Reviewer #3 Evaluations:
Recommendation: Reject
Grammar improvements needed: No
Commentary: No
Willing to review a revision: No
Do you have a potential conflict of interest?(Required): No
Annotated: No

Reviewer #3 (Comments to Author):

This paper tries to point a big error that can reject the climate model projection for global warming. In fact, if the theories are correct here, it can reject all climate model simulations for history, too. However, I cannot agree with this, which is actually not the truth, since the basic theory presented here has major flaws. Thus, I suggest the MS to be rejected.

1. The theory is based on linear statistics; however, temperature power 4 is calculated for radiation. This cannot be linearized for 33 K temperature difference. This misunderstanding together with Eq. 6 may happen to represent its effect on radiation, but the theoretical basis is not solid.

2. The "forcing" term used here is confusing. Sometimes it is for climatology, and sometimes for change. The major problem here is the 4 m w-2 error is for total F0 but not dFi. The annual error is annual mean of the error, but not error generated every year. The cumulative effect is fake. This is the reason for ~100 times overestimation of the error.

3. The 4 w m-2 error itself is for F0, which means the error for GHG global warming forcing should be dF*12.1% but not F0*12.1%.

4. The conclusion is obviously wrong, since the annual error should have existed even without global warming. The climate models would go everywhere if this amount of error exists.