



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_50545
Title of the Manuscript:	Geophysical Consequences of Tropospheric Particulate Heating: Yet Further Evidence that Global Warming is Caused by Particulate Pollution, Not Carbon Dioxide
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	<p>Individual Lines 99-102, Please supply data to indicate that the cause of global warming is due to particulate pollution, not CO2.</p> <p>Line 112-119 is particulate pollution. If so, how do you distinguish particulate pollution from CO2?</p> <p>Lune 117-118 nevertheless have direct climate, please show data from citation 51-54.</p> <p>Line 175 carbon-free desert, for example where?</p> <p>Line 177 cite <math>E=h\nu</math></p> <p>Line 183 <math>Fe_3O_4</math> change to Mixture of <math>Fe_2O_3 + FeO</math></p> <p>Line 188-189 Citation 42 is the resent results or previous results, which, please supply citation both of the resent results and previous results.</p> <p>Line 206 The effect of forest-fire is also origin of CO2, not always brown carbon aerosols[88,89,49,90-92].</p> <p>Line 213 snow disappearance causes CO2 volatilization.</p> <p>Line 234 please supply data to indicate trapped in Western nations.</p> <p>Line 236-242, please supply data that CFA increases over time. Because global warning increases over time.</p> <p>Line 241-242 CFA contains Fe and C, so how do you indicate that global warming is caused by particulate pollution, not CO2.</p> <p>Figure 2, please discuss why both TMIN and TMAX increase over time, but DTR decrease over time. The data is USA. The other countries indicate the same phenomenon. According citation 114 it is not all the same. Please discuss the reason.</p> <p>Line 265 DTM to DTR.</p> <p>Fig 3 terminated at 2020, should not prolong to 2040 because this is scientific discussion.</p> <p>Fig 3, why weighted average increase in WW2?</p> <p>Line 282-288 and 320-321 and Fig3 indicate no data of CO2, so from these how do you discuss about CO2?</p> <p>Ozone disruption is the different story from global warming, therefore delete lines 513-526 and Table 1.</p> <p>Conclusions are too long. Simple and condense.</p> <p>According to your paper I cannot delete CO2 as the cause of global warming and I agree to</p>	<p>We supplied references.</p> <p>Particulates are solids or liquids. CO2 is a gas.</p> <p>Please refer to references for data.</p> <p>Added. Doing that would have entailed too much technical description, for example describing real and imaginary components that would have been beyond the range of this paper.</p> <p>Correct as written.</p> <p>Reference 42 as reviewed refers to both previous and recent.</p> <p>CO2 is not the subject. The reference is for particulates, not CO2.</p> <p>CO2 is not the subject here.</p> <p>See references 95 and 96.</p> <p>Particulate pollution proxies in Fig. 3 increase over time. Data on geoengineering CFA addition to atmosphere not released to the public.</p> <p>There is much discussion on that subject in the paper.</p> <p>TMIN increases at a greater rate than TMAX as described in the paper. We did not discuss difference noted in citation because authors could not explain it except to speculate it might be because of ongoing human-induced land degradation.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Fig. 3 was reproduced with permission from the original and thus could not be changed.</p> <p>There are four data sets used, the weighted average was used to combine them into one curve.</p> <p>From ice-core data there was no significant change in CO2 over that period. Particulate pollution destroys ozone. It is relevant.</p> <p>Used previous conclusions as new section "Review Summary" and wrote a short conclusions section.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	add particulate pollution as the cause of global warming.	We very much appreciate your thoughtful review.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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