



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	<u>Short communication</u>

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Correct where highlighted in yellow on the reattached copy of manuscript.	Thank you for identifying the typos – these have been corrected. Please kindly note that after checking our version of the document previously forwarded to the editor for review, we noted that instances where two words have been merged were absent in our last version of the manuscript forwarded to the editor. We presume this may be due to software compatibility issues. We have saved the document in the latest version of Microsoft Word 2016 (in compatibility mode) and also as a pdf file.
I continue to have the same opinion. The idea of fossil fuel extraction having a geothermal effect on the climate is farfetched, but interesting enough to be published in a world that is ever more dogmatic and eliminating diversity of thought. Only for that reason it should be published.	We welcome this positive attitude.
The authors should do a rough estimate of the effects they describe. Just determine how much oil is consumed and insert this in the crust. Then see how much the heat flux is reduced. Not providing such simple back-of-the-envelope calculations is a missed opportunity and renders the manuscript low quality.	We have included a calculation to estimate the amount of heat produced as a result of oil and gas production over 10 years (2007-2017) and subsequent warming of global average temperature over the same period. We have found this to be 17% of total temperature rise observed over this 10-year period.
The authors continue to use phrases such as "As noted by [15], the idea ..." (line 61). Correct is "As noted by Zhang et al.[15], the idea ..." In lines 44, 141, 156, 159, 192, 193, 231 centigrade is written wrong.	Thank you for identifying these. We have rectified.
The abstract is better, but still reads as an introduction.	Thank you for highlighting – we have revised the abstract in light of this comment.
Note: The Gaia hypothesis has very little to do with this proposed idea. Or the authors should explain how the extraction of oil is self-regulatory. Created	Reference to Gai will not be made in the text.