

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_83779
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of an Environment and Climate Data Acquisition System (EC-DAQS) for Radio Meteorology
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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1 abstract is written well. It is self-Explanatory.</p> <p>2, Introduction part: It presents interesting information but it is also very short. I suggest adding information about similar studies for the region or close countries. The author can also contextualize more the study on this section.</p> <p>3 Methodology: The research method is scientific and precisely. It is thoroughly described. If the author could add a table or something that can help us understand more. it would be great!</p> <p>4 a) I like the results, but the section also needs improvement. Graphics should be remade with proper software. The way the information is presented within parenthesis is not adequate I believe, please revise that too.</p> <p>b) I think the section 3.2 of the manuscript is methodology rather than result. Please rearrange this part specially the mathematical equation to the methodology part.</p> <p>5 Discussion: This is where I believe the paper needs the most improvement. I missed other studies and how they are similar (or not) to this one. What are the similar findings for near countries (regions). The paper would greatly benefit from more detailed information on previous studies for the region and whereabouts. Even though, the manuscript shows good result it is not discussed well. Please discuss your findings.</p> <p>6 conclusions: Seems enough and OK.</p> <p>7 Bibliography/References It seems OK!</p>	<p>1. Thank you for your encouraging comments</p> <p>2. Noted for future developments of the EC-DAQS device.</p> <p>3. Noted. Table 1 has been modified One Table (Sample of data logged on EC-DAQ Figure 4) and one graph (Figure 5b) have been added</p> <p>4, a) Noted and corrected as suggested</p> <p>b) Noted and corrected as suggested</p> <p>5. Noted for future developments of the EC-DAQS device. These results are just in the preliminary stages.</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Noted</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper has potential and with a few improvements can be accepted by the Journal. The English language needs some reviewing. The paper is fairly well written/organized and the subject is suitable for publication.</p> <p>Finally: The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal. Generally, the paper is fairly well organized. Abstract, Introduction, Method, and Discussion are to the point. But it comprises negligible mistakes which revised by the reviewer. As a final verdict, I am pleased to recommend the revised version of the manuscript for publication.</p>	

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>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.