



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_47650
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Convection in Global Warming
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Knowing that a pot with a lid has a weaker heat exchange with the outside is a fact that is no secret to anyone who has been engaged in cooking. The classroom demonstration in this article can be used in primary school lessons. 2. The article refers to a number of historical classical research (including in German), but no results have actually been used in the writing. The theoretical level of their cited research works is very high, which does not allow people with low theoretical knowledge to understand them. Doubts about the use of sources also result from the fact that the reference 1 is mistaken for page numbers (529-46 in the manuscript, 529-546 is correct); the same is true for reference 2 (there are 123-64 in the manuscript, 123-164 correct). For references 3, 5, 6, 8,14, 28 and 31, the page numbers in the reference are decreasing that raises doubts about that the authors of the manuscript have actually seen these works and do not know the structure of the references at all. 3. The article does not provide any data on the significance of different global warming processes and there is no reasoned argument about the "mistaken" approach of most researchers. 4. Academic practice does not foresee the transfer / copying of figures of other research papers. In Figure 2, there are no vertical axis units for particulate pollution. Identifying a causal relationship is not the same as demonstrating a temporal trend on an appropriate scale. 5. Figure 3 shows the theoretical level of the manuscript authors in a grotesque manner. 6. Claims made in Conclusion have not been scientifically proven. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Agu Eensaar</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Tallinn University of Applied Sciences, Estonia</i>