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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

	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	Reading the text, he even seemed well argued and referenced. However, I came across some statements that seemed to me speculation and not science, as follows: "There is something inherently dishonest about geoengineering articles that neither mention nor discuss the effects of tropospheric aerial particulate emplacement done by the military and its various commercial contractors, an activity that has been ongoing for at least two decades..." "Moreover, many of them appear to be naïve about the catastrophic dangers proposed by solar radiation management and other geoengineering schemes, and invariably fail to even mention the ongoing tropospheric geoengineering and its risks..." I can understand that the text is intended to act as a denunciation of what the military is doing against the global climate, but I do not understand why this is in a scientific paper. There is no scientific proof of this. Specifically about it! The Science values the truth, but it is the truth obtained through the "Scientific Method". If you can't get evidence - through the Scientific Method - proving that the military is using geoengineering to change the climate - then that statement should not be here in a scientific journal. You say your fellow scientists are naive, but I say they are smart! If the Scientific Method proved that you want it, anyone capable of using The Method could prove it. If it cannot be proved by the Scientific Method, it is not Science. If anyone could say what they wanted in a scientific article without the validation of the Scientific Method, any and all speculation would be valid and we would turn to the Dark Ages. I understand there is a good intention to warn people, but I searched through all the texts and found no proof - based on the Scientific Method - proving that it is <u>the military</u> who is using geoengineering to change the climate.	
Minor REVISION comments	No coments.	
Optional/General comments	The study is well founded and has shown promise. However, the authors should remove from the text the arguments without scientific proof, or should cite in the text - or in parentheses - that the statement needs proof, or scientific consensus.	

	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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Gabrielli Teresa Gadens Marcon*
Department, University & Country	*University of Rio Grande do Sul State, Brazil*