

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_113160
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of air-sea CO2 flux during ARAMIS, EGEE and ROAM
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Title: avoid shortforms in the title</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid using shortforms in the abstract without defining them earlier. A good abstract should have problem statement, introductory statement, objectives, methodology, results and discussion, and finally conclusion of the work. This abstract somehow lacks all the elements above. Kindly rearrange the abstract following the sequence in summary presented in an abstract. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kindly recheck the formatting on how the citing of a reference should be presented. Appropriate format having author's name, and year is crucial for a good academic writing. It may be clearer if all the historical facts about the projects like ARAMIS, EGEE and ROAM are presented based on maps of the tropical Atlantic Ocean for illustrative clarity. <p>Data and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> From Table 1, the short form used like TA, DIC, SSS and SST should be redefined either in the caption of the table or as footnote for Figure 1. <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any methodology statement must be presented in past tense not present tense. Kindly recheck and make appropriate grammatical corrections. Same goes to other method sections as commented in item 1 under methods. It is recommended to rewrite the equation using Microsoft equation with proper definition for all symbols including correct units used in the equation. Kindly extract 2 equations and arrange using Microsoft equations as commented in item 3 under methods. <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 2 can have a better clarity if the images are bigger in size. The double regression equation is obtained by using a certain methodology. Unfortunately, the methodology is not stated under the methodology section. Kindly present the appropriate methodology to obtain the relationship equation. Many fundamental theories like CO₂ fugacity are presented as results, however, the theoretical understanding is not presented well in the introduction section or even in the methodology section. Kindly improve the presentation of the theories and findings. Kindly indicate all the projects and positions/locations on maps clearly in the methodology prior to any results presentations for appropriate reference. Kindly use a standardized use of terms for locations throughout the manuscript for instance, top panel basin In all Figures, kindly standardized the use of fonts and font size. In Figure 5, kindly name top panel as A and bottom panel as B. Thus, use identification like Fig. 5A or Fig. 5B in the results' explanations. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A good academic writing, there should not be any citation stated, for instance in this case, reference 24 should not be cited in conclusion. Avoid mention the conclusion for the first time in the conclusion section. Most appropriately, the conclusion section mentions about future recommendations about the project objectives or the results' impact about CO₂ release or problems. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amizon Azizan
Department, University & Country	School of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia