

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Part 2(a)

**Correspondence between
paper authors and
*Journal of Climate***

From: Journal of Climate <jcli@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Mon, 21 Nov 2011 11:59:17 -0500
Subject: JCLIM manuscript received JCLI-D-11-00649 (PAGES AUS2K submission)

Ref: JCLI-D-11-00649
Journal of Climate

Dear Dr. Gergis,

Your submission entitled "Evidence of rapid late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" has been assigned to Editor John Chiang who will soon begin the peer review process for this submission to the PAGES AUS2K Special Collection.

You can log in to Editorial Manager (<http://jcli.edmgr.com/>) at any time to check the current status of your submission.

Thank you for submitting your work to Journal of Climate.

With Best Wishes,

Anthony J. Broccoli

=====
Anthony J. Broccoli
Chief Editor
Journal of Climate

Laura Buttner
Chief Editorial Assistant
jclim@me.com

5

From: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Mon, 9 Apr 2012 22:37:11 -0400
Subject: Your revision of JCLI-D-11-00649 is due soon

Ref.: JCLI-D-11-00649
Journal of Climate

Dear Dr. Gergis,

This is an early reminder that we hope to receive your revision of "Evidence of rapid late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" on or before Apr 12, 2012.

Please evaluate the reviews and make all necessary modifications to your manuscript. Then, please upload your revised manuscript along with a detailed explanation of how you have responded to the comments of each reviewer. You can upload your revised manuscript and response files to: <http://jcli.edmgr.com/>

Please contact our office at Chiang.JCLI@ametsocmail.org if you have any questions or concerns.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Hayley Charney
Editorial Assistant
Journal of Climate
Dr. John Chiang, editor

6

From: Matthew Hacker <mhacker@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Thu, 12 Apr 2012 12:00:14 -0400
Subject: JCLIM revision received JCLI-D-11-00649

Ref.: JCLI-D-11-00649

Dear Dr. Gergis,

Your revision of the manuscript "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" has passed technical check and has been assigned to Editor John Chiang who will continue the review process.

If you have any questions concerning your manuscript, please contact the Editor's office.

Thank you for submitting your work to Journal of Climate.

Kind regards,

Production Tech
Journal of Climate

7

From: Julie Fiorilla <jfiorilla@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Thu, 12 Apr 2012 04:50:46 -0400
Subject: Revised Submission Confirmation for JCLI-D-11-00649

Ref.: JCLI-D-11-00649

Dear Dr. Gergis,

Your revised manuscript for "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" has been received at the AMS and will be screened for adherence to formatting requirements. You will be notified when it is forwarded to the assigned Editor for Journal of Climate

You may check the status of your manuscript by logging onto Editorial Manager at (<http://jcli.edmgr.com/>).

Kind regards,

Journal of Climate

8

From: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:57:04 -0400
Subject: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org

Re: JCLI-D-11-00649
Journal of Climate

Dear Dr. Gergis,

We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.

Congratulations!

Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the forms are below.

Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org).

Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate

Sincerely,

Dr. John Chiang, editor
Journal of Climate

PRODUCTION INFORMATION

Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane (ckeane@ametsoc.org).

----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1 May 2011, use:
http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf

----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or after 1 May 2011, use:
http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf

---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this form:
http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf

You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.

Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form. This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production or give you instructions for providing anything required.

Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:
<http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>

If you need further information, please contact:
Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

9

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
Subject: Re: Embargo date
To: Joshua Cockfield <jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>
CC: <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
In-Reply-To: jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Wed, 2 May 2012 11:58:40 -0700
Hello Josh,

Dr. Gergis's paper will likely appear on our Early Online Release site by 18 May. This will be the final manuscript version supplied by the Dr.Gergis, not the edited and typeset and author proofed final version - the final version will likely be published in one of the September issues of JCLI.

For either the EOR version or the final published version, I can get you more exact dates as the time gets closer. Would you do the media release for the EOR version, or would you wait until the final published version=3F

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator
Peer Review Support Manager

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

ph: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

American Meteorological Society
45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
To: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:36:02 -0700
Subject: Embargo date

Hi Gwendolyn,

I'm a communications officer in a research group at the University of Melbourne and the final submission of one of our papers has just been sent through to the Journal of Climate. We would like to arrange a media release prior to publication of the paper online and were wondering how we can find out when the article will first appear online (ie. embargo date). If you could let me know that would be great. Details of the paper are in the forwarded message below.

Thanks,

Josh

Josh Cockfield

Project and Communication Officer (Tuesday-Thursday)
South Eastern Australian Recent Climate History
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne
Ph: (03) 8344 7304

j.cockfield@unimelb.edu.au
www.climatehistory.com.au

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
Subject: Re: FW: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
In-Reply-To: <CBC5B4D7.A53C%jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Wed, 2 May 2012 11:40:31 -0700

Dear Joelle,

There is no charge for the supplementary material.

And I am about to respond in a separate email to both you and Joshua Cockfield about your likely publication date.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator
Peer Review Support Manager

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

ph: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

American Meteorological Society
45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 22:42:16 -0700
Subject: FW: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

When estimating my page charges, do I include or exclude the supplementary section

That is, do I only include number of pages and figures in the main body of the manuscript=3F

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>

Date: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:57:04 -0400

To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

Subject: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org

Dear Dr. Gergis,

We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate. =20

Congratulations!

Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the forms are below.

Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org).

Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate

Sincerely,

Dr. John Chiang, editor
Journal of Climate

)
From: Christine Keane <ckeane@ametsoc.org>
Sender: Christine Keane <ckeane@ametsoc.org>
To: 'Joelle Gergis' <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>

Joelle,

I have received the form, thank you.

Best,
Christine

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2012 1:54 AM
To: ckeane@ametsoc.org
Cc: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org
Subject: JCLI-D-11-00649 page charge estimation form attached

Hi Christine and Gwendolyn

Please find my signed page charge charge estimation form attached.

Please let me know if there is anything else you need.

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

----- Forwarded Message

From: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
Date: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:57:04 -0400
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Subject: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org

Re: JCLI-D-11-00649
Journal of Climate

Dear Dr. Gergis,

We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late 20th

century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.

Congratulations!

Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the forms are below.

Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org).

Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate

Sincerely,

Dr. John Chiang, editor
Journal of Climate

PRODUCTION INFORMATION

Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane (ckeane@ametsoc.org).

----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1 May 2011, use:

http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/prelMay11_pgcolorchgform.pdf

----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or after 1 May 2011, use:

http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf

---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this form:

[http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.p
df](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)

You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.

Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form. This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production or give you instructions for providing anything required.

Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:
<http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>

If you need further information, please contact:
Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

----- End of Forwarded Message

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
In-Reply-To: jgergis@unimelb.edu.au
Date: Mon, 14 May 2012 10:14:57 -0700

Hello Joelle,

We can't process manuscripts uploaded after acceptance - but you will be able to make the correction at proof stage, and you will not be charged for such a minor correction.=20

Please note that the version of the manuscript I must send for EOR posting is the final accepted version with the missing initial. However, I will manually alert press to the problem, and will extract the new cover page from the pdf you sent below and manually send this to them - press should be able to swap out the old cover page and replace it with the new one. However, as a lot of the overall process is automated, I don't know what the timing will be - it is possible that the older version may be online for a short period before the new one is swapped in.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 07 May 2012 22:35:24 -0500
Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

Please note that one of my authors noted that I left initials off our manuscript. The attached is the accepted manuscript with only a change to the author initials, I hope we can catch it at this stage rather than the proof to avoid incurring further charges.

All the best
Joelle

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 3/05/12 4:40 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:
Dear Joelle,
There is no charge for the supplementary material.
And I am about to respond in a separate email to both you and Joshua Cockfield about your likely publication date.

Best wishes,
Gwendolyn
Gwendolyn Whittaker

Publications Coordinator
Peer Review Support Manager
gwhittaker@ametsoc.org
ph: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096
American Meteorological Society
45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 22:42:16 -0700
Subject: FW: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

When estimating my page charges, do I include or exclude the supplementary section

That is, do I only include number of pages and figures in the main body of the manuscript

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

13

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Joshua Cockfield
<jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>
In-Reply-To: <CBD6830A.A895%jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Mon, 14 May 2012 04:08:22 -0700

Dear Joelle,

AMS recently changed the method by which EORs are posted - the workflow now involves 2 commercial presses, and I am hoping to hear today how I can get a posting date in advance. Once I have that, I will give you the information and send your paper for posting.

Thank you for your patience,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org], Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Sun, 13 May 2012 19:38:19 -0500
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

Just checking if you received this email=3F

A response ASAP would be greatly appreciated as we need to make concrete plans on our end.

Thanks

Joelle

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 10/05/12 12:47 PM, "Joelle Gergis" <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:

Hi Gwendolyn

I just got off the phone from the University of Melbourne media centre who are keen to publicize the release of this paper. They have a media release written and are waiting from confirmation from us as to the online release date.

Are you able to provide an update on exactly when the paper will appear online=3F

The results are important and very timely in the current climate change debate in Australia so we have been strongly urged to publicize the work. As I am sure you are aware, the media works on events like the release of a paper etc so we

can move ahead until we have more concrete information from you, the publisher.

At the moment we are planning around the 18 May release date you provided previously, but it would be great if you could confirm this ASAP.

I appreciate this may not be the normal course of action for the journal, but hopefully you can understand our position.

Thanks in advance for your help with this.

Joelle

Dear Joelle,

AMS recently changed the method by which EORs are posted - the workflow now involves 2 commercial presses, and I am hoping to hear today how I can get a posting date in advance. Once I have that, I will give you the information and send your paper for posting.

Thank you for your patience,

Gwendolyn

Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org], Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Sun, 13 May 2012 19:38:19

Hi Gwendolyn

Just checking if you received this email?

A response ASAP would be greatly appreciated as we need to make concrete plans on our end.

Thanks

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA

>

On 10/05/12 12:47 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

I just got off the phone from the University of Melbourne media centre who are keen to publicize the release of this paper. They have a media release written and are waiting from confirmation from us as to the online release date.

Are you able to provide an update on exactly when the paper will appear online?

The results are important and very timely in the current climate change debate in Australia so we have been strongly urged to publicize the work. As I am sure you are aware, the media works on events like the release of a paper etc so we can move ahead until we have more concrete information from you, the publisher.

At the moment we are planning around the 18 May release date you provided previously, but it would be great if you could confirm this ASAP.

I appreciate this may not be the normal course of action for the journal, but hopefully you can understand our position.

Thanks in advance for your help with this.

Joelle

14

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, Joshua Cockfield
<jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>
In-Reply-To: <CBD16974.A7DB%jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Mon, 14 May 2012 10:04:12 -0700

Dear Joelle and Josh,

Thank you again for your patience with this (and I am sorry that your press release has been complicated by a recent change in our workflow).

I am about to send the paper to press to initiate the EOR posting process - press has let me know that it will be posted by then end of the work day tomorrow (Tuesday 14 May, ~5pm EDT).

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org], Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Wed, 09 May 2012 22:47:52 -0500
Subject: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

I just got off the phone from the University of Melbourne media centre who are keen to publicize the release of this paper. They have a media release written and are waiting from confirmation from us as to the online release date.

Are you able to provide an update on exactly when the paper will appear online

The results are important and very timely in the current climate change debate in Australia so we have been strongly urged to publicize the work. As I am sure you are aware, the media works on events like the release of a paper etc so we can move ahead until we have more concrete information from you, the publisher.

At the moment we are planning around the 18 May release date you provided previously, but it would be great if you could confirm this ASAP.

I appreciate this may not be the normal course of action for the journal, but hopefully you can understand our position.

Thanks in advance for your help with this.

Joelle

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 3/05/12 4:58 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:

Hello Josh,

Dr. Gergis's paper will likely appear on our Early Online Release site by 18 May. This will be the final manuscript version supplied by the Dr. Gergis, not the edited and typeset and author proofed final version - the final version will likely be published in one of the September issues of JCLI.

For either the EOR version or the final published version, I can get you more exact dates as the time gets closer. Would you do the media release for the EOR version, or would you wait until the final published version

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator
Peer Review Support Manager

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

ph: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

American Meteorological Society
45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jjcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
To: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:36:02 -0700
Subject: Embargo date

Hi Gwendolyn,

I'm a communications officer in a research group at the University of Melbourne and the final submission of one of our papers has just been sent through to the Journal of Climate. We would like to arrange a media release prior to publication of the paper online and were wondering how we can find out when the article will appear online (ie. embargo date). If you could let me know that would be great. Details of the paper are in the forwarded message below.

Thanks,

Josh

Dear Joelle and Josh, Thank you again for your patience with this (and I am sorry that your press release has been complicated by a recent change in our workflow).

