Subject: Re: PLOS ONE Decision: PONE-D-18-14400
From: Patrick Frank <pfrank@slac.stanford.edu>
Date: 7/24/18, 10:37 AM
To: plosone <plosone@plos.org>

Dear Ms. Trayler,

I am not upset about a rejection.

My concern is about an incompetent rejection.

And the apparently blithe journalistic unconcern about both that and Dr. Añel's obvious severe conflict of interest.

Yours,

Pat

On 7/24/2018 1:50 AM, plosone wrote:

> Dear Dr. Frank,
>
> Thank you for contacting us with your concerns. We understand that a rejection decision can be extremely frustrating and disappointing. We appreciate that you have concerns about the criticisms noted by the Academic Editor in relation to your submission, however I trust that you understand that we must defer to Academic Editors' expertise in relation to the scientific evaluation of the submitted manuscripts.
>
> Your critiques have been noted, and passed along to our editorial team. Again, we sympathize with your disappointment and apologize that the outcome of the evaluation of your submission was not more positive.
>
> We hope that you consider submitting your future research at PLOS ONE. If I can be of any further assistance, please don't hesitate to contact me.
>
> Kind regards,
>
> Frances Trayler
> Staff EO
> PLOS ONE
>
> Case Number: 05875686
>
> ---------- Original Message ----------
> From: Patrick Frank [pfrank@slac.stanford.edu]
> Sent: 24/07/2018
> To: plosone@plos.org
> Subject: Re: PLOS ONE Decision: PONE-D-18-14400 - [EMID:c6875e6506a7d92e]
>
> Dear Dr. Añel,
>
> Thank-you for your email.
>
> I will be plain. As a climate modeler you have a fatal conflict of

interest with a manuscript that demonstrates climate models have no predictive value. You should have recused yourself.

The following directly illustrates this conflict. You wrote: "as an example, in line 273 you cite 56 and 57 and in my view these works do not support your claim, indeed they could be interpreted as serious criticisms to what you expose."

Manuscript lines 270–273 say this: "The extent of radiative forcing by various concentrations of atmospheric CO2 is primarily determined by the absorption of radiant energy in the extended 15 ?m IR radiation band originating from the warm terrestrial surface (1, 56, 57)."

Reference 56, 57 are to Houghton 1995, 2005, respectively.

The following quotes show these references exactly support manuscript lines 270–273. They entirely negate your criticism.

Houghton 1995 (reference 56) agrees that, "the absorption and emission of radiation in the atmosphere by the "greenhouse" gases, especially by carbon dioxide . lead to greenhouse warming of the lower atmosphere and the surface" and "most of the absorption by carbon dioxide of radiation from the surface occurs within 30 m of the surface."

Houghton 2005 (reference 57) says (abstract): ". 'greenhouse gases', of which the most important is carbon dioxide. Such gases absorb infrared radiation emitted by the Earth's surface and act as blankets over the surface keeping it warmer than it would otherwise be."

And in the paper itself, "The greenhouse effect arises because of the presence of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that absorb thermal radiation emitted by the Earth's surface ..."

You have completely misrepresented the plain message of references 56 and 57. They are not "serious criticisms." They are completely supportive.

And yet you wrote, "Now I would like to make clear that this has not impacted my evaluation of your manuscript."

How is it possible that a not-impacted evaluation has inverted the clear confirmation in these references?

The files at https://uploadfiles.io/f5luc show previous reviewers erroneously purported uncertainty statistics to be physically real temperatures or energetic perturbations.

These are seriously fundamental mistakes. They indicate naïveté in the student and incompetence in the trained. It is not arrogant to notice this.

I have read your review. My point-by-point response will show that it has no critical force.

Then test of moral courage will arise: does one dare to expose climate models or does one betray science? Every single editor thus far has failed this test.

Yours,

> Pat

--
****
Patrick Frank
Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource
SLAC
Stanford University

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