models for pipe burst prediction" by Ahmad Ravanbakhsh et al., Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/dwes-2021-7-RC2>, 2021

---

Review: Implementing and evaluating various machine learning models for pipe burst prediction

L7 "accurate" should be "accurately"

L25 "this" should be "these"

L52. Is PBR determined of each individual pipe? Of subsets of pipes? Please explain. If it per pipe, then I would expect lots of 0 results (0 bursts / x length). How did you process that?

L53. What is random sampling?

L240. What means inverse relation with length? Because  $1/\text{length}$  is also in the PBR formula

L251. "compare" must be "compares"

L270. I miss the discussion. Why is RCNNSVR that much better than all other methods. What unique features make this method outperform all other methods by far. Are the other methods that much simpler? And did you put equal effort in all methods in parameter tuning? Or was your goal to show that RCNNSVR is a preferred method?