



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor 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"> The study is very interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly. <p>Following Explanations are needed-</p> <p>1. Lines 78-101: References are not placed in sequence these are to be reorganized and renamed in proper order.</p> <p>3. REDUCTION OF EARTH'S SURFACE HEAT LOSS is to be replaced as REASONS OF EARTH'S SURFACE HEAT LOSS</p> <p>7. Conclusions</p> <p>It is to be re-written point wise.</p>	
Optional/General 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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Bharat Raj Singh</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>School of Management Sciences, India</i>