

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_76272
Title of the Manuscript:	MODELLING OF THE RAIN RATE AND RAIN ATTENUATION FOR THE DESIGN OF LINE-OF-SIGHT LINK BUDGET OVER WARRI, DELTA STATE
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>1. The Result presentation should begin with an opening paragraph, not Table one dumped without text reference.</p> <p>2a. On Table 1, any explanation to a wide margin between values of Rain Attenuation using ITU-R & Moupfouma methods. b. The error observed on item 8b is repeated for Tables 2-5, Figs 1-6. Authors(s) just dumped tables & figs without any statement on how they were generated.</p> <p>3. The DISCUSSION section fails to reference previous but similar study to support or show disagreement with theirs. Both Results & Discussion sections must be re-written to address the issue raised in the forgoing comments.</p> <p>4. Manuscript to be thoroughly edited/vetted for grammatical errors. Authors to check singular verbs against plural & no mix up.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>5. A number of abbreviations such as ITU-R, LOS Link, Moupfouma model are not in full meaning, why?</p> <p>6. Eq. (1) contains lower case frequency where the upper case is adopted for explanation of terms, why?</p> <p>7. For Eq. (2) & (3) esponge the word "below" and replace with equation numbers. This is a good practice in technical writing.</p> <p>8. The numbering approach using 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, etc says for introduction, methodology, etc are unacceptable. It should be written as 1., 2., 3., etc zero has no place in numbering a chapter.</p> <p>9a. 2nd line after METHODOLOGY should read "prior to RESULTS all equations with Arabic numerals collected are nouns ", Therefore 1st letter "e" should be treated in upper case.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	L. Nwaogazie. Ify
Department, University & Country	University Of Port Harcourt, Nigeria