



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please dilute the word 'misinformed' with another mild word. 2. This 'Conclusion' section should be the 'Review Summary' or 'Summary of Review'. Please write another 'Conclusion' for the review. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We changed 'misled' to 'misinformed'. Could not find a milder word that conveys the meaning. 2. We did this and it is an improvement. <p>The references are in the appropriate journal format.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you possibly establish a comparative study of CO₂ causing global warming and particulate heating causing global warming? If there are such studies where the two causative factors have been experimented and compared in order to establish which of the factors contributes the greatest of the global warming it will be fine. 	<p>That is a great idea, but virtually impossible currently as global results are always based upon models which employ assumptions and are severely limited by lack of experimental measurements especially on aerosols. Nevertheless, we found and included in revision a report of an experimental study that found in that instance that the "<i>contribution of absorbing aerosols to the heating rate was an order of magnitude larger than the contribution of CO₂ and one-third that of the water vapour.</i>"</p>
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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