

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>                        |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JGEESI_83779</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Development of an Environment and Climate Data Acquisition System (EC-DAQS) for Radio Meteorology</b> |
| Type of the 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 | <div>1. Focus on abbreviations throughout the entire article, such as ADC, LCD, and DAQS in abstract, and Liquid Crystal Display in Section 2.3.</div> <div>2. In the first two lines in Section 2.2, it is hard to clarify they and them. Please clarify.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>6. The English must be improved. There are too many wording issues to identify them.</div> |   |
| Minor REVISION comments      | <div>1. There are no (a) and (b) in Fig 1. Fig 2, and Fig 3.</div> <div>2. In the fourth line in Section 2.2, i think the digitized should be digitizes.</div> <div>3. In the fifth line in Section 2.2, i think the pass should be passes.</div> <div>4. In the sixth line in Section 2.2, the statements before "cycle" show a flow but not a cycle.</div> <div>5. The second paragraph in Section 3.2, There are no equations (5) and (6).</div> <div>6. The RMSE is expressed as <math>\sqrt{\text{sum}(\text{obs-forecst})^2/\text{num}}</math>.</div> <div>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.</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? | <div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div> |   |

Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | Yanqiu Gao                              |
| Department, University & Country | Second Institute of Oceanography, China |