

From: Patrick Frank pfrank@slac.stanford.edu
Subject: Request 3rd review
Date: April 2, 2015 at 2:45 PM
To: Earth-Science Reviews earth-eo@elsevier.com
Cc: pfrank830@earthlink.net, Ian.Candy@rhul.ac.uk

PF

Dear Dr. Li,

This is a formal request for a third review of the manuscript; one by an authentic experimental physicist, not a climate modeler.

The manuscript is about physical error analysis, not the modeling of climate.

I will be plain: reviewer #1 has made freshman undergraduate mistakes. The review is not competent. The reviewer is not a peer; his comments are not a peer review.

I am a physical methods experimental chemist. You can consult my most recent paper at the Journal of Chemical Physics:
<http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jcp/142/8/10.1063/1.4908266>

Physical error analysis is part of my professional competence. It is manifestly and demonstrably not, among climate modelers. I will send you that demonstration.

I am looking for an editor with the courage to be a scientist, Dr. Li.

Kindly yours,

Pat Frank

On 3/31/15 6:57 AM, Earth-Science Reviews wrote:

Ref.: "On the reliability of global air temperature projections in light of propagated error: A critical review" (Dr. Patrick Frank)

Dear Dr. Frank,

I very much regret to have to tell you that publication in our journal is not recommended. An explanation for this decision is given in the attached review reports (and on <http://ees.elsevier.com/earth/>). I hope that the comments contained therein will be of use to you.

Thank you for your interest in our journal.

Kind regards,
Tim Li, PhD (Editor)
Earth-Science Reviews

--

Patrick Frank, Ph.D.
Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory
SLAC
Stanford University

Tel: +1-650-723-2479
email: pfrank@slac.stanford.edu
