Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-87-RC1, 2020 © Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



GMDD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Explainable AI for Knowledge Acquisition in Hydrochemical Time Series V1.0.0" by Michael C. Thrun et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 June 2020

General Comments:

Overall, I would say that this paper has an interesting concept but is hard to interpret the main contributions and is overall hard to read. For example, in Section 2 there needs to be more information about Figure 1 in this section (Material and Methods), the authors go straight into the steps (1-6) without a high-overview first. I was just confused of the paper structure without reading Fig. 1 first, which is hard to interpret without a better explanation. There are many arrows and connections that are not explained well, because of this, I don't really have a good understanding the main concepts and think the authors need to make things clearer and easier to interpret. I just would like to have a better understanding of how decision trees can be used for DBS and other methods (e.g. k-means) and believe if the authors can make this clearer then it would

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



improve the overall paper. For example, can you add a Figure/Algorithm that explains Step 3 to Steps 5/6 better?

Other Comments:

This lacks recent explainable frameworks for clustering, for example the paper "An Explainable Artificial Intelligence Model for Clustering Numerical Databases" is very similar and does a nice job at comparing other clustering approaches (k-means) too.

I also think the authors should either explain better why this is considered an AI system. I don't really understand this until Section 2.3 (cluster analysis) where they mention that DBS uses a mix of game-theory and neural networks. This information should made more clear in the Introduction.

Section 2.1: Where are this values collected at (Germany?)? There should be a figure of the location and points on a map, this would help with the interpretation of the topographic results. Do you need to state the variables that were removed from the analysis since they have high-overlap of similarity? Shouldn't the AI system do this for you?

Section 2.2: Why is a distance metric important for the algorithm, this isn't explained well. For example, I think you need to explain the DBS system (Section 3) before this section stating why this important for the algorithm.

Figure 1: This needs to be made clearer. This is hard to interpret and not sure what's going on.

Figure 2: This needs a legend.

Figure 4: How many clusters are here? There needs to be a legend.

Figure 5: This is hard to interpret. Where are the four clusters? Can you add these to the heat map?

Figure 6: Do you need this? Seems not really relevant to the paper or combine this

GMDD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



with Figure 4.

Figures 8/9: Seem like these can be merged (Fig 8 a/b).

Figure 10: Is this important? Seems like this can be excluded.

Labeling of the Figures are off, Figure 6 is mentioned in the Discussion after Figure 9.

Discussion: Is it possible to include other methods (k-means, DBSCAN) in this framework?

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-87, 2020.

GMDD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

