



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>The paper deals with the problem of variation of maximum and minimum radio horizon distance derived from the computation of surface refractivity through measurement of atmospheric parameters. The authors provide a good and interesting introduction about the problem of the reflectivity from the surface in order to give motivation of the paper.</p> <p>However, introduction section needs improvement. The author should be more globally. The focus in Introduction section is not clear. Please make a sense especially for the last paragraph. About the Object Characteristics; the reviewer wants to see more detail about the experiments. Figure 2 has low resolution, it has to be rearranged. The results given in Figs -19 are required to discuss more detail in the manuscript. In addition, the Conclusions should be rewritten in order to clarify the readers. In addition, Make a sense (!) in writing each word and base it on both theoretical and experimental evidence, separately, especially in the experiments and conclusions. Or, at least, you should cite it. Please provide more information about processing strategy and provide more data combination of data variants. Moreover, the reviewer is not satisfied with the language too, please ask some native speakers to polish the text for the next submission. By a careful improving of the some expressions and statements, adding some explanations and correcting some English grammar and spelling mistakes.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The reviewer requests that a revised manuscript should be prepared based on the comments and suggestions above.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>R. Cuneyt Erenoglu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey</i>