

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_121984
Title of the Manuscript:	Albedo, solar flux and climatic parameters variations in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents a clear description of this study that appears to have significant implications for climate change research and mitigation strategies. The study discusses regional challenges facing in Burkina Faso but it has some global relevance having broader implications for understanding the role of albedo in climate change globally. The study also contains policy implications such as reflective materials and forest preservation. The manuscript has some lack of explanation, this should be addressed in the revised version of it. But it contributes valuable insights into the local and global factors influencing albedo.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable and covers the essence of the investigations.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract presents a clear and concise summary of the study. Very appropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Some minor revisions are required the energy formula given in the manuscript is not correct or not explained correctly. The results, that indicate the correlation between albedo, temperature and precipitation sounds reasonable but it's important to be cautious about attributing direct causation. Complex climate systems involve numerous interacting variables, and further research may be needed to disentangle the precise contributions of each factor. The manuscript concludes a link between low solar activity and high-speed solar wind events leading to heavy precipitation. This relationship is intriguing and warrants further investigation, as it could have important implications for understanding climate variability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes, they are. I have no suggestion to add more citations, but I would move the internet links within the text into this section of the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General comments	<p>In the Introduction: The explanation of albedo in the Introduction section is overly detailed and could be condensed. Conversely, the role of cosmic ray data, which is used in the calculations, is not explained at all. Please provide a concise definition of albedo and elaborate on the significance of cosmic ray data in your analysis.</p> <p>In the Section Data and Methodology: I recommend removing the internet addresses from the text body of this section. Instead, add them to your list of references and cite them within the text using reference numbers. This will improve the readability and flow of the section.</p> <p>The formula for solar wind energy is incorrect. If this is intended to represent the solar wind energy flux, the current expression may be appropriate. However, the text describes it as solar wind energy, and even if V_{SW} is squared, the result would be energy density (J/m^3) rather than energy. Please clarify whether you are calculating energy flux or energy density, and correct the formula accordingly. Additionally, provide commentary on the speed of the solar wind after presenting the formula, as this is a crucial parameter in the calculations.</p> <p>Other calculation formulae are missing from the corresponding section. For instance, cosmic rays and how they are used in the evaluations.</p>	

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:	Zoltán Várallyay
Department, University & Country	Hungary