12 April 2015

Re: ESR-15-00044

Dear Dr. Li,

Attached please find the written responses to Reviewer #1 and Reviewer #3.

For your convenience, each response begins with a summary list of author responses, followed by the full author response.

Reviewer #1 fully failed to grasp the central argument, namely that linear extrapolation of GHG forcing is vulnerable to linear propagation of error.

Reviewer #1 also exhibited no understanding of physical error analysis, or of the meaning or method of propagated error, or of the absolutely critical distinction between accuracy and precision.

There are so many informational lacunae in review #1, that it seems unlikely reviewer #1 even read the entire manuscript.

Re-iterating, reviewer #1 is not a peer, and review #1 is not a peer review.

In contrast, reviewer #3 provided a constructive review.

It has become painfully obvious that most climate modelers, if not all, are not trained as physical scientists.

In my experience, not one of them has shown any understanding of the physical error analysis in which all experimental physical scientists are trained. Nor have any of them exhibited the discretion physical scientists invariably show when encountering serious physical error.

I formally ask again that a physically trained scientist be recruited to produce a valid peer review. Any of the scientists suggested in my cover letter are qualified.

Nevertheless, the manuscript will be modified as noted in the responses to clarify certain reviewer issues.

I have sent the responses to you forthwith because our prior conversation invokes some urgency.

Thank-you very much for your patience and consideration,

Yours sincerely,

Patrick Frank

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

Tel: +1-650-723-2479 email: <u>pfrank@slac.stanford.edu</u> *****

PDF PDF

Reviewer #1 Respo...44.pdf Respo...44.pdf

Reviewer #3