



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_54141
Title of the Manuscript:	Radiometric Evidence that Chemtrails are not Contrails
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>Please report in more detail on the source of information for weather conditions during the time of the experiment.</p> <p>Please explain why between 11.44 to 11.48 times, the wavelengths lower than 250 nanometers get predominant.</p> <p>Please revise the statement in lines 119-120: "Particulate matter in the troposphere becomes heated by solar radiation and radiation from Earth"... First of all, solar radiation, mainly consisting of short wavelength radiation, does not have heating effects, therefore it does not heat up particulate matter directly. This is the case of the earth radiation, which is a long wavelength radiation. There is a great difference between the two. Please check for their different emission spectra.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	N.A.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Now it seems that X Files series has produced a new sequel, revealing how science may once again make the difference between...science and non-science, namely between what is real and what is fake, in a world where almost nobody can tell the difference between the two any longer, not necessarily because the fake has become so perfect that it is taken for the original, but mainly because the public media and opinion gets more importance than science itself. In the case of this original paper, its very perseverant authors have ingeniously demonstrated that, in fact, the jet-sprayed particulate trails, improperly called contrails, are actually chemtrails, consisting of tropospheric aerosol engineering particles which absorb UV-B and C radiation. If they were genuine contrails, mainly composed of ice crystals, they wouldn't have absorbed the short wavelength radiation emitted by a spectral radiometer with fractional nanometer resolution, as demonstrated in the experiment presented in Fig. 3. This represents an irrefutable scientific proof that chemtrails are for real and they can't be mistaken as contrails, simply because ice crystals do not absorb these types of short wavelength radiation mainly emitted by the Sun. Moreover, Fig. 4 also shows that there may appear white, as well as black trails in the sky; the black ones proving that the coal fly ash they are mainly composed of, is greatly absorbing sunlight and, therefore, it would be unwise (not to say stupid) to insist on claiming that they are made of...ice crystals, that would otherwise reflect or scatter sunlight, and appear as white contrails....</p> <p>So, the authors of this article series on aerosol sprayed trails could be congratulated for their impeccable reasoning and logic. And for their excellent documentation and demonstration with most modern and adequate appliances, about the true existence and nature of chemtrails. However, there still remain some more minor aspects to be additionally clarified in this article as mentioned above, but its overall worth is beyond any doubt and fully deserves being published.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ionac Nicoleta
Department, University & Country	University of Bucharest, Romania