

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_115837
Title of the Manuscript:	CO2 and Climate Change: Unveiling the Missing Experimental Evidence
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Topic covered in the manuscript is important for scientific community. The title is suitable. Abstract (and main body of the manuscript) draws the conclusion prematurely with insufficient/unclear evidence. The authors do not seem to have direct/enough scientific/engineering training themselves to understand and thus evaluate the grand topic they're trying to cover. Section 2.1 is not necessary. Section 2.2 is overly simplified with insufficient details. Sections 3 & 4 are too hasty for a seemingly preset conclusion. 	<p>Ad 3: Being somewhat flabbergasted by the choice of (inappropriate) language ("The authors do not seem to have direct/enough scientific/ engineering training themselves to understand and thus evaluate the grand topic they're trying to cover."), especially from someone who lacks familiarity with my credentials, I would even agree to offer – on request – to furnish an insight to my CV. For what concerns the topic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an abstract is supposed to deliver the content in concise form (see, e.g., https://www.jsq.utexas.edu/flemings/files/Landes-1951-A-Scrutiny-of-the-Abstract.pdf), to implement the reviewer's suggestions adaptations have been included in the text, yet, I suggest a clear and concise language and try to avoid loquaciousness. An additional source demonstrating a failed experiment has been included. <p>Ad 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the current discourse surrounding climate change, it becomes increasingly essential to incorporate section 2.1, as it represents a pivotal aspect that has been conspicuously absent in ongoing discussions—the notable dearth of empirical evidence. Nonetheless, it has been shortened to comply with the reviewer's suggestions. Section 2.2, in contrast, maintains an appropriate brevity, reflective of the absence of substantial empirical support. Given this absence (of empirical evidence), expanding sections 3 and 4 to arrive at the same conclusion appears not appropriate. Nevertheless, minor additional clarifications have been included to comply with the reviewer's suggestion. The reviewer's insinuation of a "preset conclusion" lacks elucidation and demands further clarification. However, perhaps it helps to re-emphasize what I wrote in the email for submission: "<i>The intention of this submission is not to cast doubt on the efforts of the scientific community in addressing climate change. Rather, it is an earnest call to reinforce our collective understanding through rigorous experimentation, thereby fortifying the credibility of our scientific assertions. It is my hope that this article will serve as a catalyst for further research and discussion within the field.</i>"
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Language is very good.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The conclusion on this grand topic is drawn on merely 9 valid questionnaire responses. Question was not clearly specified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Question was not clearly specified.": None of the addressees, i.e. the experts and the institutions, even commented on an alleged lack of clarity. (If the inquiry really lacks clarity in its formulation, guidance on appropriate rephrasing is solicited. I.e., what shall be changed?) The conclusion did not stem from the analysis of nine valid questionnaires only. Rather, it was derived from a comprehensive literature review spanning seven months, exhaustive exploration utilizing all available tools, and subsequent outreach to globally recognized institutions such as the NOAA in the United States for additional support. It is essential to acknowledge that notwithstanding the aforementioned critiques, the reviewer has not demonstrated the inaccuracy of the article's central assertion. That is to say, it appears that the reviewer, too, lacks

Review Form 1.7

		<p>cognizance of any empirical evidence that would refute the central hypothesis underpinning decarbonization initiatives.</p> <p>Personal observation: Upon commencing this research, my primary objective was straightforward: to find a description of an experiment for presentation to students. However, I was increasingly taken aback and discouraged by the apparent lack of full adherence within the community to fundamental principles of scientific analysis. Put differently, I would have preferred that the need for writing this article did not arise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Furthermore, it is critical to emphasize that the absence of empirical evidence, as discussed, represents a novel finding; to the best of my knowledge, this particular outcome has not been previously documented in the scientific literature.
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	