I am about to send the paper to press to initiate the EOR posting process - press has let me know that it will be posted by then end of the work day tomorrow (Tuesday 14 May, ~5pm EDT).

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]

To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org], Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]

Sent: Wed, 09 May 2012 22:47:52

Subject: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

I just got off the phone from the University of Melbourne media centre who are keen to publicize the release of this paper. They have a media release written and are waiting for confirmation from us as to the online release date.

Are you able to provide an update on exactly when the paper will appear online?

The results are important and very timely in the current climate change debate in Australia so we have been strongly urged to publicize the work. As I am sure you are aware, the media works on events like the release of a paper etc so we can move ahead until we have more concrete information from you, the publisher.

At the moment we are planning around the 18 May release date you provided previously, but it would be great if you could confirm this ASAP.

I appreciate this may not be the normal course of action for the journal, but hopefully you can understand our position.

Thanks in advance for your help with this.

Joelle

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: 3 834 49868
Fax: 61 3 834 47761

On 3/05/12 4:58 AM, Gwendolyn Whittaker wrote:

Dr. Gergis's paper will likely appear on our Early Online Release site by 18 May. This will be the final manuscript version supplied by the Dr. Gergis, not the edited and typeset and author proofed final version - the final version will likely be published in one of the September issues of JCLI.

For either the EOR version or the final published version, I can get you more exact dates as the time gets closer. Would you do the media release for the EOR version, or would you wait until the final published version?

>

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator

Peer Review Support Manager

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

ph: 617.226.3929

fax:617.531.2096

American Meteorological Society

45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joshua Cockfield <mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org">gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:36:02 -0700

Subject: Embargo date

Hi Gwendolyn,

I'm a communications officer in a research group at the University of Melbourne and the final submission of one of our papers has just been sent through to the Journal of Climate. We would like to arrange a media release prior to publication of the paper online and were wondering how we can find out when the article will first appear online (ie. embargo date). If you could let me know that would be great. Details of the paper are in the forwarded message below.

Thanks,

Josh

15

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
CC: Joshua Cockfield <jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Mon, 14 May 2012 16:50:53 -0700

Hello Joelle,

It's after business hours here, but I have just emailed press to ask if they can delay the posting as you outline below. I will hear back from them one way or the other Tuesday morning my time, and will let you know what they say.

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Cc: Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Mon, 14 May 2012 17:51:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

Thanks for chasing this up.

We were planning on a media briefing on Thursday 17 Australian time so is it possible to hold off one full day to give us time to prepare

That is the paper appears online at the end of your work day on Wednesday

Please let me know ASAP what's possible.

Thanks
Joelle

Sent from my iPhone

On 15/05/2012, at 3:04 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:

Dear Joelle and Josh,

Thank you again for your patience with this (and I am sorry that your press release has been complicated by a recent change in our workflow).

I am about to send the paper to press to initiate the EOR posting process - press has let me know that it will be posted by then end of the work day tomorrow (Tuesday 14 May, ~5pm EDT).

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org], Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]

Sent: Wed, 09 May 2012 22:47:52

Hi Gwendolyn

I just got off the phone from the University of Melbourne media centre who are keen to publicize the release of this paper. They have a media release written and are waiting from confirmation from us as to the online release date.

Are you able to provide an update on exactly when the paper will appear online

The results are important and very timely in the current climate change debate in Australia so we have been strongly urged to publicize the work. As I am sure you are aware, the media works on events like the release of a paper etc so we can=E2 move ahead until we have more concrete information from you, the publisher.

At the moment we are planning around the 18 May release date you provided previously, but it would be great if you could confirm this ASAP.

I appreciate this may not be the normal course of action for the journal, but hopefully you can understand our position.

Thanks in advance for your help with this.

Joelle

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 3/05/12 4:58 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:

Hello Josh,

Dr. Gergis's paper will likely appear on our Early Online Release site by 18 May. This will be the final manuscript version supplied by the Dr. Gergis, not the edited and typeset and author proofed final version - the final version will likely be published in one of the September issues of JCLI.

For either the EOR version or the final published version, I can get you more exact dates as the time gets closer. Would you do the media release for the EOR version, or would you wait until the final published version

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator
Peer Review Support Manager

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org
ph: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096
American Meteorological Society
45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
To: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 23:36:02 -0700
Subject: Embargo date

Hi Gwendolyn,

I'm a communications officer in a research group at the University of Melbourne and the final submission of one of our papers has just been sent through to the Journal of Climate. We would like to arrange a media release prior to publication of the paper online and were wondering how we can find out when the article will first appear online (ie. embargo date). If you could let me know that would be great. Details of the paper are in the forwarded message below.

Thanks,

Josh

16

Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Tuesday, 15 May 2012 11:41 PM
From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: Joshua Cockfield <jcoc@unimelb.edu.au>, Rebecca Scott
<rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au>, Alvin Stone <alvin.stone@unsw.edu.au>, Alexandra de
Blas <alideblas@gmail.com>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>
Conversation: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Good morning Joelle and Josh, et al.,

Press will hold your EOR until tomorrow afternoon (ie the afternoon of Wednesday 16 May Boston time), so your planned briefing on Thursday the 17 Australia time should be fine, correct?

Again, apologies we weren't able to sort this out more smoothly for you - our EOR system used to be a lot more manual (and thus a bit easier to adjust case by case) but now it's part of an overall electronic workflow and understanding when and how human intervention can be used took a bit of effort. So thank you on behalf of all future authors with the same situation, because I now know how to make it work!

Please let me know of any other concerns or problems along the way.

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Cc: Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au], Rebecca Scott [mailto:rebeccas@unimelb.edu.au], Alvin Stone [mailto:alvin.stone@unsw.edu.au], Alexandra de Blas [mailto:alideblas@gmail.com], s.phipps@unsw.edu.au [mailto:s.phipps@unsw.edu.au]
Sent: Mon, 14 May 2012 19:57:12 -0500
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Many thanks for letting us know Gwendolyn

An extra day would would make all the difference so we can plan our press briefing on Thursday 17 May Australian time.

Please let us know as soon as you do.

Thanks again for your help with this!

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 15/05/12 9:50 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:

Hello Joelle,

It's after business hours here, but I have just emailed press to ask if they can delay the posting as you outline below. I will hear back from them one way or the other Tuesday morning my time, and will let you know what they say.

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Cc: Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Mon, 14 May 2012 17:51:24 -0500
Subject: Re: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

Thanks for chasing this up.

We were planning on a media briefing on Thursday 17 Australian time so is it possible to hold off one full day to give us time to prepare?

