From: **Andrew Miall** miall@es.utoronto.ca
Subject: Re: ESR speaks
Date: September 8, 2015 at 7:36 AM
To: Patrick Frank pfrank830@earthlink.net

AM

Dear Patrick:

I copy below the response I just got from Dan Lovegrove, the Elsevier journal manager. It would appear that Elsevier did try quite hard to get appropriate reviewers for this paper. I don't think ESR can take this any further now. I am not qualified to push this myself, not having the knowledge of your area of science.

Cheers,
Andrew

Yes, this paper has been a bit of a headache. The same rules would apply to Soon's paper: namely that if we can find at least two reviewers to peer review it, and their reviews are favourable enough, then it will be accepted for publication if determined by the editor to be of high enough quality.

Up until now, we have not managed to find many people who have even been willing to review it. Part of the reason I believe is that it deals with climate change from a much more 'atmospherical physics' viewpoint and so it sits at the very edge of what the journal publishes. I think the author would have more success if he submitted it to a specialist journal where it is more suited to the scope.

For what it is worth, when the first submission was made to Tim Li, one reviewer was strongly negative and the other reviewer (suggested by the author) was lukewarm about it. A further 9 reviewers (including 3 suggested by the author) declined the opportunity to review or did not respond to the invitation. In its second pass, overseen by Manfred Strecker, a further 5 reviewers (including 1 suggested by the author) were invited: none of them agreed to review. I am not sure whether any changes to the manuscript were made in light of feedback from the first submission.

I am reluctant for this manuscript to be considered further in its present form, given how many unsuccessful tries to get it peer reviewed there have been, and because the two reviews that it did receive were not encouraging. If however you feel that you would be prepared to oversee its peer review so that two objective and impartial reviews can be obtained, I would be willing to reconsider a further resubmission. Please note that this is quite exceptional and that in the normal course of events if an author does resubmit a subsequent version of the 'same' manuscript, the reasons have to be compelling and/or the points raised during earlier rounds of peer review must have been incorporated or rebutted by the authors.

On 29 Aug 2015 at 5:33, Patrick Frank wrote:

Dear Andrew,

By now you probably know that ESR has returned the second submission without sending it out for review. This, after four months.

Tim Horscroft's ostensible reason was they, "were not able to find referees who wish to engage with the ms."

I know that at least two among my suggested reviewers would have agreed to review.

Tim also misrepresented round one, writing, "You will recall the previous version under number EARTH2700 that was declined based on the reviews."

One review recommended publication and the other was shown thoroughly incompetent. ESR declined despite the reviews. Tim's description is an inversion.

This all seems a bit gratuitous.

I'm sorry to say ESR's response apparently evidences an editorial courage that does not rise to its convictions. In my experience this is become banal.

Best wishes,

Pat

Patrick Frank
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
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Andrew D. Miall, B.Sc., Ph.D., D.Sc., FRSC
Professor of Geology
Gordon Stollery Chair in Basin Analysis and
Petroleum Geology
Department of Earth Sciences
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 3B1, Canada
Res: (416) 236-9264
Bus: (416) 978-8841
Mobile: (647) 588-6562
miall@es.utoronto.ca
http://webcan.es.utoronto.ca/people/faculty/miall-andrew/
