

From: Lupo, Anthony R. LupoA@missouri.edu
Subject: RE: 5153401: Decision Finalized
Date: January 13, 2017 at 10:31 AM
To: pfrank830@earthlink.net



Patrick:

Good afternoon. Thanks for the copy. This letter is warranted. They should have sent the back to me.

Thanks!

Best,
Tony

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: pfrank830@earthlink.net
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 12:21 AM
To: [Rana Ali](#)
Cc: [Jorge Gonzalez-cruz](#); gonzalez@me.ccny.cuny.edu; [Lupo, Anthony R.](#)
Subject: Re: 5153401: Decision Finalized

Dear Ms. Ali,

Thank-you for your email notice. I have now submitted the manuscript to another journal, terminating my manuscript submission with Advances in Meteorology. This in part because the Journal has seriously violated its ethical duty.

From the evidence adduced below, the Journal:

- deliberately withheld information from me,
- attempted perpetration of fraud,
- short-circuited Prof. Lupo's proper standing,
- misrepresented the resubmission to Prof. Gonzalez-cruz,
- withheld from Prof. Gonzalez-cruz critically central documentation, including
 - the resubmission cover letter
 - the author responses to the first round reviews, and
 - knowledge of the first submission itself.

Given the above, I can no longer have any confidence in the Journal or in the Journal's review process.

With this email, therefore, I formally withdraw the submission of Propagation of Error..., your manuscript number 5153401, from the Journal purview.

Ms. Rana, I expect you were merely following the directives of someone else, perhaps the Chief Editor and/or the Publisher of the Journal.

Nevertheless, the behavior of the Journal came to light when, upon receiving the rejection email from Prof. Gonzalez-cruz, I discovered he was unaware that I had responded to the first round of reviews. After I sent Prof. Gonzalez-cruz my written responses, he admitted to having never before seen them.

The responses to the reviewers had been appended to the resubmission cover letter. Had Prof. Gonzalez-cruz received that letter he would have possessed the reviews. Therefore, the Journal did

Gonzalez-cruz received that letter he would have possessed the reviews. Therefore, the Journal did not supply it.

Prof. Gonzalez-cruz was surprised to discover the manuscript had been submitted previously (email of January 8, 2017 12:30 pm). Therefore, the Journal must have represented manuscript to him as a new submission.

Beginning August 2, 2016, Ms. Rana, your artfully worded emails avoided mentioning the name of the resubmission editor. You made only cryptic references to "The Editor."

We now understand that your art was meant to obscure the fact that Prof. Lupo had been removed as manuscript editor, and Prof. Gonzalez-cruz assigned.

You did not admit this editorial change until well after I had inadvertently discovered it. It is to be strongly suspected that had I not discovered it, this misdirection would have persisted through the entire process.

The discovery occurred on 29 October 2016, when I emailed to Prof. Lupo asking about the resubmission review status. Prof. Lupo replied (31 October email) that, "[The Journal] never gave me the resubmitted article. Someone else has this."

This was my first indication of the Journal's editorial switch. Further communication revealed the switch was done without notifying Prof. Lupo.

I then asked you to identify the manuscript editor (3 Nov. email). Your November 7 reply was again occult, referencing only "The Editor."

I therefore repeated the request (7 Nov. email). On 14 November, you finally identified Prof. Gonzalez-cruz, more than three months after resubmission.

The evidence of bad faith on the part of the Journal is stark. Once again, the Journal:

- deliberately withheld information from me,
- attempted to perpetrate a fraud,
- short-circuited Prof. Lupo's proper standing,
- misrepresented the resubmission to Prof. Gonzalez-cruz,
- withheld from Prof. Gonzalez-cruz critically central documentation, including
 - the resubmission cover letter
 - the author responses to the first round reviews, and
 - knowledge of the first submission itself.

The Journal has behaved disgracefully and has committed serious ethical violations. In my view, the Journal has made itself unworthy.

Cordially yours,

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 11, 2017, at 11:39 PM, Rana Ali <rana.ali@hindawi.com> wrote:

~

>
> Dear Dr. Frank,
>
> Thank you for your feedback. Dr. Gonzalez has received your comments and we will inform you as soon as we receive his feedback.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Rana
>
> --
> *****
> Rana Ali
> Editorial Office
> Hindawi Publishing Corporation
> <http://www.hindawi.com>
> *****
>
>
> On 1/9/2017 5:53:18 AM, Patrick Frank pfrank830@earthlink.net wrote:
>
>> 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
>> ++++++
>
>