That is the paper appears online at the end of your work day on Wednesday ?

Please let me know ASAP what's possible.

Thanks
Joelle

Sent from my iPhone

On 15/05/2012, at 3:04 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:

Dear Joelle and Josh,

Thank you again for your patience with this (and I am sorry that your press release has been complicated by a recent change in our workflow).

I am about to send the paper to press to initiate the EOR posting process - press has let me know that it will be posted by then end of the work day tomorrow (Tuesday 14 May, ~5pm EDT).

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org], Joshua Cockfield [mailto:jcoc@unimelb.edu.au]

Sent: Wed, 09 May 2012 22:47:52 -0500
Subject: Embargo date for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

I just got off the phone from the University of Melbourne media centre who are keen to publicize the release of this paper. They have a media release written and are waiting from confirmation from us as to the online release date.

Are you able to provide an update on exactly when the paper will appear online?

The results are important and very timely in the current climate change debate in Australia so we have been strongly urged to publicize the work. As I am sure you are aware, the media works on events like the release of a paper etc so we can't move ahead until we have more concrete information from you, the publisher.

At the moment we are planning around the 18 May release date you provided previously, but it would be great if you could confirm this ASAP.

I appreciate this may not be the normal course of action for the journal, but hopefully you can understand our position.

Thanks in advance for your help with this.

Joelle

Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Wednesday, 16 May 2012 1:39 AM
From: Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: <smcdermott@ametsoc.org>
Conversation: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hello again Joelle,

There is an item I want to alert you to as we begin processing your paper for final publication:

Including "PAGES Aus2K Project Members" in your author list is fine, but AMS style is such that the individual group members will not be listed on the first page of the final published paper. You could, however, list them in the Acknowledgements section of the paper. Alternatively, you could list them individually as co-authors along with the rest of you. Let me know which way you would prefer, so I can leave a note for the copy and tech editors.

Whichever way the project members are listed, we will need signed copyright forms from them. They don't all have to sign the same copy of the form, if that makes it easier for you to to round up signatures. I've cc'd our copyright admin, Sean McDermott, so he'll know the special circumstances here. The paper will continue to move through production while signatures are gathered, though we will need the complete set before final publication.

Let me know if you need more information on any of this.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
To: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Mon, 14 May 2012 13:14:57 -0500
Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hello Joelle,

We can't process manuscripts uploaded after acceptance - but you will be able to make the correction at proof stage, and you will not be charged for such a minor correction.

Please note that the version of the manuscript I must send for EOR posting is the final accepted version with the missing initial. However, I will manually alert press to the problem, and will extract the new cover page from the pdf you sent below and manually send this to them - press should be able to swap out the old cover page and replace it with the new one. However, as a lot of the overall process is automated, I don't know what the timing will be - it is possible that the older version may be online for a short period before the new one is swapped in.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 07 May 2012 22:35:24 -0500
Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

Please note that one of my authors noted that I left initials off our manuscript.

The attached is the accepted manuscript with only a change to the author initials, I hope we can catch it at this stage rather than the proof to avoid incurring further charges.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 3/05/12 4:40 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org> wrote:

Dear Joelle,

There is no charge for the supplementary material.

And I am about to respond in a separate email to both you and Joshua Cockfield about your likely publication date.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator
Peer Review Support Manager

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

ph: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

American Meteorological Society
45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108-3693

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: gwhittaker@ametsoc.org [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 30 Apr 2012 22:42:16 -0700
Subject: FW: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

When estimating my page charges, do I include or exclude the supplementary section?

That is, do I only include number of pages and figures in the main body of the manuscript?

Thanks in advance for your help with this

Joelle

18

Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Saturday, 19 May 2012 3:36 AM
From: Whittaker, Gwendolyn <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: "smcdermott@ametsoc.org" <smcdermott@ametsoc.org>
Conversation: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Joelle,

As long as you are fine with the group name and the individual members of the group only being listed in the Acknowledgements (and not appearing at all on the title page), then yes, this will work fine.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

On Thu, May 17, 2012 at 11:50 PM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:
Hi Gwendolyn

It is going to be impossible to round up signatures from 25 busy people.

These are people that contributed data and/or few comments on the paper but are not part of the core author team. I think it is best if we move this to the Acknowledgements so we have the issue.

I think I've seen it done on other journal papers (see attached) so hopefully it is not a problem.

Please do let me know

Thanks

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 16/05/12 1:39 AM, "Gwendolyn Whittaker" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
<<http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>> > wrote:

Hello again Joelle,

There is an item I want to alert you to as we begin processing your paper for final publication:

Including "PAGES Aus2K Project Members" in your author list is fine, but AMS style is such that the individual group members will not be listed on the first page of the final published paper. You could, however, list them in the Acknowledgements section of the paper. Alternatively, you could list them individually as co-authors along with the rest of you. Let me know which way you would prefer, so I can leave a note for the copy and tech editors.

Whichever way the project members are listed, we will need signed copyright forms from them. They don't all have to sign the same copy of the form, if that makes it easier for you to round up signatures. I've cc'd our copyright admin, Sean McDermott, so he'll know the special circumstances here. The paper will continue to move through production while signatures are gathered, though we will need the complete set before final publication.

Let me know if you need more information on any of this.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
To: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
Sent: Mon, 14 May 2012 13:14:57 -0500
Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hello Joelle,

We can't process manuscripts uploaded after acceptance - but you will be able to make the correction at proof stage, and you will not be charged for such a minor correction.

Please note that the version of the manuscript I must send for EOR posting is the final accepted version with the missing initial. However, I will manually alert press to the problem, and will extract the new cover page from the pdf you sent below and manually send this to them - press should be able to swap out the old cover page and replace it with the new one. However, as a lot of the overall process is automated, I don't know what the timing will be - it is possible that the older version may be online for a short period before the new one is swapped in.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

From: Joelle Gergis [mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au]
To: Gwendolyn Whittaker [mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: Mon, 07 May 2012 22:35:24 -0500
Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hi Gwendolyn

Please note that one of my authors noted that I left initials off our manuscript.

The attached is the accepted manuscript with only a change to the author initials,

I hope we can catch it at this stage rather than the proof to avoid incurring further charges.

All the best

Joelle

19

Subject: Re: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Monday, 21 May 2012 10:32 PM
From: Whittaker, Gwendolyn <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: Sean McDermott <smcdermott@ametsoc.org>
Conversation: JCLIM Final Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Hello Joelle,

"Science" is not published by the AMS, and publishers do have differing legal requirements regarding copyright. AMS practice is that all individuals who are listed as authors on papers (including members of any groups listed as authors) must either transfer their copyright to the AMS, or sign a US Government or Crown form indicating that their copyright belongs to the government.

