To: tcoxdenver@aol.com

Cc: lambert@virginia.edu

Dear Dr. Cox,

The manuscript demonstrates that the CMIP5 climate models forming the very basis of the up-coming AR5 Report of the IPCC are unable to resolve the effect of greenhouse gases on global air temperature.

This demonstration obviates not only the AR5 Report, but every single such report issued by the IPCC and all other scientific institutions over the last 25 years. It also obviates the EPA endangerment ruling concerning greenhouse gases.

Such a result is hardly "quite narrow" in approach. Nor is it conceivable that this result is without "interest or lessons" for an audience concerned with risk analysis.

Prof. Lambert's judgment is rationally incomprehensible.

Yours sincerely,

Xenophanes, 570-500 BCE

On Aug 22, 2013, at 8:17 PM, tcoxdenver@aol.com wrote:

22-Aug-2013 RE: Paper No. RA-00263-2013 entitled Propagation of Error and the Reliability of Global Air Temperature Projections

Dear Dr. Frank:

Thank you for your submission to Risk Analysis. After carefully reviewing your manuscript, our Area Editor, Prof. James Lambert, has recommended that the paper is not appropriate for publication in Risk Analysis.

I encourage you to consider submitting other manuscripts to Risk Analysis.

Tony Cox Editor-In-Chief

Comments from Prof. James Lambert, Area Editor

This paper describes error propagation in the use of global circulation models to forecast air temperature.

This paper appears to be careful scientific work that is outside the scope of typical papers published in Risk Analysis. Occasionally we consider papers this far afield. In this case however, the approach is quite narrow and there is little promise of interest and lessons that transfer across the several disciplines that are the audience of the RA journal.

The result that quantifies the "reliability" of estimates of global temperature into the future could be useful to practitioners of risk analysis.

We thus look forward to seeing this work published in journals such as those cited in the references, e.g., Journal of Climate, Climatic Change, Geophys. Review Letters, Nature, Amer. Journal of Physics, and many others who would be qualified to evaluate the merits of this manuscript.

Reviewer Comments

n/a