



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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the paper, it is aimed to reveal unacknowledged causality leading to increases in combustibility, intensity, and extent of wildfires. For this purpose, existing literature including scientific and medical, and evidence, including photographic, of near-daily, near-global jet-spraying particulates in the atmosphere as related to wildfires were used. In this aspect, it seems an interesting contributions for the readers. I think it is a work that is generally acceptable. However, the following corrections and additions should be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The position on the world and legend information of the imagery presented in Figure 1 will be useful for the reader. • The information provided in the last paragraph in the introduction should be accompanied by a reference if possible. • What is the source of the photos presented in Figure 2? Are these photos taken by the authors? It must be specified. If possible, the location information of these photographs should also be given(Figs 2-6). • In particular, the effects of these particulates should be presented and discussed in Section 2. • Section 2.1 is written somewhat like magazine news. It is far from being scientific. Consider the entirety again in accordance with scientific ethics. • The imagery and information presented in Figure 8 should be discussed in more detail in the text. The visual and information presented in Figure 8 should be discussed in more detail in the text. If possible, it should be associated with the results in Section 4.6 and especially in Figure 9. • "I / we" expressions should not be included in a scientific study. Please, correct it. • In the Conclusion, the findings already listed in the text are re-ordered in paragraphs. The Reader should be reconsidered to improve relevance, and a few suggestions should be added at the end. Because, in this study, many valuable results have been obtained in terms of the reader's suggestion. <p>In addition, the reviewer is not satisfied with the language too, please ask some native speakers to polish the revised manuscript. By a careful improving of the some expressions and statements, adding some explanations and correcting some English grammar and</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	spelling mistakes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest minor revision before the possible publication in Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International. The reviewer requests that a revised manuscript should be prepared based on the comments and suggestions above.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>R. Cuneyt Erenoglu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Geomatics Engineering, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey</i>