

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Focus on abbreviations throughout the entire article, such as ADC, LCD, and DAQS in abstract, and Liquid Crystal Display in Section 2.3.2. In the first two lines in Section 2.2, it is hard to clarify they and them. Please clarify.3. Tab 1 and Fig 5 give the same information, and please consider removing one. Also the second and third paragraph in Section 3.2 have the same problem.4. I don't know whether this system is capable of displaying other weather parameters, such as UV, humidity, etc. With the results of more parameters, this article will be more abundant.5. In the fifth paragraph in Section 1, what are the differences and connections between the newly developed EC-DAQS and those designed previous. Please state relative interpretation.6. The English must be improved. There are too many wording issues to identify them.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Noted and edited accordingly2. Noted and edited accordingly3. Noted and corrected accordingly4. Yes, Sample Data has been included in Figure 4.5. Noted and edited accordingly6. Noted and edited accordingly
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are no (a) and (b) in Fig 1. Fig 2, and Fig 3.2. In the fourth line in Section 2.2, i think the digitized should be digitizes.3. In the fifth line in Section 2.2, i think the pass should be passes.4. In the sixth line in Section 2.2, the statements before "cycle" show a flow but not a cycle.5. The second paragraph in Section 3.2, There are no equations (5) and (6).6. The RMSE is expressed as $\sqrt{\sum(\text{obs}-\text{forecst})^2/\text{num}}$.7. The MBE and RMSE give the distances between the two methods of measurements, but I can't objectively measure the accuracy of EC-DAQS. The MBE and RMSE between other system and observation from the digital thermometer and sound level meter should be presented to demonstrate its considerable accuracy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Noted and edited accordingly2. Noted and edited accordingly3. Noted and edited accordingly4. Noted and edited accordingly5. Noted and edited accordingly6. Noted and edited accordingly7. Noted and corrected accordingly
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)	No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript.