Subject: RE: Case 05876565 PONE-D-18-14400
From: plosone <plosone@plos.org>
Date: 8/13/18, 4:32 AM
To: "pfrank@slac.stanford.edu" <pfrank@slac.stanford.edu>

Dear Dr Frank

I am writing to confirm receipt of your letter requesting an appeal for your manuscript. Your request has been forwarded to our internal editors who will determine whether or not PLOS ONE will consider your appeal. The amount of time this process can take varies, especially if we need to consult additional editorial board members.

We will notify you via email once a decision has been made on whether we will consider your appeal. If your request for an appeal is granted, your manuscript will go out for review a second time and may incur additional review time. Decisions on appeals are final without exception. Details about appeals can be found under "Editorial and Peer-Review Process" at: http://www.plosone.org/static/information.action.

We will be in touch again soon with more information, but in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thank you and best wishes.
Kind regards
Kate Massingham
Staff EO
PLOS ONE

Case 05906221

---------- Original Message ----------
From: Patrick Frank [pfrank@slac.stanford.edu]
Sent: 12/08/2018 22:01
To: jheber@plos.org; plosone@plos.org
Subject: Case 05876565 PONE-D-18-14400

Dear Dr. Heber,

Thank-you for providing the PLoS One avenue of appeal.

Please find attached the in-filled PLoS Appeal Request form as well as my point-by-point response to the Editorial review.

The formal appeal rests upon Academic Editor Dr. Añel's profound conflict of interest with a manuscript study that negatively impacts his own professional work.

Regarding his review, Dr. Añel never addressed the core of the study: that global air temperature projections are linear extrapolations of GHG forcing and the logical entrainment of propagated calibration error.

He never addressed the obvious truth that GCMs cannot resolve a perturbation (CO_2 forcing) 114-fold below their lower limit of resolution.

The point-by-point response finally shows that Dr. Añel's review lacked substantive content and was dismissive rather than critical.

My original cover letter asked that the reviewers not include climate modelers for the intrinsic reason of deep professional conflict and the evidenced reason of non-expertise in physical error analysis. I believe that case to now be made.

I ask only for a fair and knowledgeable review. The point-by-point shows that neither was in view here.

The linearity of GCM air temperature projections is fully demonstrated and the propagation of GCM thermal flux error is correctly done.

I seek a journal editor with the courage of a scientist; willing to publish an obviously correct study in the face of intense political opposition.

A good scientific argument provides an invulnerable bulwark against criticism. One need only require critics to point out an error (that does not exist).

Yours sincerely,

Pat

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

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

Kate Massingham
Staff EO
PLOS ONE
ref:_00DU0Ifis._5000Bm0AnJ:ref