

Sent Feb 25, 2017 4:20:46 PM Jonathan Jiang

Hi Jonathan, I've looked through the reviews and will work on responses/revisions, thanks. If the revised ms goes in as a new submission, will it go back to the same reviewers (strongly preferred)?

Received Feb 25, 2017 5:03:14 PM Jonathan Jiang

Yes. I'll ask the same reviewers to comment.

Sent Feb 25, 2017 5:06:36 PM Jonathan Jiang

Thank-you Jonathan. That alone puts you in a different (far superior) class relative to prior editors.

Received Feb 26, 2017 12:49:54 PM Jonathan Jiang

One challenge for you is to get along with people like Patrick Brown. He is very much like the typical reviewers you would get in the review process. AG

Received Feb 26, 2017 12:49:55 PM Jonathan Jiang

U Editors cannot make sole decision without reviewers. Since your paper touch upon climate, climate or atmospheric reviewers must be included, Brown is a

Received Feb 26, 2017 12:49:58 PM Jonathan Jiang

typical one, thus if you cannot find a way to convince him, chances of convince others are slim.

Sent Feb 26, 2017 12:54:59 PM Jonathan Jiang

Pat Brown must have a mind open to argum

Sent Feb 26, 2017 12:55:41 PM Jonathan Jiang

Argument. So far I have not seen that.

Received Feb 26, 2017 12:55:52 PM Jonathan Jiang

I'll talk to him on Monday.

Sent Feb 26, 2017 12:56:13 PM Jonathan Jiang

Some of his constructions have been very strange.

Sent Feb 26, 2017 12:56:32 PM Jonathan Jiang

Some have been contradictory.

Sent Feb 26, 2017 12:58:42 PM Jonathan Jiang

Honestly I do not think it will be possible to convince someone whose career and livelihood depend on the one outcome.

Sent Feb 26, 2017 1:07:38 PM Jonathan Jiang

Thank-you. I understand that your discussion with PB will not include reviewer comments.

Sent Feb 26, 2017 1:08:37 PM Jonathan Jiang
I need time to address those in peace.

Received Feb 26, 2017 1:45:36 PM Jonathan Jiang
No, discussion with PB will not include reviewer comments.

Sent Apr 23, 2017 9:02:09 AM Jonathan Jiang
Hi Jonathan -- just to let you know I have fully resolved reviews 1,3,4 and 6. Working on 5.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:03:01 AM Jonathan Jiang
Also, I talked to Patrick B and believe it should be forcing should be W/m², not W/m²/year.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:03:31 AM Jonathan Jiang
Forcing should be W/m²

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:05:17 AM Jonathan Jiang
L&H error is a statistic, not an energy flux.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:06:47 AM Jonathan Jiang
It's not forcing

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:08:09 AM Jonathan Jiang
You need to address why

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:10:15 AM Jonathan Jiang
It's an error statistic averaged over a year, Jonathan. This is how L& H calculated it. It's *obvious*.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:11:18 AM Jonathan Jiang
You mentioned PB is not open to debate, but he feels the same thing about you, so I still believe it both sides need to be open, I'll schedule an visit t

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:11:19 AM Jonathan Jiang
o Stanford and meet you both sometime

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:12:25 AM Jonathan Jiang
I do not believe I ever said or wrote PB is not open to debate.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:13:19 AM Jonathan Jiang
I debated him in detail. If he said I am not open His judgement is unfair

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:13:50 AM Jonathan Jiang
Unsupported by the evidence

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:16:41 AM Jonathan Jiang
He feels the same, he offered detail of why is not $w/m^2/year$, and you were not listen to him. PB was a top student.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:17:42 AM Jonathan Jiang
Anyway, you need to explain why is $w/m^2/year$, not w/m^2

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:17:46 AM Jonathan Jiang
His argument about that was forced and wrong. I demonstrated that in detail.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:18:21 AM Jonathan Jiang
You should read the posted exchange.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:18:23 AM Jonathan Jiang
May be add a section in your paper to explain this

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:19:07 AM Jonathan Jiang
I did explain that. It's an annual average error statistic.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:19:24 AM Jonathan Jiang
He feel the same about you, so I need visit both of you together, sometime

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:19:32 AM Jonathan Jiang
It's not forcing.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:20:11 AM Jonathan Jiang
You can satisfy your need to know by reading our posted debate.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:20:52 AM Jonathan Jiang
Ok, but still need to convince why not w/m^2 to reviewers.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:21:14 AM Jonathan Jiang
Sitting in a meeting will be less rational than the written debate.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:21:48 AM Jonathan Jiang
Tell them it's an error statistic.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:22:52 AM Jonathan Jiang
It's (plus/minus) Jonathan. How is a forcing simultaneously positive and negative?

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:23:04 AM Jonathan Jiang
You need to explain why

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:23:20 AM Jonathan Jiang
The confusion on this is incredible

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:24:30 AM Jonathan Jiang
L & H explain why. It's right there in their equations.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:25:27 AM Jonathan Jiang
You're a physicist Jonathan. Why isn't this obvious to you?

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:25:39 AM Jonathan Jiang
In simple physics it is, but climate system is more complicated. Also, why so many smart people like PB did not agree?

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:26:16 AM Jonathan Jiang
Error is error. Climate is not special.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:26:50 AM Jonathan Jiang
PB is completely untrained in physical error analysis.

Received Apr 25, 2017 8:27:20 AM Jonathan Jiang
Talk to you later, go to meeting.

Sent Apr 25, 2017 8:28:00 AM Jonathan Jiang
He showed no understanding of a calibration experiment or of the meaning of physical error.

Sent Jun 7, 2017 6:45:33 AM Jonathan Jiang
Hi Jonathan - ms resubmitted last night. Hope it meets your standard. Grateful for your courage and integrity.

Received Jun 7, 2017 6:49:58 AM Jonathan Jiang
Thanks. I'll have a look.

Sent Jun 21, 2017 2:02:20 PM Jonathan Jiang
Hi Jonathan - is it OK to ask you what you thought of the responses?

Received Jul 8, 2017 1:29:40 PM Jonathan Jiang
You have not convinced your reviewers by your responses.

Sent Jul 8, 2017 1:50:49 PM Jonathan Jiang
Not a surprise at all. They're probably unconvinced. The important question is whether I convinced you.

Received Jul 8, 2017 1:58:51 PM Jonathan Jiang
Not yet, also, I need at least one reviewer agree with you, but ALL are not, including your suggested reviewers

Sent Jul 8, 2017 2:10:09 PM Jonathan Jiang

What possible rational reason is there to reject. GCM projections are linear. Error propagates linearly. That's QED Jonathan, and I think you know it.

Sent Jul 9, 2017 11:56:53 AM Jonathan Jiang

One more thought, Jonathan. I analytically disproved Pat Brown's entire analysis, right there in black and white. Was he "convinced"?

Sent Jul 9, 2017 11:59:24 AM Jonathan Jiang

Likewise the reviewers. They are committed to one point of view. They will never be "convinced". This is where you as editor will have to decide about science vs protocol.