Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_86053**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Rainfall Variability and Trend Analysis over Nguru Yobe 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:

(https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy)

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	**The article "Rainfall Variability and Trend Analysis over Nguru Yobe State Nigeria" performs an analysis of rainfall behavior in the northeast region of Nigeria. It features clarity and good results. However, I recommend some modifications to make the article even better.** **ABSTRACT:** **1) Make it clear about the importance of the work. What makes your article different?** **2) You only mentioned the coefficient of variation results. What about the trend test results?** **3) You used the acronyms MJJ and ASO. When reading the summary, we could not identify what this means.** **4) What are the years of observation of the data? It is important to make this clear.** **INTRODUCTION:** **1) Line 3: Adjust the text "system. rainfall"** **2) Discuss the results of other articles that worked with the subject of your work. For example:** https://doi.org/10.4136/ambi-agua.2171 **3) Mention the years of observation of your work (last line of the introduction)** **MATERIALS AND METHODS** **1) Figure 1 is not referenced throughout the text.** **2) Did you use any method to handle the lost data?** **3) Any comments on this range of years of observations? You have 17 with no data... Are there some impacts in your results? You need to discuss.** **4) Item 2.4.1- The Mann-Kendall Method needs to be presented correctly: what is the formula for parameter Z? What does it mean? What significance level did you use?** **5) Parameter S: you say: *"S with a positive number suggests an upward trend, whereas S with a very low negative value indicates a downward trend"*** **Despite this, at no time have you discussed this parameter before.** **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** **1) Line 4-6: You point to Figures 4 and 5. However, until the moment of writing, you have only presented a single figure. Pay attention to the order.** **2) You present figure 2 and do not comment on it.** **3) In all tables, you need to inform the unit of measurement of precipitation and other terms that appear there (if any).** **4) Tables 1 and 4 and Figure 5: unformatted** **5) You present Tables 5 and 6 and do not comment on them.** **6) Item 3.3: When applying the method, you find a trend, but is it significant for the 95% confidence level? Make this clear in the text.** **CONCLUSION** **1) In your conclusion, you should make clear the contributions of your research. Mention your differentiator.** **REFERENCES** **1) You need to format them correctly.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Yagho de Souza Simões**
Department, University & Country	**Engineering School of São Carlos, University of São Paulo, Brazil**