



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_30781
Title of the Manuscript:	Warming Effect Reanalysis of Greenhouse Gases and Clouds
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>The principal scientific contributions of this paper are contained in Sections 2-4. If confirmed, the author's work would have a significant impact on the climatology community. Obviously, given the scope of this review, I am not able to confirm the author's findings.</p> <p>Section 1.3, on the other hand, is confusing and poorly written. It also would appear to add little to what readers of this paper would already know, and it contributes little if anything to the rest of the paper.</p> <p>In Section 1.3, the author discusses "cloudiness changes", often without specifying in which direction. The notation CL-% for %Cloudiness or %CL is poorly chosen.</p> <p>The term "Surface balance" in Table 3, appears to simply be the sum of SW radiation absorbed and "Downward radiation emitted by the atmosphere" (meaning, I presume, LW radiation absorbed by the surface). Presumably the term means the total SW and LW radiation <i>absorbed</i> by the surface. The term "Surface balance" is needlessly confusing and should be replaced. The last column of the table has an addition error.</p> <p>The term "pseudo-balance" doesn't make sense to me. A state that is in flux is not in any kind of balance. By "black surface" temperature" the author presumably means a black body temperature.</p> <p>Frankly, I would suggest eliminating Section 1.3.</p>	<p>Author's comment <i>(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)</i></p> <p>There are two major findings in this paper. The first result is the contributions of GH gases and clouds of the GH effect in the all-sky conditions. There is only one published paper (Schmidt et al. ref. 7) showing these contributions for the normal sky condition, which is all-sky. The author has shown that these calculations are wrong, because the negative effects of clouds have been excluded and only the positive GH effects of clouds are included. Another finding in this paper is the empirical feedback effect of water vapor. This issue is still one of the unsolved issues in the climate change.</p> <p>I have removed section 1.3 and therefore the comments for section 1.3 need no answer.</p>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>If the author insists on retaining Section 1.3 as an introduction to the effect of clouds, it should be completely rewritten so as to be far more comprehensible to those not already familiar with the issue.</p>	<p>I have removed section 1.3.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Fig. 3. and the printing in it is too small and hard to read. is</p>	<p>I have enlarged Fig 3.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		