www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_28446
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling and Estimating Photosynthetically Active Radiation from Measured Global Solar Radiation at Calabar, Nigeria.
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)

www.sciencedomain.org



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	Reviewer's Report Article title: Modelling and Estimating Photosynthetically Active Radiation from Measured Global Solar Radiation at Calabar, Nigeria.	
	The study looks good in terms of providing the necessary dataset for the region, where direct PAR measurements almost do not exist.	
	Line 13: Please the sentence measured global is not complete, kindly check again. Line 68: The symbol of the minutes in the latitudes and lengitude figures is not 4.1. I give sit is an expectage by	
	longitude figures is not 1'. I guess it is an apostrophe. Line 72: Please provide the unit of the global solar radiation data obtained using Gunn-Bellani radiation integrators.	
	Line 80: Please use where instead of Where, if you were describing the parameters in Equation 2. Line 83: Same comment as line 80 above	

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Line 297: Please use Table 5 instead of table 5

Line 298: Use recorded instead of record

Line 307: Please use Figure 1 instead of figure 1

Methodology

Please did you develop the coefficients in the model equations (Equations 10 - 24), yourself or they were based on the literature values. If they are site specific values, then it is difficult to accept the following statement in your conclusion:

'Therefore, the proposed models could be used to estimate PAR at Calabar and other locations with similar climatological conditions across the globe'

Results and discussion

Please kindly provide spaces between your figures and their units e.g 5.36 MJm⁻²day⁻¹and not 5.36MJm⁻²day⁻¹.

Model Performance

Please is it possible to move section 3.1 up, since this could be part of the methodology.

Conclusions

The sentences in lines 299 and 309 look contradictory, can you please explain further why the models cannot be used to estimate PAR at Calabar for March – December as you have stated in the second sentence

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

	in line 309.	
	Reference	
	Please the initials in your references do not have	
	spaces between them. Is it the requirement of the	
	journal? (E.g. use J. N., instead of J.N.,)	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Quansah
Department, University & Country	Meteorology and Climate Science Unit, Department of Physics, Kwame Nkrumah University of
	Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (07-06-2013)