



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_34637
Title of the Manuscript:	Temperature extremes over selected Stations in Nigeria.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Essentially the authors did not address my comments in the original manuscript despite their response that they did. They say that they are only looking at the trends over this time frame, yet they offer a possible reason for Ikeja station, but not the other two. That does not make sense as it seems like they only want to publish results without the discussion. They also did not address comments about their trend lines such as what are the r values for their best fit lines. Why not? There does seem to be quite a lot of variability in the records, thus the confidence of the trend lines is weakened. For example, Fig 2b has slightly decreasing trend, but potentially more significant is that there appears to be a lessening in variance with time. I stated that the authors need to state why they used the 1971-2000 data set as opposed to the more recent normal of 1981-2010. They did not address that concern. If those data are not available then state it, do not let the reader in limbo wondering why the most recent data set was not used. The authors added a figure showing location of stations, but it is hard to read and no explanation what the lines mean in the figure. It is especially noteworthy that they added a new Figure 1, yet did not adjust the rest of the figure numbers. They did not address the problems in the figures as far as small text, bad spacing of axes and so forth as noted in the original review. The number of types is still there where words do not have a space in between them. They still have 410 for one of the temperatures as opposed to 41°. I still found both spellings of Osogbo, one with an h in there, despite sighting that problem in the original review. I noted that they should put in station data like elevation and lat an long but they did not do that. That could easily have been put in Table 1. They added that Ikega represents rain forest but yet they say population increase (they used different words)</p>	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

could be responsible for the warming. That also does not make sense. There is no such info on the other two stations. There are still numerous sentences with bad grammar (noun –verb agreement). Overall, I see no difference in the paper.

Reviewer Details:

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