



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.	
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).	
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.	

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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Peter Stallinga</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of The Algarve, Faro, Portugal</i>