



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_48249
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RAINFALL, MAXIMUM TEMPERATURE AND CONVECTIVE SYSTEMS OVER SELECTED CITIES IN 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In this paper authors have to evaluate the relationship between rainfall, maximum temperature and convective activities over Ikeja, Abuja and Kano cities in Nigeria. Monthly weather data of squall, thunderstorms, maximum temperature and rainfall were obtained from the archives of the Nigeria Meteorological Agency for the period between 1985 and 2015 (30years). Seasonal and interannual variations and relationships between the parameters were analyzed. Over Ikeja the result highlighted a gradual increase in these parameters from January to May/June, while the decrease began from October through to December. It further shows that the utilization of modeling and mapping techniques may also give further insight into the variation of these systems and a clue to issuing more accurate forecasts and predictions.</p> <p>The study is very interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly. Following Explanations are needed- Page 5: 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION is to be replaced by 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Page 17: 4. Conclusion is to be re-written point wise.</p>	Correction made in the manuscript
Optional/General comments	<p>Manuscript is interesting and structured properly, but need to be maintained with same Font and its size.</p> <p><i>The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.</i></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	