From: **Frank, Patrick** pfrank@slac.stanford.edu
Subject: Re: Request 3rd review
Date: April 9, 2015 at 9:17 AM
To: Eo, Earth (ELS) earth-eo@elsevier.com
Cc: Ian.Candy@rhul.ac.uk, pfrank830@earthlink.net

PF

Dear Dr. Li,

Did you try any of the reviewers I suggested? It is difficult to believe that 9 of them would decline to review.

I am nearly done writing a response to review #1. The reviewer knows nothing of error analysis, the review is misconceived from the start, and is completely incompetent; scientifically meritless.

It is arbitrary that you should reject based one negative but incompetent review, in light a review #2 that is positive and constructive. It is more reasonable to accept based on the one competent and positive review.

Yours sincerely,

Pat Frank

On 4/9/2015 3:18 AM, Eo, Earth (ELS) wrote:

> Dear Dr. Frank,
> It took a quite long period for me to find suitable reviewers for your manuscript. I contacted 11 potential reviewers, and was turned down by 9 of them. I don't think that it is a good idea to continue a new set of request. Please submit your manuscirpt to other relevant journals.
> Sincerely yours,
> Tim Li
> Editor, ESR
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Patrick Frank [mailto:pfrank@slac.stanford.edu]
> Sent: Friday, April 03, 2015 3:16 AM
> To: Eo, Earth (ELS)
> Cc: pfrank830@earthlink.net; Ian.Candy@rhul.ac.uk
> Subject: Request 3rd review
>
> 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
****

--
++++++++++++
Patrick Frank
Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource
SLAC
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

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