



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	Fig. 1: "Geoengineering particulate trails". Authors must provide evidence that the photos are of chemtrails and are not mere contrails. Similar, Line 538 : "an activity that has been ongoing for at least two decades [44-50].", the references are only of the authors themselves. These allegations should be removed to give the manuscript more scientific nature.	We added discussion and a new figure (new Fig. 2) to show that the trails are chemtrails not contrails. We removed the sentence with the references [44-50]
Minor REVISION comments	It is a well know fact that the eruption of the Pinatubo lowered the temperature on the planet, yet, following the authors it should have increased the temperature. Can the authors elaborate on this?	We explained this in revision. Good point.
Optional/General comments	The authors extend on their own work (Ref 34-37), some of which I had the pleasure of reviewing too. I still think the peak of WWII (section 4) is an incorrect analysis and representation of the data. Yet, overall, the manuscript can be published after some adjustments.	We appreciate your efforts reviewing our work and the improvements resulting therefrom. In this paper in sections 6 and 7 we made use of non-ww2 observations to show the effect of particulate pollution reducing surface heat loss. We also pointed out that there was no appreciable change in CO2 during those war years based upon ice core data. Many thanks for your review.

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

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