



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_48873
Title of the Manuscript:	Further Evidence that Particulate Pollution is the Principal Cause of Global Warming: Humanitarian Considerations
Type of the Article	Review 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:

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



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	N.A.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	N.A.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This paper advances mind-blowing theories about how particulate pollution may actually be the cause of global warming instead of global cooling, by speculating, in an extremely inventive and intelligent way, on the drawbacks of conventional thinking. From this point of view, the authors, who still keep deep-footed in the ground, orchestrate a puzzling mental game on how separate items of information could be re-arranged and re-built in new thinking patterns to reverse some existing pre-definite scientific misconceptions. They should be given all merits and credits: for their out- and up-standing position on their own original point of view. After all, who guarantees that scientific truth is unilateral? And this is exactly what this paper demonstrates: that reality may sometimes be reversed.</p> <p>The main important contributions of this paper relate to the followings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The mechanism through which aerosol particulate pollutants lead to local or global warming has been completely reviewed and renewed with new facts and findings about how they absorb radiation and heat up the troposphere, how this resulting heat is transferred to surrounding atmosphere, how the general convective processes are severely diminished due to the marked decrease of adverse temperature gradient relative to the Earth's surface and to the reduction of the convection-driven surface heat loss.</li> <li>2. The main quantitative index that objectively demonstrates this process is DTR (diurnal temperature range), representing one of the most important ETCCDI indices of universal reference for magnitude of air-cooling and/or warming processes.</li> <li>3. The actual mechanism of reversed convection is demonstrated by a simple demonstration experiment which provides critical and convincing insight on how convection works and by interesting WWII evidence on thermal peaks due to increased concentrations of debris and smoke in the atmosphere of military combat and bombardment places.</li> <li>4. The already unanimously known negative effects of PM pollutants on human health are emphasized by new proofs regarding the neurodegenerative diseases and undeniable WHO statistics which show a marked increase of specific morbidity and mortality.</li> <li>5. The state of the matter relating to geo-engineering techniques is presented in a very dramatic but artistic manner, reflecting the strong convictions that the authors have on their own truth, approach and understanding of the problem.</li> </ol> <p>And all due respect should be given to the authors of this paper for their most determined way of seeing and stating things. After all, even Galileo Galilei himself dared to say that the Earth revolves around the Sun in a time when everybody else believed the contrary!</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ionac Nicoleta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bucharest, Romania</b>