



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_34637
Title of the Manuscript:	Temperature extremes over selected stations:Ikeja, Osogbo and Maiduguri
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	<p>There are many, many major problems with this manuscript. The authors need to have the correct spelling of the climate station Osogo vs Oshogbo, both are used frequently.</p> <p>The discussions do not address the major issue of the paper, that is, the results of the trends are not the same for all three stations. This is critical as far as saying that all of the extreme temperature trends are a function of global warming.</p> <p>More info on the stations are needed, such as elevation, physical setting as in are they all metropolitan. The station in Lagos might be as the authors refer to the urban heat island, although they do not use that terminology.</p> <p>The title needs to be change to reflect trend in temperature extremes and note they are in Nigeria.</p> <p>Trends need to be better defined including the correlation coefficients and variance for the best-fit lines. These are lacking so it is unclear how well the trend is defined. In fact, in some cases there seems to be an outlier that could easily dictate the trends in the best-fit lines.</p> <p>The plots need to be edited especially the second set of figure with the histograms as the font is too small and there are condensed numbers on the axis, meaning there was no editing by the authors.</p> <p>Why are the 10 and 90th percentiles used for the extremes. No problem with that, but if others have used those same values then that would provide support in this paper for using those values.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>I am curious why the authors used the 1971-2000 normals their trends as opposed to 1980-2010. Are those data not available for these stations? If so, authors need to state that.</p> <p>The authors use the term significantly increase on page 5 for the trend, but this implies that there is a certain level of significance in their trend line (such as 90% level of confidence). However, no such significance is presented.</p> <p>I suggest the authors get some help in the writing as I am assuming that English is their second language. There are cases where sentences are very long and in some cases disagreement in noun and verbs.</p> <p>Designations for the individual results such as TX10P are confusing. However, if they are part of the program used, they should at least appear on the figures to help the reader go from text to figures much more easily.</p> <p>In the conclusion they refer to radioactive heating in their next to last sentence. I assume they mean radiative, as it definitely is not radioactive heating.</p> <p>One of references has et al. for the authors, while the others list all authors-this needs to be consistent as per the journal format.</p> <p>There are no authors listed for the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	There are some editing comments that would be corrected with some assistance in the writing, as well as typos that need to be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	The authors do not address the potential reasons for the inconsistency in the temperature trends, as well as lacking any explanation for the trends in general in the Osogbo or Oshogbo and the Maiduguri stations. As such, the paper should not be published unless the lack of the discussion of the results is addressed among the other comments noted above.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Gregory A. Zielnski</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Maine, USA</i>