SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Physical Science International Journal**
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		
Minor REVISION comments	This is a very interesting paper, about the trend of daily maximum and minimum temperatures recorded at three sites in Nigeria during thirty years. Two main sections are presented. The first is devoted to the trend of the frequency of days with maximum and minimum temperatures above the 90^{th} and below the 10^{th} percentiles and the second considers the decadal distributions. Although the analysis is correct some minor changes should be introduced before its publication. 1. Abstract. Avoid unnecessary repetition of site names. 2. L. 22-23 Remove "However, neither...of Africa", since this sentence is repeated. 3. L. 26, Remove "Nigeria" since this name is followed by "Western Nigeria".	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. L. 35. Replace “each of the parameter” by “each parameter”. 5.- Section 2. A map showing the measurement sites together with a description of these sites would be useful. 6.- Table 1. Unit (^{0}C) should be introduced. 7.- Section 3.1. Equations of the linear fits would improve the manuscript, together with the correlation coefficient. Moreover, this correlation coefficient may be tested for significance against zero. The corresponding table may be downloaded form http://www.life.illinois.edu/ib/203/Fall%2009/PEARSONS%20CORRELATION%20COEFFICIENT%20TABLE.pdf The two-tailed test must be selected, if N is the number of years, df=N-2. If the correlation coefficient attains or exceeds that appearing in the table for, for instance, 0.05, then the correlation coefficient is statistically significant at the 5% level. 8.- Comment the kind of graphics and the procedure followed for their explanation at the beginning of Section 3.2, since this reviewer finds this section a bit confusing. 9.- Fig. 4 c and d, x axis label is missing. 10.- Revise Figs. 4- 6, since the y axis is usually devoted to the frequency, whereas the x axis describes the variable, the number of days in this case. 11.- L. 111, revise “Figure 4c and 4c”. 12.- L. 146, revise “Figure 6c and 6c”. 13.- Fig. 4c, 5c, 5d, 6c, 6d some numeric labels on the x axis are missing. 14.- Figs 6 c and d are the same.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Isidro A. Pérez***
Department, University & Country	***University of Valladolid, Spain***