



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_50701
Title of the Manuscript:	SARIMA MODELLING OF THE FREQUENCY OF MONTHLY RAINFALL IN OSUN STATE, 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is précised. 2. Abstract is ok. 3. Key words should be written alphabetically. Keywords should be 4-6. 4. Introduction part is ok. 5. See Line 38, Section 2: MethodsWriteSARIMA Model or Modeling.....instead of.... Methods....delete section number 2.1 only.... and keep material as it is. 6. See lines 63 and 64,... equation (1)... Where is equation (1)? 6. See line 85,.... Section 3.0,... Results and Discussion....write....3.0 Application..... 7. Table, Figures and equation numbers should be written section wise, such as,.....1.1,1.2,1.3,.....2.1,2.2,2.3,..... 8. See line 145,Section number 4.7...???...make it correct. 9. Section 3.0 should be reconstructed. 10. Conclusion part should be written systematically. This part depends on findings in application and significance of research. 11. References should be written alphabetically. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Nil	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ramesh M. Mirajkar</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar College, India</i>