I understand that the task of asking 25 individuals to sign and return forms may seem daunting, but 25 is by no means the largest number of authors we see on papers. Keep in mind we don't need the forms immediately - it will be several months before your paper is ready to put into an issue, and that is the point by which the copyrights must be complete. Also, you do not have to ask each of the 25 to sign the same copy of the form - they can each sign and send them separately, however is easiest. And as we do not require hard (paper) copies of the forms, emailing them will suffice.

Let me know if this helps,

Gwendolyn

On Sun, May 20, 2012 at 8:33 PM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:
Hi Gwendolyn

Is it not possible to get Aus2K project members listed on the front page but the names listed in the acknowledgements as per the Science paper attached?

I think it is important to have the group acknowledged on the title page but need to keep things manageable.

Please let me know what's possible

Thanks

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 19/05/12 3:36 AM, "Whittaker, Gwendolyn" <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>

<[http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org](mailto:gwhittaker@ametsoc.org)> > wrote:

Hi Joelle,

As long as you are fine with the group name and the individual members of the group only being listed in the Acknowledgements (and not appearing at all on the title page), then yes, this will work fine.

Best wishes,

Gwendolyn

On Thu, May 17, 2012 at 11:50 PM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
<[http://jgergis@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:jgergis@unimelb.edu.au)> > wrote:
Hi Gwendolyn

It is going to be impossible to round up signatures from 25 busy people.

These are people that contributed data and/or few comments on the paper but are not part of the core author team. I think it is best if we move this to the Acknowledgements so we have the issue.

I think I've seen it done on other journal papers (see attached) so hopefully it is not a problem.

Please do let me know

Thanks

Joelle

Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012
Date: Thursday, 31 May 2012 10:01 AM
From: JCLIM Chief Editor <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>
To: Steve McIntyre <smcintyre25@yahoo.ca>
Cc: Raphael Neukom <neukom@giub.unibe.ch>, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Conversation: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Dr. McIntyre,

Thank you for your inquiry. Please communicate directly with the authors regarding access to their data.

Sincerely,
Tony Broccoli

On 5/27/2012 11:06 PM, Steve McIntyre wrote:

Since I originally looked for this data late last week, I notice that the 27 proxy series retained in the Australia analysis have been archived at NOAA. This is good and appreciated. However, since these are screened from a larger population, the original population needs to be archived as well. Thanks very much, Steve McIntyre

From: Steve McIntyre [mailto:smcintyre25@yahoo.ca]
Sent: May-27-12 3:09 PM
To: Anthony Broccoli (jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu)
Cc: Raphael Neukom (neukom@giub.unibe.ch); Joelle Gergis (jgergis@unimelb.edu.au)
Subject: Gergis et al 2012

Dear Dr Broccoli,

I am writing in respect to data for Gergis et al 2012, Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium, recently published in Journal of Climate.

There has obviously been considerable adverse publicity about authors of paleoclimate temperature reconstructions using unarchived data and several committees have recommended that such practices end. This has occurred once again with Gergis et al 2012. Could you please ask the authors to archive the proxy data used in their reconstruction? And if they do not have permission from the originating authors to archive the data as used, would you please retract the article. Last year I made a similar request to co-author Neukom and was blown off. Hence the present request directly to you.

The authors state that their regression calculations used a screened subset from a larger original data set. This larger pre-screened data should be the one that is made available.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly,

Stephen McIntyre

Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012
Date: Monday, 4 June 2012 4:53 AM
From: JCLI Chief Editor <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: "amspubs@ametsoc.org" <amspubs@ametsoc.org>, Raphael Neukom
[REDACTED] Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Conversation: Gergis et al 2012

Hi David,

Section 2 of the Ethical Guidelines for Authors is the only guidance from AMS that I am aware of regarding data access and data archival.

Regards.
Tony

On 6/1/2012 9:39 PM, David John Karoly wrote:

Hi Tony,

Can you provide clear guidance on the data access and data archival policies for papers in AMS journals?

There is no clear guidance in the information for authors in the Authors' Guides section of the AMS Periodicals web site. Section 2 of the file listed under Ethical Guidelines for Authors etc states:

"2. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to public sources of information (literature and data) and methodology used to permit the author's peers to test the paper's scientific conclusions."

Our manuscript does that.

Steve McIntyre in his email below says that he would like our paper to be retracted (or even rejected) because it does not meet his data access requirements.

What are the AMS data access requirements for publications in AMS journals?

Best wishes, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Joelle Gergis
Sent: 28 May 2012 11:39
To: Anthony Broccoli

Cc: Raphael Neukom; David John Karoly
Subject: Re: Gergis et al 2012

Hi Anthony

This is the first time Steven McIntyre has requested data used in our recently released Journal of Climate paper:

<http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00649.1>

If he had the courtesy of asking us directly, we would have informed him that we have archived all records used in the analysis through the NOAA World Data Center for Palaeoclimatology:

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/recons.html>

Given the paper was only released on 17 May, NOAA are still in the process of developing a feature page for the reconstruction, but here is the draft:

http://hurricane.ncdc.noaa.gov/pls/paleox/f?p=519:1:3345151224849419:::Pl_STUDY_ID:12915

We are not in a position to pass on the entirety of our database as some records are not yet publically available. It has taken years to develop working relationships with individual researchers, some groups are still publishing their work, others have only released their data for a particular study and so on.

The compilation of this database represents years of our research effort based on the development of our professional networks. We risk damaging our working relationships by releasing other people's records against their wishes so is clearly something we are unprepared to do to satisfy the curiosity of a notorious climate change skeptic.

