Paper: **"Bias correction of CORDEX-Africa regional climate model simulations for climate change projections in northeastern Lake Chad: Comparative analysis of three bias correction methods"**

Corresponding Author: Mardochée Dingamdji

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Blinded

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title "Bias correction of CORDEX-Africa regional climate model simulations for trend analysis in northeastern Lake Chad: Comparison of three bias correction methods" is clear and descriptive. It accurately reflects the study's focus on bias correction methods and their application in climate model simulations for a specific geographic area. However, it could be slightly shortened for clarity.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. It introduces the context, describes the three bias correction methods evaluated, and presents the main results. However, the abstract is dense and could benefit from a more precise separation of objectives, methods, and results to improve readability.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
While the article is generally well-written, there are several minor grammatical errors and instances where punctuation could be improved. These do not significantly detract from the content but do affect the overall professionalism of the manuscript.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methods section is comprehensive, detailing the bias correction techniques used, the models evaluated, and the statistical measures applied. The explanation is thorough, making it easy to understand how the study was conducted and how the results were derived.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The results are presented clearly, using tables and figures to support the findings. The discussion of the results is logical and ties back to the study's objectives. However, some complex statistical data might be challenging for readers without a strong background in the field, slightly affecting the clarity.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusions are well-supported by the results presented in the article. They accurately reflect the findings and implications of the study, offering a concise summary of the key points. The discussion also appropriately contextualizes the findings within the broader field of climate modelling and bias correction.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The article includes a comprehensive list of appropriate references for the study. The references are up-to-date and relevant, demonstrating the authors' engagement with existing literature in the field.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Overall, the article is of high quality, with clear explanations of methods and a solid foundation in the literature, though there is room for minor improvements in language and clarity.

Reviewer J:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is informative and captures the main elements of the study.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Consider reducing the complexity of some sentences to enhance readability.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Although the article is well-written and informative, there are some grammatical and stylistic improvements that can make it more clear and easier to read.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The study methods section is explained in a clear manner, and the various components of the methods are grouped in a logical sequence.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Check the text for errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. To do this, you can either use grammar checking tools or seek assistance from a colleague or professional editor.
The results section should display findings without any interpretation, while the

discussion should give interpretation and implications. Make certain that these two are not merged.

Ensure that every statement, particularly those that present specific data or claims, is properly referenced.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is a concise and effective summary of the key findings of your study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Ensure all statements, especially those presenting specific data or claims, are properly referenced.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper's structure is effective, but it's important to ensure that each section transitions smoothly to the next.

Although the language is generally clear, there are a few sentences that are too complex. Clarity could be improved by breaking these into shorter, more direct sentences.

Check for minor grammatical and typographical errors while proofreading.