



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>)

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		
Optional/General comments	The public and the scientific community have been systematically deceived into falsely believing that the pervasive, jet-sprayed 'chemtrails' are harmless ice-crystal contrails. We have presented radiometric measurements which unambiguously prove the falsity of that characterization for one specific, but typical instance. We show in a more general framework that the physical manifestations of the aerial trails are inconsistent with ice-crystal contrails, but entirely consistent with aerosol particulate trails. We describe potential reasons for the deception, and cite the extremely adverse consequences of the aerial spraying on human and environmental health. For the sake of life on Earth, the modification of the natural environment by aerial particulate spraying and other methodologies must immediately and permanently end. A good research attempt.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Irshad Ullah
Department, University & Country	Pakistan