We did, however, provide an extensive contact list for all data contributors in the supplementary section of our recent study "Southern Hemisphere high-resolution palaeoclimate records of the last 2000 years" published in The Holocene (Table S3):

<http://hol.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/12/16/0959683611427335>

This list allows any researcher who wants to access non publically available records to follow the appropriate process of contacting the original authors to obtain the necessary permission to use the record, take the time needed to process the data into a format suitable for data analysis and so on, just as we have done.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow

School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 28/05/12 5:09 AM, "Steve McIntyre" <smcintyre25@yahoo.ca>
<UrlBlockedError.aspx> > wrote:

> Dear Dr Broccoli,
> I am writing in respect to data for Gergis et al 2012, Evidence of unusual
> late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction
> spanning the last millennium, recently published in Journal of Climate.
>
> There has obviously been considerable adverse publicity about authors of
> paleoclimate temperature reconstructions using unarchived data and several
> committees have recommended that such practices end. This has occurred once
> again with Gergis et al 2012. Could you please ask the authors to archive the
> proxy data used in their reconstruction? And if they do not have permission
> from the originating authors to archive the data as used, would you please
> retract the article. Last year I made a similar request to co-author Neukom
> and was blown off. Hence the present request directly to you.
>
> The authors state that their regression calculations used a screened subset
> from a larger original data set. This larger pre-screened data should be the
> one that is made available.
>
> Thank you for your attention.
>
> Yours truly,
> Stephen McIntyre
>
>

Subject: Re: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 3:15 PM
From: John Chiang <jch_chiang@berkeley.edu>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Joelle:

Thanks for alerting us to the error. I am seeking advice from the Chief Editor on how to properly handle your request, and will get back to you shortly.

Best regards,
John

On Jun 8, 2012, at 4:35 AM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission
Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" JCLI-D-11-00649 which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ($p < 0.05$) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper.

[REDACTED] this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au> <<http://climatehistory.com.au/>>

On 1/05/12 1:57 PM, "John Chiang" <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
<x-msg://657/chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org> > wrote:

> CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org <x-msg://657/chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
>
> Re: JCLI-D-11-00649
> Journal of Climate
>
>
> Dear Dr. Gergis,
>
> We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late
> 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning
> the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.
>
> Congratulations!
>
> Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page
> and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the
> forms are below.
>
> Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review
> editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further
> information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker
> (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org <x-msg://657/gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>).
>
> Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate

>
> Sincerely,
>
> Dr. John Chiang, editor
> Journal of Climate
>
>
> *****
> PRODUCTION INFORMATION
> *****
> Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane
> (ckeane@ametsoc.org <x-msg://657/ckeane@ametsoc.org>).
>
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1
> May 2011, use:
> http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf
>
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or
> after 1 May 2011, use:
> http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf
>
> ---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this
> form:
>
>
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.p](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)
> d> f
>
> You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by
> logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.
>
> Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS
> Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form.
> This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production
> or give you instructions for providing anything required.
>
> Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:
> <http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>
>
> If you need further information, please contact:
> Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, gwhittaker@ametsoc.org
> <x-msg://657/gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
>
>
<Gergis_Manuscript_and_Supplementary_April_2012_final.pdf>

23

Subject: Re: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission
Date: Friday, 8 June 2012 10:05 PM
From: Whittaker, Gwendolyn <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>, JCLI Chief Editor
<jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu> [REDACTED], David
Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>,
Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Dr. Gergis and Dr. Chiang,

I have put a production HOLD on this paper - I will now await further word from Dr. Gergis and Dr. Chiang before any further production is done.

In cases where papers return to peer review (for another round of revision and new decision) after acceptance, we do remove the Early Online Release version from our site.

Gwendolyn

--

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator &
Peer Review Support Manager
American Meteorological Society

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

phone: 617.226.3929

fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

On Thu, Jun 7, 2012 at 10:35 PM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:
Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" (JCLI-D-11-00649) which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ($p < 0.05$) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in

the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

--
Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 1/05/12 1:57 PM, "John Chiang" <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org> <<http://chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>> wrote:

> CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org <<http://chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>>
>
> Re: JCLI-D-11-00649
> Journal of Climate
>

>
> Dear Dr. Gergis,
>
> We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late
> 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning
> the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.
>
> Congratulations!
>
> Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page
> and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the
> forms are below.
>
> Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review
> editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further
> information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker
> (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org <<http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>>).
>
> Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Dr. John Chiang, editor
> Journal of Climate
>
>
> *****
> PRODUCTION INFORMATION
> *****
> Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane
> (ckeane@ametsoc.org <<http://ckeane@ametsoc.org>>).
>
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1
> May 2011, use:
> http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf
>
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or
> after 1 May 2011, use:
> http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf
>
> ---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this
> form:
>
>
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.p](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)
> d> f
>
> You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by
> logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.
>
> Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS
> Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form.
> This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production
> or give you instructions for providing anything required.
>
> Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:
> <http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>

>
> If you need further information, please contact:
> Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, gwhittaker@ametsoc.org
> <http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
>
>

--
Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator &
Peer Review Support Manager
American Meteorological Society

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

phone: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

24

Subject: Re: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission
Date: Saturday, 9 June 2012 8:59 AM
From: Whittaker, Gwendolyn <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>, John Chiang
<chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>, JCLI Chief Editor <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>,
Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au"
<s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>
Conversation: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Dr. Gergis and all,

I can confirm that press removed the EOR version of this paper from our site earlier this afternoon.

Gwendolyn

On Fri, Jun 8, 2012 at 3:44 PM, David John Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:
Thanks for advising us of this action. It is what we wanted.

Thanks, David

~~~~~  
Prof David Karoly  
School of Earth Sciences  
University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA  
ph: +61 3 8344 4698  
fax: +61 3 8344 7761  
email: dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au  
<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/~dkaroly/wp/>  
<<http://www.earthsci.unimelb.edu.au/%7Edkaroly/wp/>>  
~~~~~

From: Whittaker, Gwendolyn [gwhittaker@ametsoc.org]
Sent: 08 June 2012 22:05
To: Joelle Gergis
Cc: John Chiang; JCLI Chief Editor; Raphael Neukom; David John Karoly;
s.phipps@unsw.edu.au; Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant
Subject: Re: Error in our JCLI-D-11-00649 submission

Dear Dr. Gergis and Dr. Chiang,

I have put a production HOLD on this paper - I will now await further word from Dr. Gergis and Dr. Chiang before any further production is done.

In cases where papers return to peer review (for another round of revision and new decision) after acceptance, we do remove the Early Online Release version from our site.

Gwendolyn

--
Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator &
Peer Review Support Manager
American Meteorological Society

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

phone: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

On Thu, Jun 7, 2012 at 10:35 PM, Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au> wrote:
Dear Dr Chiang

I am the first author of the paper "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" (JCLI-D-11-00649) which was recently accepted for publication in the Journal of Climate.

While attempting to release non-publicly available records used in our study with NOAA this week, our team discovered an error in our paper.

