



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The Abstract: Good suggestion. Done.</p> <p>Your statement in line 16-18: I would prefer you reframe it this way: 'Climate change, specifically cause a change in temperature and atmospheric water vapor [1-3] ...' Add this reference [Ukhurebor, K.E; Abiodun, I.C (2018) 'Variation in Annual Rainfall Data of Forty Years (1978-2017) for South-South, Nigeria', <i>Journal of Applied Sciences & Environmental Management</i>, Vol. 22(4), pp 511-518, DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jasem.v22i4.13] to it.</p> <p>Your statement in line 68: Would be better as 'Sometime around 2010 the...'</p> <p>Your statement in line 104: Is somehow too authoritative and destructive. It would be scientifically unethical. So, I would kindly suggest you reframe it this way: 'The 2005 U. S. Air Force Document AFD-0561013-001 did not given a correct detail about the aerial spraying...' Please, it would be better if you do same both in your abstract and everywhere you have used such authoritative and destructive statements.</p> <p>Your statement in line 210-211: 'The purposes of the aerial spraying, like the composition of the aerosol particulates, are closely held secrets...' This is a very powerful statement, referencing it would be better.</p> <p>References: In line 585-587 you used <i>et al</i>, note that the names of all the authors must be written in the reference. Please, check out your references arrangements.</p>	<p>Abstract: That would be our preference but other reviewers in the past have objected.</p> <p>Added reference and made wording more precise.</p> <p>Changes wording to accommodate several reviewers.</p> <p>Modified statement.</p> <p>No references available except ours.</p> <p>Vancouver style only shows 5 then et al.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Please, try and avoid the use of authoritative and destructive statements when faulting some other research studies. Also check out for some other minute errors especially grammatical ones.	Improved that
Optional/General comments	This manuscript reviews the unacknowledged causality that leads to increasing combustibility, intensity and the extent of California wildfires and concomitant harm to human and environmental health. I wish to commend the effort of the author(s) because they did moderately well in this review study.	Thank you and thanks for the review.



SDI Review Form 1.6

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