Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_44290**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Air Pollution, Not Greenhouse Gases: The Principal Cause of Global Warming**
Type of the Article	**Short Communication**

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	1. **Authors should rewrite the methodology** 2. **Authors should seek for reading proof of the manuscript for improve on the English standard of the manuscript.**	**Thank you for the review**. 2. Even among English proof-readers there is variation, for example, on placing commas. The English in the revised manuscript is improved at lease for some readers. 1. Since the 1960s, especially in Western nations, government-funded scientists have functioned more-or-less on a consensus basis, almost invariably failing to cite contradictory ideas and evidence. Consequently, the Methodology described in this manuscript likely will be unknown to most scientists. Although I made very minor revisions to the Methodology in the present revised manuscript, reviewers might benefit from the following discussion published in my 2008 book *Maverick's Earth and Universe*. "There is a much more fundamental way to make scientific discoveries and I disclose it here: An individual ponders and through tedious efforts arranges seemingly unrelated observations into a logical sequence in the mind so that causal relationships become evident and new understanding emerges, which can then be justified by experiment or by theoretical consideration. At first all this may seem somewhat confusing and abstract. But this is really just an extension and generalization of what we all do more-or-less subconsciously. One day in 1976, while having lunch with Nobel Laureate Harold C. Urey (1893-1981) and Nobel Laureate Hannes Alfvén (1908-1995), the subject of conversation turned to approaches for making scientific discoveries. Alfvén expressed frustration at trying to build a theory based upon three or four astrophysical theories because, as he said, there is very little chance that all would be correct. When I described the approach I use for making scientific discoveries, Alfvén's eyes opened widely and he exclaimed, "Oh! How fundamental!" Urey just smiled at me. Harold Urey was a good friend and mentor." To some this might seem to be more philosophy than science, but properly applied it is both. Recall, for example, Isaac Newton's book, translated from Latin, is entitled "Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy."

		To a great extent, post- World War II scientists tend to be specialists building upon some perceived model(s) of nature and all too often fail to realize or take into account that we live in a highly-connected natural world. By applying the Methodology I describe, a scientist through tedious efforts can arrange seemingly-independent observations into a logical sequence so that causal relationships become evident thus leading to new observations, ideas for new experiments and/or new theoretical considerations, and ultimately to new discoveries. The best way to understand this is by example. In 1979 I published a paper in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* (PDF) describing the logical progression of understanding leading to a new concept on the composition of Earth's inner core. A government official, who had never encountered a paper of that type, queried Prof. Dr. Hans E. Suess, who described my PRSL paper as "a fundamental statement." The best way to understand some of the implications and advances that stemmed from that 1979 PRSL paper is to read the 2014 *Current Science* review article (PDF). The geoscience community in Western nations not only ignores published contradictions, but actively acts to suppress them. For example, the above *Current Science* paper was first submitted to an Elsevier journal, but the editor, a geology professor at the University of Oxford, rejected the paper without any reviews with just a brief nonsense statement; that is not science. The present manuscript, "Air Pollution, Not Greenhouse Gases: The Principal Cause of Global Warming", might be described as "a fundamental statement." In essence it is the consequence of arranging seemingly-independent observations into a logical sequence so that causal relationships become evident and thus will lead to new observations, new ideas for experiments and/or theoretical considerations, and ultimately to new discoveries.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	