In section 2.2 lines 220-224 of the paper we say:

For predictor selection, both proxy climate and instrumental data were linearly detrended over the 1921-1990 period to avoid inflating the correlation coefficient due to the presence of the global warming signal present in the observed temperature record. Only records that were significantly ($p < 0.05$) correlated with the detrended instrumental target over the 1921-1990 period were selected for analysis.

When we went to recheck this on Tuesday, we discovered that the records used in the final analysis were not detrended for proxy selection, making this statement incorrect.

The detrending of proxy records had been done in another paper on Southern Hemisphere temperature variations that we had been writing simultaneously, so we wrongly assumed the same thing had been done in the Australasian paper.

[REDACTED] this was not picked up until now.

Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper. We wish to alert you to this issue before the paper goes into final production.

Meanwhile, independently of our team's detection of this error, prominent climate change blogger Stephen McIntyre has identified the issue overnight (I was alerted through an intimidating email this morning):

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/06/gergis-significance>

So instead of this being a unwanted but unfortunately normal part of science, we are likely to have an extremely negative online commentary about our work and possibly the journal. We apologise in advance for any problems caused.

As you know, the paper has already been accepted and is posted on the "Early online release" section of the Journal of Climate website. Until we have a chance to revise the submission, we suggest that the paper is removed.

Please let us know how you'd like us to proceed, be it through a revised or new submission.

All the best

Joelle Gergis, on behalf of the co-authors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 1/05/12 1:57 PM, "John Chiang" <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org> <<http://chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>> > wrote:

> CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org <<http://chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>>
>
> Re: JCLI-D-11-00649
> Journal of Climate
>
>
> Dear Dr. Gergis,
>
> We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript, "Evidence of unusual late
> 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning
> the last millennium," has been accepted for publication in Journal of Climate.
>
> Congratulations!
>
> Your paper will begin production after AMS has received the appropriate Page
> and Color Charge Form from you or your funding administration. Links to the
> forms are below.
>
> Now that your manuscript has been accepted for publication, the peer-review
> editorial office no longer has control of it. If you need further
> information, please contact AMS Publications Coordinator Gwendolyn Whittaker
> (gwhittaker@ametsoc.org <<http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>>).
>
> Thank you for publishing in Journal of Climate
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Dr. John Chiang, editor
> Journal of Climate
>
>

> *****
> PRODUCTION INFORMATION
> *****
> Questions about charges should be sent to Christine Keane
> (ckeane@ametsoc.org <<http://ckeane@ametsoc.org>>).
>
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper before 1
> May 2011, use:
> http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf
>
> ----If you are paying your charges in full and submitted your paper on or
> after 1 May 2011, use:
> http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/post1May11_pgcolorchgform.pdf
>
> ---If you received either a partial or a full waiver of charges, use this
> form:
>
>
> [http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.p](http://www.ametsoc.org/pubs/journals/documents/pre_or_waiver_pgcolorchgform.pdf)
> d> f
>
> You can check on the production status of your submission at any time by
> logging in at <http://amsjamc.edmgr.com/>.
>
> Processing times may vary, but generally authors will be contacted by AMS
> Publications staff about two weeks after AMS has received the charge form.
> This email will either confirm that your submission has begun full production
> or give you instructions for providing anything required.
>
> Reprints can be ordered from Sheridan Press using the following link:
> <http://eoc.sheridan.com/ametsoc/eoc>
>
> If you need further information, please contact:
> Gwendolyn Whittaker, Publications Coordinator, gwhittaker@ametsoc.org
> <<http://gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>>
>
>

--
Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator &
Peer Review Support Manager
American Meteorological Society

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

phone: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

--

Gwendolyn Whittaker
Publications Coordinator &
Peer Review Support Manager
American Meteorological Society

gwhittaker@ametsoc.org

phone: 617.226.3929
fax: 617.531.2096

45 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

25

Subject: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Thursday, 14 June 2012 2:55 PM
From: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Conversation: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649

CC: broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org, lbuttner@ametsoc.org

Dear Dr. Gergis:

Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2012 informing us of a significant error in the analysis of your study. We immediately removed the Early Online Release (EOR) of your paper from our website (it was removed by the afternoon of June 8), and production of your paper was put on hold.

After consulting with the Chief Editor regarding your situation, my decision is to rescind the acceptance of your manuscript for publication. My understanding is that you will be redoing your analysis to conform to your original description of the predictor selection, in which case you may arrive at a different conclusion from your original manuscript. Given this, I request that you withdraw the manuscript from consideration.

Please let me know if you and your co-authors agree to the paper being withdrawn.

I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing the error to my attention. I invite you to resubmit your work as a new manuscript once the necessary analyses are done, and the manuscript rewritten.

Sincerely,
John Chiang
Editor
Journal of Climate

Subject: Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
 Date: Friday, 15 June 2012 9:21 PM
 From: Chief Editor JCLI <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>
 To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
 Cc: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>, John Chiang <jch_chiang@berkeley.edu>, "lbuttner@ametsoc.org" <lbuttner@ametsoc.org>, Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>
 Conversation: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649

Dear Dr. Gergis,

I'm weighing in at this time because of a need for some clarification. Your latest email to John characterizes the error in your manuscript as one of wording. But this differs from the characterization you made in the email you sent reporting the error. In that email (dated June 7) you described it as "an unfortunate data processing error," suggesting that you had intended to detrend the data. That would mean that the issue was not with the wording but rather with the execution of the intended methodology.

Would you please explain why your two emails give different impressions of the nature of the error?

Regards,
 Tony Broccoli

On 6/14/2012 9:48 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:
 Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649 Dear John

Just to clarify, there was an error in the words describing the proxy selection method and not flaws in the entire analysis as suggested by amateur climate skeptic bloggers.

Over recent days we have been in discussion with colleagues here in Australia and internationally about the use of detrended or non detrended data for proxy selection as both methods are published in the literature.

People have argued that detrending proxy records when reconstructing temperature is in fact undesirable (see two papers attached provided courtesy of Professor Michael Mann).

While anthropogenic trends may inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to reconstruct interannual variations. However, in an exercise of this nature we are also intrinsically interested in reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable to retain trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability of the proxies to reconstruct this information.

Both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that both are supported in the literature. Thus we believe that either approach is entirely justifiable.

In terms of revisions to our paper, we plan to compare the influencing of using detrended and non detrended proxy selection in a supplementary section but it is very unlikely to result in a rewrite of the paper. Instead, there will be correction

of the correct method used in the paper and reference to additional supplementary material where appropriate.

Given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, my strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course follow your advice on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, we hope to hear from you again soon.

