



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_47843
Title of the Manuscript:	Earth Thermal Emissions and Global Warming
Type of the Article	<u>Short communication</u>

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	The abstract is written as an introduction. The abstract should only summarize the results.	Thank you for pointing this out – we have rectified.
Minor REVISION comments	Do not use texts such as in line 71, 83, 97, "[12] made a case ...", but instead use "Nordell and Gervet made a case ... [12]" Some tiny typos exist. Please read the document again.	Thank you for highlighting – we have rectified and corrected typos – hopefully not missing anything.
Optional/General comments	The idea of an analogy between Earth and a body is absurd, in my opinion. Even more absurd is then to infer things from the similarity. Next thing will be to assocaita a brain to the planet. However, the idea of oil as an insulator is new to me (I did not know Ref. 13), and just for the orginality of this idea, I think it can be published. (What is missing in this world is ideas). The authors are advised to use a more scientific appraoch, not looking everywhere for proof of their ideas, but instead test the hypothesis they present. I would like to see calculations based on a physcial model as to how much heating can be produced by this effect.	We appreciate the comments. As these comments are not instructing compulsory action, the analogy has been toned down but not removed entirely. We are not the only to view the earth in those terms. The Gaia hypothesis proposed by James Lovelock is not too dissimilar to the way we describe planet earth (e.g. see Volk, T. (2003) Gaia's Body: Toward a Physiology of Earth (The MIT Press)). We hope to adopt a more scientific approach when we undertake data gathering/analysis and climate modelling as part of the next phase of the study. This is now indicated in the conclusion.

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	