



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	The comments are included in the revised manuscript. Once these comments are incorporated/addressed, the manuscript will be acceptable for publication. Although the manuscript is mostly well-written, there are characterizations and assertions made in the text that are not substantiated by supporting facts and appropriate supporting references. A scientific journal article should not read like an opinion letter to the editor of a newspaper or magazine. If a statement is a characterization, assertion, or opinion, not supported by facts and references, it must be deleted from the text.	<p>It is a rare privilege to receive such a thorough review and a bit humbling to find revealed mistakes in the grammar of our native language! We have addressed all concerns except the commas in the reference list, as the reference list is generated by a computer program 'Endnote' which should be correct for Vancouver.</p> <p>We have especially endeavoured to address the matters related to a "secret international agreement" 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> <p>We sincerely appreciate your effort which has caused us to improve the manuscript substantially.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		