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### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | **Introduction to Conclusion:** Sudan, which is one of the climatic zones of West Africa, is conspicuously missing in the work. The Savannah being listed as one of the zones there should have been Sudan. All the three zones are Savannahs.  
**Abstract:** Materials and methods used not listed here. Bring results in the second sentence isn’t proper.  
**Conclusion:** It should be re-written. Summary (i.e. Aim and Results) of the work was given instead of its Conclusion (i.e. Opinion, Position or Stand of the author/s based on his/her/their Findings) |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | Lines 10-12: ...rate was... not ... 'rate were' ...  
Lines 16: ...there are also bi-modal peaks... not ..."there is also bi-modal peak"...  
Lines 21 and 22: Recast sentence.  
Lines 28: ...two precipitation types... not ... "two precipitations types..."  
Line 34: Recast. The "it’s there for what?  
Lines 83: ...most researches... not ... 'most research'...  
Line 90 - 93: ...data are... not ... "data is"... In fact, lines 90 – 93 need to be rewritten.  
Line 96: The domain of interest was... not ... 'were'...  
Lines 108 - 113: "Strongest latent heating in the atmosphere" appeared several times here and in some other locations. 'It' can sometimes be used. |
| **Optional/General** comments | The article would have been good but for the show of lack of mastery of the study area by the author/s as seen in listing of Savannah as one of the climatic zones of West Africa and the gross absence of Sudan. It is not just a mistake – you find it in the text and figures. A map of the study area would have possibly helped out this. |
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