mdpi.com Journals A-Z	For Authors About Open A	Access Policy fmiskolczi@cox.net My Profile Logout
	Title / Keyword	Journal all Volume
	Author	Section Clear
~	Article Type all	Special Issue Page Search
Harr Manu		
User Menu		
User Profile		
Manage E-mail Alerts	Journal	IJERPH (ISSN 1660-4601)
Manage Saved Searches		http://www.mdpi.com/journal/ijerpn/index
Change Password	Manuscript ID	ijernh-8047
Edit Profile		Article
Logout	Title	Greenhouse Effect and the Radiative Structure of the Earth's Atmosphere
Submissions Menu	Number of Pages	29
		Download Manuscript
Submit Manuscript	Authors	Ferenc Miskolczi
Display Submitted	Received	31 March 2011
Holp		
пер		
	Review Report Form	
		High Average Low No Answer
	* Originality / Novelty	(x) () () ()
	* Significance of Content	(x) () () ()
	* Quality of Presentation	$()$ (\mathbf{y}) $()$ $()$
	Scientific Soundness	(x) () () ()
	* Interest to the readers	() (x) () ()
	* Overall Merit	(x) () () ()
	* Overall Recommendation	 Accept in present form Accept after minor revision, I do not need to see the revised version Reconsider after major revision, I want to see the revised version
	* English Language and	() English language and style are fine
	Style	(x) Minor spell check required
		() Extensive editing of English language and style required
	Comments and Suggestions	
	for Authors	
	* Comments and Suggestions for Authors	Abstract: First sentence (lines 15-18). Instead of: There are accumulating evidences that the greenhouse effect in the Earth's atmosphere is not a 'free' parameter and anthropogenic global warming (AGW) estimates based on the classic greenhouse theory and CO2 doubling experiments (usually conducted by general circulation models) are totally wrong.
		I would say something like this:
		There are accumulating evidences that the greenhouse effect in the Earth's
		atmosphere is not a 'free' variable and anthropogenic global warming (AGW) estimates based on the classic greenhouse theory and CO2 doubling experiments (usually conducted by general circulation models) are in need of serious reconsideration and improvements.
		The Introduction (lines 34-105) is not a proper introduction for the non-expert reader (it is not understandable even for practicing meteorologists either). Instead, clear statements should be given on the problem to be solved in the paper. The references (Lacis, Pierrehumbert, Rosseland, Chandrashekhar) say nothing about the issue. The optical thickness-language is known only for a very narrow branch of radiative transfer specialists.
		From lines 127, the author goes even further. Lines 127-134 are quite understandable for say three persons in the world, warranted not being among the readers of IJERPH.
		139-277 could be easily abandoned. The Observed Empirical Facts session could be interesting, if the average reader had

 the faintest idea what he was talking about.

 At 395, the 5 Theoretical Interpretations section starts to be very interesting. But it surely de of the former pages, so they can be hardly abandoned.

 The 6 Results and discussion session is again vary informative (lines 674-730).

 The wonderful figures from 734 to 791 are again only for specialists, though the next two (Fi number appears twice, the latter is missing) shows clearly the concept of greenhouse stabili

 My conclusion is here that less is more.

 I recommend halve its in length and ease its style.

 Date & Signature

 Date of manuscript submission

 31 March 2011 9:00:13

 Date of this review

 16 May 2011 16:05:20

* denotes required fields.

Terms & Conditions Privacy Policy Contact MDPI Payment Information Jobs at MDPI © 1996-2011 MDPI Publishing (Basel, Switzerland) unless otherwise stated