



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_41320
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF TROPOSPHERIC VARIATION OF RADIO REFRACTIVITY AND FIELD STRENGTH VARIABILITY OVER SOME SELECTED STATIONS IN NORTHERN NIGERIA
Type of the 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The full meaning of ERA should be given at first appearance (See Abstract)</li> <li>2. Maximum or minimum values of results obtained for the refractivity, temperature and field strength at certain periods needs to be reported in the abstract.</li> <li>3. Authors were not consistent with referencing style. There are different styles used in their text.</li> <li>4. The first figure in methodology is not labelled. All figures must be labelled.</li> <li>5. In table 2, there are results for the refractivity and temperature for Bida, however, that is not reflected in Figure 1a and b. Why?</li> <li>-6. Authors should carefully explain the difference in refractivity and temperature for the Sahel and Sudan savannah. What is causing the differences?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. European Re-Analysed data</li> <li>2. Done</li> <li>3. Checked and corrected</li> <li>4. Ok. Correction made</li> <li>5. it was from the size of the graph. It is now corrected.</li> <li>6. Just like in the guinea savannah, the refractivity is a function of temperature. From the correlation of temperature and refractivity as clearly shown in Fig. 6(c) it revealed a partially strong negative correlation. This suggest that an increasing temperature result to a decreasing refractivity. This is true in all the three regions of study.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The research is undertaken with professionalism. However, major issues raised should be addressed.	