

From: **Patrick Frank** pfrank830@earthlink.net
Subject: Re: manuscript gmd-2017-281
Date: November 14, 2017 at 9:42 PM
To: Didier M. Roche didier.roche@lsce.ipsl.fr
Cc: jules@blueskiesresearch.org.uk, editorial@copernicus.org



Dear Dr. Roche,

Thank-you for your email.

This will be short. Quote and response.

You wrote, "premises that the error arising from simulated cloud cover on an annual mean is a 4 W.m⁻² error in long wave radiation calculations in CMIP models."

This is not my premise. It is a result reported in Lauer and Hamilton, 2013.

The quantity $\pm 4 \text{ W/m}^2$ is a rms uncertainty statistic. It is not a positive-sign physical error as you represented it.

"By thus doing an average over the year, you ignore completely their variations over the year. ... you also ignore the fact that different types of clouds (low vs. high for example) have different radiation effects and that therefore their vertical distribution is also of major importance."

Calculating annual GMST does not presume that every point on Earth is of uniform temperature every day, everywhere, all year.

Calculating global average irradiance does not presume that every point on Earth receives 340 W/m².

Calculating global average cloud forcing (Hartmann, 1992; Stephens, 2005) does not presume all clouds are the same everywhere.

Taking an average does not presume that a uniform magnitude reigns everywhere.

The complete ignorance reflected in your argument calls a judgment of incompetence.

"However, the valid point of Dr. Annan is that the *annual* timescale is explain nowhere in the manuscript."

My source, Lauer and Hamilton, 2013, reported annual means; mentioned in ms line 575.

Manuscript lines 578-579 show exactly how and where the annual timescale arises. SI Section 6.2 derived the annual timescale exactly.

Your statement is factually and demonstrably wrong; as was that of Dr. Annan.

You may have read the manuscript twice, but you did not understand it even once.

You are a climate modeler, Dr. Roche. Your publication list shows no relevant expertise; a condition obvious in the quality of your commentary.

Like Dr. Annan you have profound professional and career conflicts of interest with a manuscript demonstrating that climate models have no predictive value, which they do not.

You people are determinedly rejectionist. Protocol is your cover.

Yours sincerely,

Pat

Patrick Frank, Ph.D.

Patrick Frank

Palo Alto, CA 94301

email: pfrank830@earthlink.net

+++++

These things are, we conjecture, like the truth;

But as for certain truth, no one has known it.

Xenophanes, 570-500 BCE

+++++

| On Nov 14, 2017, at 7:13 AM, Didier M. Roche <didier.roche@lsce.ipsl.fr> wrote:

On Nov 15, 2017, at 7:10 AM, Didier M. Roche <didier.roche@cea.fr> wrote:

Dear Patrick Frank,

Following the rejection of your manuscript gmd-2017-281 and your subsequent email to Copernicus, it has been decided that it will be treated as an appeal of the rejection decision.

In such cases an Executive Editor is nominated to provide an independent evaluation of the manuscript in question to confirm or reject the previous decision.

In the case of your manuscript, I have been asked to handle the appeal.

I have now read your manuscript in details two times and evaluated the decision of Dr. James Annan who previously rejected your submission.

My analysis of your manuscript is that indeed it is not suitable for publication in GMD as it is. The reasoning you develop is based on the premises that the error arising from simulated cloud cover on an annual mean is a 4 W.m⁻² error in longwave radiation calculations in CMIP models.

However clouds are highly variable in time and space. By thus doing an average over the year, you ignore completely their variations over the year. Similarly, when you state that "Global Cloud forcing is net cooling" (page 30) you also ignore the fact that different types of clouds (low vs. high for example) have different radiation effects and that therefore their vertical distribution is also of major importance.

The point related to the annual timescale was already pointed to you by Dr. Annan. I agree with his analysis.

Let me also highlight that in your appeal you incorrectly stated that "Dr. Annan wrongly claimed the ± 4 W/m² annual error is explained "nowhere in the manuscript." It is explained on page 30, lines 571-584. "

However, the valid point of Dr. Annan is that the *annual* timescale is explain nowhere in the manuscript. He never claimed, as you seem to suggest in your answer, that you did not explained the calculation method for your ± 4 W/m² error.

Based on my expertise and on the material I received from your submission and appeal, I thus fully confirm the rejection of your manuscript as submitted under number gmd-2017-281.

With best wishes,
Didier Roche (Exec. Editor GMD)

--

=====
Didier M. Roche
IPSL/Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement

Adresse:
Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement
Centre d'Etude de Saclay
CEA-Orme des Merisiers, bat. 701
F-91191 GIF-SUR-YVETTE CEDEX

Tel.:
+33 (0) 1 69 08 96 52
Didier.Roche@lsce.ipsl.fr

