



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_42006
Title of the Manuscript:	Fifty Years after “How to Wreck the Environment”: Anthropogenic Extinction of Life on Earth
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

	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	<p>The idea and the manner in which the authors of this article presented their assumptions and findings on covert technological activities in the global atmosphere is admirable but, for attaining a more balanced approach, they are suggested to think whether the following two suggestions deserve attention too:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The hypothesis of “a secret international agreement” is “presumably” considered to be true and, therefore, is strikingly repeated more times throughout the article. Please be aware that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) scientific debates should be well defended and supported with solid evidence and facts and, as long as the authors are not able to provide at least credible, convincing proofs to support their clear-cut statements, they should withstand a more prudent approach; b) the freedom of opinion and speech, no matter how rightfully supported with hard facts they may be, is no substitute for sheer cause-effect fundamental truth. 2. The authors seem to leave an important issue out of their debate, namely there are specific international and national laws, regulations and provisions supporting the legal, although differing, interventions in the atmosphere (e.g. cloud-seeding) and, therefore, they should also accept the fact that, unless such activities are completely banned on legal grounds, they may still be performed within the legal limits they are permitted. It's unfair but it's also true ! So, which truth prevails? The judicial or the scientific one? Or the ethical one? 	<p>We appreciate this reviewer's efforts and the review.</p> <p>We have endeavoured to address this comment in our revisions. Here we focused on general considerations, rather than citing numerous individual observations, including false and/or misleading responses from officials queried about the aerial spraying that are reported on numerous opposition websites and in the social media. The near-daily, near-global aerial spraying is a massive undertaking and health wise quite toxic by comparison to occasional cloud-seeding for agricultural and recreational purposes. Nevertheless, we as scientists have, or should have, the ability to elucidate misrepresentations connected with scientific activities and, in doing so, strive for the betterment of civilization. And, while we may not be able to specifically cite a particular “secret international agreement”, we should be permitted a lower standard of evidence as is permitted in public health, viz. the Precautionary Principle, in instances when many people are threatened or great resources might be needed for treatment.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Please provide explicit reference for Figure 3.	We have provided it to the extent possible.
Optional/General comments	<p>The review article debating on the overall potential disruptive and destructive effects of particulate aerial spraying is not quite an unbiased approach on a most vital weather warfare issue but its extremely well documented content with objective scientific facts, its clearly and systematically defended conclusions and, above all, its consistency and full compliance with findings which have already been certified by the <i>International Program of Chemical Safety</i>, through its <i>Environmental Health Criteria</i> published series, turns it into more than an overview of Gordon J.F. MacDonalds' forecasts; it actually stands for a proof-sound account of serious scientific premises and findings related to one of nowadays most important taboo problems: an increasing weaponized atmosphere and environment at all costs.</p> <p>The wide display of objective, scientific arguments; the abundant references, facts and figures supporting all statements; the clear and systematic organization of problems and plans of reference; the correct explanation of natural processes and tele-connections; the plain, perfect English language etc. are some of the main attributes pleading for the acceptance and publication of this article which in fact, voices up an “inconvenient truth”..., thus taking sides on Man's survival in an endangered environment.</p>	Thank you.