

From: Patrick Frank pfrank830@earthlink.net
Subject: Re: Risk Analysis Manuscript Decision
Date: August 23, 2013 at 3:22 PM
To: Tony Cox tcoxdenver@aol.com
Cc: lambert@virginia.edu

PF

Manuscript reference 64 cites an RA paper that evaluates the errors of chemical models. It provided me the precedent for submission.

Substituting chemical referents, an analogous consistency would have led you to reject 64. But, of course, you did not.

Showing climate models are unreliable is now of critical import to legislators, policy-makers, environmental regulators, insurance companies, city planners, farmers, and of interest anyone who uses physical models to project observables.

The manuscript focus also meets every single one of the five criteria in your linked editorial: 2008 Risk Analysis, Vol. 28(5), 1135.

The reasoning behind your decision is a ludicrous pretext, evidencing the intellectual diffidence that is now almost a banality among editors of climate-oriented journals.

I had hoped that you and Dr. Lambert were unaffected. That hope was misplaced.

Yours sincerely,

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 Aug 23, 2013, at 1:06 AM, Tony Cox wrote:

For more information on the scope of our journal, please see <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2008.01138.x/abstract>,

I agree that your results look quite interesting for a climate change audience. However, the methods you use seem to me to have limited application in the mainstream of health, safety, environmental (HS&E) and adversarial risk analysis, where most of our emphasis is. Thus, I agree with Dr. Lambert's assessment, I do hope you will submit your work to a journal more concerned with climate change modeling and policy.

Best,

-- Tony

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 22, 2013, at 10:30 PM, Patrick Frank <pfrank830@earthlink.net> wrote:

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.

