



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_49392
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GLOBAL SOLAR RADIATION AT SELLECTED POINTS IN NIGERIA USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK MODEL (ANNM)
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/sdi-general-editorial-policy>)



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	Line 203-219 confusing. Rewrite Figure 6: not all maps are on same scale. Figure 8 on p15 and 9 on p. 16: Labels not readable. The speculative interpretation on lines 417-425 has no basis.	Thank you for your comments All the corrections mentioned by the reviewer have been done thoroughly
Minor REVISION comments	In many places singular/plural is mixed in the phrases or articles missing In many cases unnecessary capitalization of words "Global" can be reoved from the keywords "Architecture Model" can be removed as a keyword "thirty-six points" is out of context in the abstract "25W/m ² " → "25 W/m ² " L73: "995" → "1995" L104: "m2" → "m ² " "inputted" → "input" (2x) Referincing not "according to [12]" but "according to" and then the name of a person or people. Equations numbered with (1) instead of 1, etc. Eq. 14 is redundant L 291: remove "that means that .. observed" The figure on p11 has label on page 12. (It is caused by the crappy Word software) The figure on p13 has no label below the figure L 336 "w/m ² " → "W/m ² " "radiation concentration" → "radiation density" or "flux". L417: "Amount of radiation ... 20 to 50 W/m ² ". This would not be an amount, but an (aevrage?) radiation intensity. The number seems a little low. Please check! Normal maps give amount of 2000 kWh/year. (230 W/m ²)	
Optional/General comments	The technique of neural networks is applied to weather data in Nigeria. The authors show it can be done and correctly use this technique. I am always very sceptical to the usability of the technique, but that is a totally different question. The manuscript can be accepted, since there is nothing technically wrong in it.	

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>	