

From: **Patrick Frank** pfrank830@earthlink.net
Subject: Re: 5153401: Decision Finalized
Date: January 8, 2017 at 7:53 PM
To: Jorge Gonzalez-cruz jgonzalezcruz@ccny.cuny.edu
Cc: Rana Ali rana.ali@hindawi.com

PF

Dear Prof. Gonzalez,

Apparently you did not receive the entire submission file, which should have included documents from prior submission 3852317. This seems a grievous omission.

I attach the point-by-point responses to the reviews for previous manuscript 3852317 for your information.

Please convince yourself about the quality of the two negative reviews. I have no doubt but that you'll agree they are entirely incompetent.

With two incompetent reviews, and a third review finding no error, manuscript 3852317 should have been published after the first round.

Apparently you did not receive the Editorial Supplement with 5153401, either. It would have provided ample evidence of the general incompetence of climate modelers as regards physical error analysis.

I also attach my response to your one reviewer from the 2014 review he mentions, which is effectively identical to the review provided to you. On examination of the response, you'll find the review thoroughly incompetent.

Your reviewer is not expert in error analysis. He is incompetent in the subject. He is not qualified to review a manuscript on physical error analysis. His is not a peer review.

The caution of inexpertise was included in my cover letter, and copious evidence was provided. I regret it was ignored.

If you were not given the full submission documentation, you have every right to be embarrassed, and upset with the journal. There would be no excuse for such fundamental negligence.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick Frank, Ph.D.

Palo Alto, CA 94301

email: pfrank830@earthlink.net

++++
These things are, we conjecture, like the truth;
But as for certain truth, no one has known it.

Xenophanes, 570-500 BCE

++++



Reviewer #1
Response.pdf



Reviewer #2
Response.pdf



Reviewer #3
Response.pdf



Reviewer 1
Response.pdf

On Jan 8, 2017, at 7:02 PM, Jorge Gonzalez-cruz <jgonzalezcruz@ccny.cuny.edu> wrote:

Dear Prof. Frank,

If you decide for a re-submission, it will help your cause to provide a point by point rebuttal to all reviewers' comments (from both submissions).

I assure you our reviewers are the most knowledgeable in the field, and we reserve the right to choose them according to their expertise in the subject matter.

Sincerely,

J.

Prof. Jorge E. Gonzalez, Ph.D. FASME
NOAA CREST Professor of Mechanical Engineering
The City College of New York
Office: Steinman Hall (T-238)

140th and Convent Ave.
New York, NY 10031
Voice (212)650-5279
Email: jgonzalezcruz@ccny.cuny.edu
Webpage: <http://cuerg.ccny.cuny.edu>

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Frank [mailto:pfrank830@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, January 8, 2017 4:43 PM
To: rana.ali@hindawi.com
Cc: gonzalez@me.ccny.cuny.edu
Subject: Re: 5153401: Decision Finalized

Dear Prof. Gonzalez,

Thank-you for your notification.

The Editorial Supplement that accompanied 5153401 is of relevance. Item 5 therein treats a criticism identical to one made by the current reviewer (p. 2, par. 2).

That criticism shows no understanding of error analysis, and is scientifically meritless. Please consult item 5 for the demonstration.

The two negative reviews of prior manuscript 3852317 were thoroughly incompetent. This is beyond any dispute, as my point-by-point responses fully demonstrated.

Reviews having no critical merit cannot remain outstanding. I am left to wonder whether the responses were consulted at all.

In my cover letter, I asked that no climate modeler be used as reviewer because they do not understand physical error analysis. The Editorial Supplement fully documented that case.

However, you clearly ignored that request. The result is an incompetent review.

I will write a response. It will provide evidence, yet again, that climate modelers are not competent in physical error analysis. Do send it along to the reviewer.

Yours sincerely,

Patrick Frank, Ph.D.
Palo Alto, CA 94301
email: pfrank830@earthlink.net

+++++

These things are, we conjecture, like the truth; But as for certain truth, no one has known it.

Xenophanes, 570-500 BCE

+++++

On Jan 8, 2017, at 12:30 PM, Jorge E. Gonzalez <amete@hindawi.com> wrote:

Dear Dr. Frank,

After reviewing your Research Article 5153401 titled "Propagation of Error and the Reliability of Global Air Temperature Projections" by Patrick Frank, I regret to inform you that it was found to be unsuitable for publication in Advances in Meteorology. You may log in to the Manuscript Tracking System in order to read the review report(s) received for your manuscript.

The major concern is that after detail review of your manuscript, we found that is a nearly identical version of a previously submitted manuscript (3852317) to this journal, and the issues raised then by the reviewers remain outstanding. A re-submission is an acceptable approach for this journal, in such cases, authors should provide a point by point rebuttal of the issues raised, and how the new submission was in general improved. This was not the case. Reviewers remain skeptical of your content. Therefore, the outcome is similar as the previous submission.

We do apologize for the delayed response, it took significant effort to verify these points, and hope you consider your journal for your future research.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Advances in Meteorology, and we wish you the very best in your research.

Sincerely,

Jorge E. Gonzalez
gonzalez@me.ccny.cuny.edu

