Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_40647**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparison between meteorological data from conventional and automatic weather stations in the state of Espírito Santo, Brazil**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstracts** It is important for the Author to be careful with the wording. For example in the Abstract the Author indicates that Conventional Weather Stations have been replaced by Automatic Weather Stations, however, this may be confusing and not entirely correct, since in some cases, are installed to complimenting and enhance observations in areas were there are no or few observation. The Focus is not replacement but enhancement of the Observation using Automation. **Not very clear from the Abstract of the objectives of the comparisons. This needs to come out clearly.** **Introduction:** There are a series of grammatical errors and lack of logical flow of information and the Author Indicated the Objective of the study was to conduct a comparative assessment of the meteorological Data from Conventional and Automatic Weather Stations. It is therefore important to Know if the assessment was done on Parallel Observation between Convectional and Automatic Weather Stations **and what the Author wanted to achieve by doing the comparisons? Was he trying to find out which among the two is more accurate?, which is more reliable?. It is important for the Author to clearly articulate the objectives of the Study. The Objective Need to be SMART.** **Methodology** **The Author need to enhance clarity in the methodology and tile it with the study objectives.** **The Table Captions (Table 4, line 102) "Tests used to compare the estimates of the Meteorological Valuable" is not clear. What is meant by the estimates? Is it the Observation ?** **Ensure consistent in the write up. For-example in Table 2: Maximum Temperature in one case is abbreviated as MaxT and in another Case Maxt (Line 84).** **The Author used the terminology to Standardize the Dates, How were the dates standardized?** **In Table 4, Line 104 and 105, the Author make reference to 'e' to represent meteorological variables and 'nd' a number of data pairs, however, e and nd does not appear in any of the formula** **Results** **The results presented are good but they need to be aligned to well defined objectives.** **The Table Captions (Table 4) "Tests used to compare the estimates of the Meteorological Valuable" is not clear. What is meant by the estimates? Is it the Observation?** **The results indicated there is a good agreement between CWS and AWS for Maximum and Minimum temperature and and very big discrepancies for Precipitation. However, the Author did not provide the reason for such observation**	

	Conclusion **The conclusion should be aligned to and emanate from well and clearly formulated objectives of the study. The Author need to do more work to further improve the conclusion and the quality of the Paper.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The comparative analysis of the performance of the CWS and AWS is an important and necessary activity for effective climate observation and Monitoring. Under the World Meteorological Organization guideline for meteorological Observation and Monitoring, there are climate Monitoring Principles which includes the requirements to conduct parallel Observation between the two systems. Therefore this study is important and is inline with WMO guidelines on Climate Observation and Monitoring (WMO/TD No. 1185). It is important for the Author to clear grammatical errors and enhance readability of the document. The Author to provide more discussion on the Results to enhance the quality of the Paper	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Ladislaus B. Chang'a***
Department, University & Country	***Tanzania Meteorological Agency*** ***Director of Research and Applied Meteorology, Part-Time Lecturer University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania***