

**Subject:** Re: PLOS ONE : Appeal request for PONE-D-18-14400 - [EMID:8b1ee6ca19d337da]  
**From:** Patrick Frank <pfrank@slac.stanford.edu>  
**Date:** 8/22/18, 3:30 PM  
**To:** Frances Trayler <frances.trayler@editorialoffice.co.uk>, jheber@plos.org

Dear Ms. Trayler,

Thank-you for letting me know the PLoS One appeal process is a fraud; a bait-and-switch.

Demonstrated: Dr. Añel's review was incompetent throughout. Ignored.

Demonstrated: climate modelers know nothing of physical error analysis. Ignored.

Demonstrated: a fatal conflict of interest. Ignored.

The editorial rejection included *\*no\** substantive specifics. Because there are none.

This, "*we remain concerned about the lack of evidence to support the conclusions presented.*" is nothing more than a cruel and self-serving joke. The evidence is overwhelming.

The PLoS decision smacks of moral and intellectual cowardice; an unheroic flight from the courage of a scientist.

A special irony is that Dr. Mueck co-founded a journal focusing on negative results. She has here betrayed her own chosen calling.

PLoS have made science a mockery and integrity a sham.

Yours,

Pat

On 8/21/18 10:02 PM, Frances Trayler wrote:

PONE-D-18-14400

Propagation of Error and the Reliability of Global Air Temperature Projections

PLOS ONE

Dear Dr. Frank,

I am writing to you with regard to your appeal on the editorial decision for your submission to PLOS ONE "Propagation of Error and the Reliability of Global Air Temperature Projections", PONE-D-18-14400.

We appreciate your arguments as to why you believe that this manuscript has not been evaluated according to PLOS ONE policy and have considered them carefully. However, I regret to inform you that we have decided that the rejection should be upheld.

As you are aware, PLOS ONE policy does allow authors to name individuals who may not be able to assess the submission objectively, due to personal, financial or other conflicts of interests. However, this policy does not provide for excluding whole groups and communities, and the journal cannot uphold all requested exclusions for reviewers or editors if such requests compromise the quality of the review process for the work under consideration.

After careful evaluation of your manuscript, we feel that the implications for climate modelling warrant review by experts from that community. Such expertise is, in our view, necessary to properly assess the claims within the manuscript.

In summary, we feel that Section Editor Añel's assessment was sufficient to reach a decision on this manuscript and that hence your manuscript does not meet our criteria for publication. Whilst we acknowledge that in your rebuttal you may have been able to address some of the concerns raised previously, overall we remain concerned about the lack of evidence to support the conclusions presented.

I appreciate that you will be disappointed by this decision and I am sorry that we cannot be more positive on this occasion. Please note that decisions on appeal cases are final.

Thank you for your interest in PLOS ONE.

Regards,

Frances Trayler  
Staff E0  
PLOS ONE

on behalf of

Leonie Mueck  
Associate Editor  
PLOS ONE

--

\*\*\*\*\*

Patrick Frank  
Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource  
SLAC  
Stanford University

Tel: +1-650-723-2479  
email: [pfrank@slac.stanford.edu](mailto:pfrank@slac.stanford.edu)

\*\*\*\*\*