



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_46113
Title of the Manuscript:	Fundamental Climate Science Misunderstanding: Concomitant Harm to Humanity and the Environment
Type of the Article	Policy 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In this paper authors have investigated about the climate science community (CSC) that has misrepresented climate change, falsely claiming carbon dioxide causes global warming, and making computer models of Earth's radiation balance without taking into consideration the troposphere particulate geo-engineering that has been taking place for several decades, thus rendering invalid those models and their interpretations. During study, authors describe five policy proposals, applicable to all sovereign nations, to end geo-engineering attacks on citizens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study is very interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly.</li> </ul> <p><i>Following Explanations are needed-</i></p> <p><b>1. Lines 78-101: References</b> are not placed in sequence <i>these are to be reorganized and renamed in proper order.</i></p> <p><b>3. REDUCTION OF EARTH'S SURFACE HEAT LOSS</b> <i>is to be replaced as</i> <b>REASONS OF EARTH'S SURFACE HEAT LOSS</b></p> <p><b>7. Conclusions</b> <i>It is to be re-written point wise.</i></p>	<p>Many thanks for the review.</p> <p>1. More references have been added and efforts have been made to assure that these are in numerical order as of their first occurrence. Some references may appear out of order only because they are used two or more times.</p> <p>3. I used the suggested "Reasons" in the title of section 3. Good suggestion.</p> <p>7. Conclusions. I did not understand "point wise", but I did check and rewrite edit the conclusions which I believe now are proper and correct.</p> <p>Again, thanks for the prompt review.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Manuscript is interesting and structured properly.</p> <p><i>The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.</i></p>	



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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>