



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_33809
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF RADIO HORIZON DISTANCE USING MEASURED METEOROLOGICAL PARAMETERS OVER SOME SELECTED LOCATIONS IN NIGERIA
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I think that literature review is incomplete, needs further improvement.</p> <p>In introduction section the authors might fully explain the importance of this research, previous papers about methodology and area, but conceptual explanations must be changed to "theory and method" section as well as Figure 1 (the figure is too big).</p> <p>The objective of the paper must be rewritten (last introduction paragraph). Suggestion: ...The paper presents the analysis of radio field strength variability over seven locations in Nigeria in different weather conditions using two years of meteorological data.... (Note that are different weather or meteorological conditions, not climatic)</p> <p>Section 1.1 might be named Data and study area. Figure 2 needs further improvement: map must be enhanced and axis numbers, references and graphical scale are difficult to read. I think graphical scale is wrong. The geographical information is repeated in Figure 2 and Table 1, I think Figure 1 is unnecessary. Table 1: units must be in second line in all cases (see elevation, in climate column the authors should include reference concerning to the climate classification used. Equations fonts are too small.</p> <p>Section 2.1 must be included in section 1.1. and must include a sensibility and errors information of meteorological data obtained as well as technal description of this instrumental, photo seems to be</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>unnecessary. Section 3, Must begin with text explanation of results and then, inclusion and explanation of Figures. Explain in a sentence why is important to obtain seasonal variation of surface refractivity and its relationship with objective of this paper.</p> <p>Figure 4 and 5 legends needs further detail. These are average values, which period? Both Figures must have same y-axis scale.</p> <p>Line 2 of Seasonal variations.... Paragraph in page 5 needs writing improvement..." It is observed from the result that the result..."</p> <p>And in line 8 same paragraph I think that this is due to the higher values of humidity because of the influence of Atlantic Ocean in station, not the other way.</p> <p>Paragraph in Fig 5 is extremely long. It must be written dividing into more paragraphs. The numbers must have the same quantity of decimal places in all paper.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 would include a minimum reference to why it is important to know radio horizons with different antenna heights</p> <p>Taking into consideration the time period considered I think it should be better to include the two years in only one graphic for each station avoiding too much Figures.</p> <p>Again, y-axis scale must be unified in all Figures (from 6 to 18) choosing one useful in all cases for comparison, If in some cases this would be impossible it would be discussed and noted in legend.</p> <p>At least in one of them explain the notation of RHd'12@80m etc... Lines in Figures are too thick</p> <p>Results and conclusions need further discussion.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	English writing must be improved.	
Optional/General comments	General comment: The paper describes an interesting and useful issue, but the manuscript must be improved.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Marisa G. Cogliati</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National University of Comahue, Argentina</i>