



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_44148
Title of the Manuscript:	California Wildfires: Role of Undisclosed Atmosphere Manipulation (Geoengineering)
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>In Abstract, the first usage of U.S. should be written in full. Other abbreviations can follow suit.</p> <p>In line 47, "like author JMH", kindly provide, if available any other supporting reference to buttress the fact/testimony stated from line 47 to 55</p> <p>The assessment is remotely sensed. That is very good. However, further investigation such as laboratory tests of particulate matter, water or what have you would provide more empirical findings. If such tests were done as reported in lines 168 to 176, the results should be stated clearly and displayed in tables if possible</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>We opted to provide references to data rather than make tables here so as not to distract or discourage the reader from the information provided.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is interesting and controversial. It attempts to expose the unknown about man's role on impending climatic vagaries in the USA with some level of evidence. The study is good and timely. The manuscript would draw the attention of relevant bodies in the U.S. government. That is good however.	Many thanks for your review. It is much appreciated.

PART 2:

	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)	