



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_51152
Title of the Manuscript:	The Greenhouse Effect Definition
Type of the Article	

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	Line 132 has to be expanded. "The results show that the IPCC model cannot be fitted into this new GH effect magnitude." Explain why.	This finding is a very important result of this study. That is why I have added a new paragraph to explain why the IPCC model cannot be fitted into the total warming range of 400 ppm.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 72: "346.5 – 75" should be "345.6-75.0" Fig. 1, the text and value of "LW radiation emitted by the surface" should be placed under the LW radiation flux at the right, to avoid confusion. The method in lines 85-98 is questionable and only works if contributions are independent, which they probably aren't (example, latent heating is caused by water). Anyway, if it determined in this way by literature, the author is permitted to do the same. Maybe a comment can be added. (optional).	This error has been corrected. This is a good observation. I decided to prevent confusion by using an arrow pointing the emitted flux. I have added paragraphs into Discussion section about the GH effect and the so-called snowball effect.
Optional/General comments	Nice to see somebody is still taking on the role of science in this politically polluted area of the climate by questioning questionable models. The manuscript does not bring anything new, but the policy of the journal is to not reject on lack of novelty, so it can be accepted.	I think that it is a serious scientific error that the IPCC's GH definition violates scientific laws. The purpose of this abuse of science is - Firstly to create a strong GH gas image for CO ₂ (27 % versus 7 % contribution) and - Secondly to make enough warming capacity for CO ₂ in the IPCC's climate models for the concentrations from 280 ppm onward. As I have shown the warming equation (generally climate models) used by the IPCC cannot be fitted into the total warming of 2.5 °C by 400 ppm of CO ₂ . It maybe interesting to know that I submitted the manuscript of this new GH effect definition to 10 different top journals of climatology. Every journal had its own scientific reasons to reject the paper, but no one said that there is nothing new. Science and Nature informed that there is not enough novelty and significance. I disagree, because the scientific basis of GH effect has been wrong, and the warming effect of CO ₂ is much smaller. That is the key issue of the climate change. Also, one thing is astonishing: no reviewer noticed that I had included the SW absorption into the GH effect, and it is not correct, because it is part of the incoming solar insolation (240 Wm ⁻²). I noticed this error by myself and that is why I composed this manuscript.



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	