



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_47001
Title of the Manuscript:	METEOROLOGICAL VARIABLES THAT AFFECT VISIBILITY DEGRADATION AND THEIR SEASONAL TRENDS IN THE NIGER DELTA REGION OF 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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This paper is aimed to look at the METEOROLOGICAL VARIABLES THAT AFFECT VISIBILITY DEGRADATION AND THEIR SEASONAL TRENDS IN THE NIGER DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA. The main aims of the paper as stated by the author(s) are: (1) To analyze the seasonal variability of relative humidity (RH) and wind direction in the Niger Delta region over a period of 31 years. (2) To investigate the correlation between each of the two parameters (relative humidity (RH) and wind direction) and visibility in the Region. These are my observations:</p> <p>(1) Based on what is presented in the paper, the seasonal analyses of the RH and the wind speed were done; however, their correlation with the visibility was not presented. Here I suggest you do correlation analyses between the visibility data and that of the relative humidity; you also do same between the visibility data and that of the wind direction. Having done these, you can now figure out which of the meteorological parameters has significant effect on the visibility in each state.</p> <p>(2) The visibility data was not presented in any form in this work, neither was it analyzed. So I suggest you bring your retrieved visibility data into the work for the analysis.</p> <p>(3) No basis was established to indicate factual evidence as to which states have prevalence of either hydrocarbon-related aerosols or just dust aerosols. You had better show clearly that aerosols in A state is predominantly hydrocarbon while that in B state is predominantly mineral dust.</p>	Corrected as per the comments and implemented in the revised MS
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>L 81: Elaborate on the type of statistics used. For instance, daily/monthly/annual mean values of RH and wind direction determined.</p> <p>L 212: Indicate the measure of RH in percentage.</p> <p>L214: Can you justify your claim that RH is high in the four cities while the highest you recorded is 38 which according to L181 is either low or very low</p> <p>L226/227: You defined high wind speed as &gt; 70 and low wind speed as between 40 and 70. However, according to the table in L236 none of the values reached 70, which means in all the cases, wind direction is low.</p>	All corrections done
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Is there any need to acknowledge the sources of your data?</p>	