



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_34002
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THREE GEOSTATISTICAL INTERPOLATION METHODS FOR THE ESTIMATION OF AVERAGE DAILY RAINFALL
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-Please restructure the abstract. Some sentences are not conveying the meaning you intended -I seem not to follow what you are trying to present in this sentence: "Point rainfall data from nine (9) gauging points over the Upper Dep River Basin, North Central Nigeria with a total catchment area of 6076km² were collected and the moving average method, ordinary kriging technique and nearest point or Thiessen method were used for the interpolation" -I suggest you remove the "LITERATURE REVIEW" heading, as you have already discussed literature under the INTRODUCTION. Check to confirm. The "Theory of Geostatistical Analysis", heading is in order, but no need to allocate too much details to it -It will help this research if the author(s) is/are able to discuss literature on various techniques used for previous studies AT THE STUDY AREA, and make strong conclusion on which one is best. It can also form part of the recommendations for future application -summarize the peculiarities of each of the three methods you used in the abstract and conclusion section	The comments of the reviewer are noted and some corrections have been made as highlighted in yellow The comments of the reviewer are noted and some corrections have been made as highlighted in yellow No study of this kind has been done in the study area as mentioned in the introduction The peculiarities of the three methods used have already been discussed in 'Results and Discussions'
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-"for days in the same month", under your abstract, how many days?? -More references could help improve the study -I noticed few topographical errors in the text	The comments of the reviewer are noted and some corrections have been made as highlighted in yellow
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		