

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_88277
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Selected Empirical Schemes of Calculating Sensible Heat Flux from Routinely-Measured Meteorological Parameters in a Tropical Location
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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	The manuscript entitled, "Evaluation of Selected Empirical Schemes of Calculating Sensible Heat Flux from Routinely-Measured Meteorological Parameters in a Tropical Location" is well organized and very important ideas are raised. This is very important and I will recommend this manuscript to be published, with major revisions.	
Minor REVISION comments	<div>1. In abstract part, "In the wet season, BP, BREB, HU, SMT and ST had MBE values of 37.4 Wm⁻², 14.2 Wm⁻², 4.2 Wm⁻², 12.0 Wm⁻² and -1.1 Wm⁻² respectively." Please use comma and correct throughout manuscript.</div> <div>2. Introduction part is too narrowed. Could you revise starting from general to specific?</div> <div>3. What is novelty of this study? It should be clearly stated very carefully to make it easy for readers.</div> <div>4. Methodology of this research is not clearly stated. The authors are recommended to use flow chart in procedure of their works.</div> <div>5. In result and discussion where is the authors inferences? Revise and compare with previously reported works.</div> <div>6. Figures legends and Tabular explanation is displaced fixed table mode and make it visible for all readers.</div> <div>7. Grammar problems, typo errors and at the end of conclusion giving direction for readers.</div> <div>8. The authors used very old references. It is better if they update all references (2019-2022) to use recent information.</div>	<div>1. Punctuation marks were used appropriately throughout this manuscript.</div> <div>2. This study is about sensible heat flux. Therefore, the introduction was focused on sensible heat flux specifically.</div> <div>3. The novelty of the study has been included.</div> <div>4. The methodology is clearly stated. All the methods used are in 'Theory and Methodology' section. It's not necessary that flow chart be used in the study.</div> <div>5. The results were compared with previously reported works in section 3.2.</div> <div>6. The figures and tables have been fixed.</div> <div>7. Typo errors have been corrected.</div>
Optional/General comments		

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)	