

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_96535
Title of the Manuscript:	HUMANITY LIVES ON THE COSMIC MICROWAVE
Type of the Article	Short communication

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:

(<https://www.journaligeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes, As it opens up a different level of thinking about natural phenomenon. Analogy with microwave oven with earth looks very interesting. Yes I think, abstract should be in convergent way of briefing about article. Start with broader idea of the article to its depth may be better. It is not found in this article. As per technical article, then it is not appropriate. If it is with experiments conducted pictures and some more studies would help us to understand it in better way. Partially may be correct No. Please add more reference on the studies made till now. Please try to find more recent papers.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Partially	
Optional/General comments	More supporting information is needed to convince this hypothesis.	

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:	G Sujaykumar
Department, University & Country	Yenepoya Institute of Technology, India