



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Methodology section must be completed and detailed to be more concise by authors.</p> <p>One wonders is this paper of philosophy or science? The methodology being replicable in science, I invite the authors to give more elements of understanding of the method/methodology used in their manuscript.</p> <p>Otherwise I think that Results section was compiled with discussion one. Important to reveal this aspect in section 3.</p> <p>L29-31 How can authors refer to "have been intentionally and covertly sprayed ..." in science? That need to be clarified and more argued!</p> <p>L85-90 The analysis of the curve indicates that the increase did not start from 0. Even if this increase seems slight before the peak, it is to be considered, and if so, what would be the reason? Moreover, the graph clearly indicates that around the 1950s, there was an increase that did not stop and that does not seem to stop until 2040. What is more, what do the authors think is driving this exponential growth? It would be interesting if the authors could justify the allegations made. This would make sense if the authors showed that the reasons given cut across a significant number of pollution sources.</p> <p>Conclusion of the manuscript seem raw and laconic.</p>	
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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Radji Raoufou Pierre</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Lomé, Togo</i>