

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision. ***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 2/2/2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 2/7/2018
Manuscript Title: Contribution of TRMM3b42 data to improve knowledge of rainfall in the Kayanga/Geba river basin (Republic of Guinea, Senegal, and Guinea-Bissau) ⁴	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	yes
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	somewhat
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	Some error, primarily in writing style
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the	4

content.	
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. <i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

February 7, 2018

Editorial Staff
European Scientific Journal (ESJ)

Review for Manuscript: **Contribution of TRMM3b42 data to improve knowledge of rainfall in the Kayanga/Geba river basin (Republic of Guinea, Senegal, and Guinea-Bissau)**

Dear Editors,

I find the topic of this paper to be both relevant and significant. The authors have completed a decent piece of research, something that is certainly publishable. However, it is my opinion that it needs some further editing and revision prior to being accepted for the ESJ. In short, I would suggest that it be accepted, pending minor revisions.

I offer 5 specific criticisms below.

- 1) The writing style of this paper leaves something to be desired. The work is valid research, but there are a number of awkward sentences in the draft. The authors really need to edit the prose, which would enhance the clarity of the piece. If this paper is given some additional editorial work, particularly if the awkward sentences are cleaned up, it could result in a very solid paper.

- Ex. (page 2; "Launched on November 27, 1997.....in the tropical and subtropical regions."
THIS IS AN INCOMPLETE AND AWKWARD SENTENCE.

- Page 2; “The River has its source in the west of the Badiar plateau and takes the name of Rio Gebe.” THIS IS A LONG, AWKWARD SENTENCE.
 - Section II. Data and Methods. The next to last sentence of the 1st paragraph; the word “dependents,” is used, I’m assuming author means depends?
- 2) I think the inclusion of reference locator maps to be a great reference tools (Figure 1). That said, if the authors were to also include a relatively small scale map of Africa, it would assist readers in understanding the geographic context of the work. Thus, there would be a map of Africa as a whole – placing the sub-region (West Africa) in context, but also a larger scale image of the specific watershed. I offer this suggestion based on the idea that some readers (unfortunately!) may not recognize West Africa by shape.
- I also think the Kayanga/Geba river should be more clearly highlighted on the regional map
- 3) Once weakness is that the “Methods” section reads in a choppy way. The information in this section is useful and very appropriate, but I would argue that the entire section could be organized better. For example, the description of the correlation coefficient R and Root Mean Square Error is fine, but perhaps some of this statistical information could be placed in a note that follows the text? Its inclusion in the text itself disrupts the flow of the narrative. If the statistical information is in a note, the reader could easily refer to it.
- Also I think the descriptions of how Rainfall regime, inter-annual variability, & spatial distribution of monthly rainfall, should be included as sub-headings (as opposed to section headings).
- 4) I’m guessing I may have reviewed an early draft of the paper, but the numerical labeling of the different sections (4.3, 3.1, etc.) is really confusing and doesn’t appear to make any sense to me. Obviously, this is a minor thing that could be fixed easily.

In sum, I do not feel the manuscript should published in its present form. However, it would be my suggestion that it be published once the paper is given thorough editing. I think the author spelled out a clear research purpose, the meeting of which would assist our understanding of how to understand climatic phenomena across the study area.

If the authors, or the editors, find this review to be harsh, I trust they can understand that it was offered with the goal and spirit of improving the work. I do really appreciate the research that was completed and hope to ultimately see it in the ESJ.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: