

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>                   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_PSIJ_23242  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Climate Sensitivity Parameter in the Test of the Mount Pinatubo Eruption |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Articles   |

### **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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

| <b>PART 1: Review Comments</b>                |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>   |
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b><br>REVISION comments | 1. The abstract is too long. It should be shortened.<br>2. Since the symbols, abbreviations and acronyms are given in the text, Table 1 should remove from the text.<br>3. The discussion must be given before Conclusion. The row must be changed. | 1. I have shortened the Abstract by removing the last sentence and now it is 291 words long.<br><br>2. Personally I find it always a good option to have a separate table for symbols and acronyms even though they are explained in a text as they appear the first time. It is difficult to find sometimes in a long text, where is the explanation for a symbol and Table is then a good solution.<br>3. The sections order will be changed. |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments         |   |   |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments       |   |   |