SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJR2P_45027**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SCALED-UP ANALYSIS OF SURFACE REFRACTIVITY ACROSS WEST AFRICA**
Type of the Article	**Scientific**

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	**The abstract of the manuscript looks poor explained the outcome of this research. There is lack of literature review and explanation of meteorology of study area. The results of this study look pretty sound however author need to add headline of result in this manuscript. There is need of correction in line 49 which explaining wrong value variation of refractivity in the atmosphere. There is no information about data set used in this research. Author need to provide formula how he make monthly and yearly average value of refractivity from satellite data set. This manuscript should be formatted into journal format as well.**	Reference has been upgraded and modified Manuscript has been upgraded by strengthening the discussion part Section has been given as per the journal guidelines
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This research will be more appreciable if, instead of monthly and yearly, daily or 6 hourly spatial- temporal analysis of atmospheric refractivity covered.	We are trying to design our study for future scenario in respect to the comments

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	