



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	<p>This has addressed the primary anthropogenic cause of global warming, which is the extraction of the Earth's hydrocarbons directly enhancing the buildup of atmospheric heat as it enhance the emission of heat from the Earth's interior, as well as it directly and indirectly enhance the buildups of CO2 and other greenhouse gases, and the particulate pollution of the atmosphere from hydrocarbons combustion (it didn't mention).</p> <p>But, for the enabling to understand and compare the impacts of the extraction of hydrocarbons on global warming via its enhancing of heat emission from the Earth's interior¹, as well as CO2 and other greenhouse gases buildups in the atmosphere², and particulate pollution of the atmosphere from hydrocarbons combustion³, this study should also addressed the role of the particulate pollution of the atmosphere from hydrocarbons combustion, as well as all three ways extraction of Earth's hydrocarbons cause global warming in its recommendation of a follow-up study.</p>	We are grateful to the reviewer for these remarks. We have tried incorporate these into the conclusion section. As this is a Short Communication article, we make a recommendation for a detailed follow-up study.
Minor REVISION comments	Consider the editorial entries made in red on the copy of manuscript reattached here.	Thanks for highlighting these – we have now addressed these.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	