

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled, " <b>Evaluation of Selected Empirical Schemes of Calculating Sensible Heat Flux from Routinely-Measured Meteorological Parameters in a Tropical Location</b> " 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.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. In abstract part, "In the wet season, BP, BREB, HU, SMT and ST had MBE values of <math>37.4 \text{ Wm}^{-2}</math>, <math>14.2 \text{ Wm}^{-2}</math>, <math>4.2 \text{ Wm}^{-2}</math>, <math>12.0 \text{ Wm}^{-2}</math> and <math>-1.1 \text{ Wm}^{-2}</math> respectively." Please use comma and correct throughout manuscript.</li><li>2. Introduction part is too narrowed. Could you revise starting from general to specific?</li><li>3. What is novelty of this study? It should be clearly stated very carefully to make it easy for readers.</li><li>4. Methodology of this research is not clearly stated. The authors are recommended to use flow chart in procedure of their works.</li><li>5. In result and discussion where is the authors inferences? Revise and compare with previously reported works.</li><li>6. Figures legends and Tabular explanation is displaced fixed table mode and make it visible for all readers.</li><li>7. Grammar problems, typo errors and at the end of conclusion giving direction for readers.</li><li>8. The authors used very old references. It is better if they update all references (2019-2022) to use recent information.</li></ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Abel Saka Gungure
Department, University & Country	Dambi Dollo University, Ethiopia