Yours sincerely

Joelle Gergis on behalf of the coauthors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 14/06/12 2:55 PM, "Hayley Charney" <hcharney@ametsoc.org> wrote:

> CC: broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org, lbuttner@ametsoc.org
>
> Dear Dr. Gergis:
>
> Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2012 informing us of a significant
> error in the analysis of your study. We immediately removed the Early Online
> Release (EOR) of your paper from our website (it was removed by the afternoon
> of June 8), and production of your paper was put on hold.
>
> After consulting with the Chief Editor regarding your situation, my decision
> is to rescind the acceptance of your manuscript for publication. My
> understanding is that you will be redoing your analysis to conform to your
> original description of the predictor selection, in which case you may arrive
> at a different conclusion from your original manuscript. Given this, I
> request that you withdraw the manuscript from consideration.
>
> Please let me know if you and your co-authors agree to the paper being
> withdrawn.
>
> I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing the error to my attention.
> I invite you to resubmit your work as a new manuscript once the necessary
> analyses are done, and the manuscript rewritten.
>
> Sincerely,
> John Chiang
> Editor

27

Subject: Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Sunday, 17 June 2012 1:30 AM
From: John Chiang <jch_chiang@berkeley.edu>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Cc: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>, Laura Buttner <lbuttner@ametsoc.org>, Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] Chief Editor JCLI <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>
Conversation: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649

Dear Joelle:

Just a quick addition to Tony's email query, and clarification on my decision letter (dated June 14).

Both Tony and I read your initial email (dated June 8 for me, I'm in Taipei) to mean that you had intended to detrend during the predictor selection, but that subsequently you had discovered that you had not. Given that you had further stated that "Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper." we had further took this to mean that you were going to redo the analysis to conform to the description of the proxy selection in the paper.

Assuming this to be true, my reasoning was that since you are likely to use a different subset of proxies in the recalculation, it allows for the the possibility of a significantly different result and conclusion. It was on this basis that I requested that you resubmit the paper (and not because of flaws in the analysis method). I understand that the results may well remain essentially the same after the redo, but this is not something that I can assume to be true.

I hope this clarifies my decision. I'll wait for your response to Tony's query before I get back to you on your June 14 email?

Best regards,
John

On Jun 15, 2012, at 7:21 PM, Chief Editor JCLI wrote:

Dear Dr. Gergis,

I'm weighing in at this time because of a need for some clarification. Your latest email to John characterizes the error in your manuscript as one of wording. But this differs from the characterization you made in the email you sent reporting the error. In that email (dated June 7) you described it as "an unfortunate data processing error," suggesting that you had intended to detrend the data. That would mean that the issue was not with the wording but rather with the execution of the intended methodology.

Would you please explain why your two emails give different impressions of the nature of the error?

Regards,
Tony Broccoli

On 6/14/2012 9:48 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649 Dear John

Just to clarify, there was an error in the words describing the proxy selection method and not flaws in the entire analysis as suggested by amateur climate skeptic bloggers.

Over recent days we have been in discussion with colleagues here in Australia and internationally about the use of detrended or non detrended data for proxy selection as both methods are published in the literature.

People have argued that detrending proxy records when reconstructing temperature is in fact undesirable (see two papers attached provided courtesy of Professor Michael Mann).

While anthropogenic trends may inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to reconstruct interannual variations. However, in an exercise of this nature we are also intrinsically interested in reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable to retain trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability of the proxies to reconstruct this information.

Both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that both are supported in the literature. Thus we believe that either approach is entirely justifiable.

In terms of revisions to our paper, we plan to compare the influencing of using detrended and non detrended proxy selection in a supplementary section but it is very unlikely to result in a rewrite of the paper. Instead, there will be correction of the correct method used in the paper and reference to additional supplementary material where appropriate.

Given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, my strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course follow your advice on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, we hope to hear from you again soon.

Yours sincerely

Joelle Gergis on behalf of the coauthors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au> <<http://climatehistory.com.au/>>

On 14/06/12 2:55 PM, "Hayley Charney" <hcharney@ametsoc.org
<x-msg://2233/hcharney@ametsoc.org> > wrote:

> CC: broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org
<x-msg://2233/broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org> , lbuttner@ametsoc.org
<x-msg://2233/lbuttner@ametsoc.org>

>

> Dear Dr. Gergis:

>

> Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2012 informing us of a significant
> error in the analysis of your study. We immediately removed the Early Online
> Release (EOR) of your paper from our website (it was removed by the afternoon
> of June 8), and production of your paper was put on hold.

>

> After consulting with the Chief Editor regarding your situation, my decision
> is to rescind the acceptance of your manuscript for publication. My
> understanding is that you will be redoing your analysis to conform to your
> original description of the predictor selection, in which case you may arrive
> at a different conclusion from your original manuscript. Given this, I
> request that you withdraw the manuscript from consideration.

>

> Please let me know if you and your co-authors agree to the paper being
> withdrawn.

>

> I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing the error to my attention.
> I invite you to resubmit your work as a new manuscript once the necessary
> analyses are done, and the manuscript rewritten.

>

> Sincerely,
> John Chiang
> Editor
> Journal of Climate

>

>

Subject: Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
 Date: Sunday, 17 June 2012 1:35 AM
 From: JOHN CHIANG <jch_chiang@me.com>
 To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
 Cc: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>, Laura Buttner <lbuttner@ametsoc.org>, Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], Chief Editor JCLI <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>, David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>
 Conversation: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649

Apologies - I meant to write "It was on this basis that I requested that you withdraw the paper ". -John

On Jun 16, 2012, at 11:30 PM, John Chiang wrote:

Dear Joelle:

Just a quick addition to Tony's email query, and clarification on my decision letter (dated June 14).

Both Tony and I read your initial email (dated June 8 for me, I'm in Taipei) to mean that you had intended to detrend during the predictor selection, but that subsequently you had discovered that you had not. Given that you had further stated that "Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper." we had further took this to mean that you were going to redo the analysis to conform to the description of the proxy selection in the paper.

Assuming this to be true, my reasoning was that since you are likely to use a different subset of proxies in the recalculation, it allows for the the possibility of a significantly different result and conclusion. It was on this basis that I requested that you resubmit the paper (and not because of flaws in the analysis method). I understand that the results may well remain essentially the same after the redo, but this is not something that I can assume to be true.

I hope this clarifies my decision. I'll wait for your response to Tony's query before I get back to you on your June 14 email?

Best regards,
 John

On Jun 15, 2012, at 7:21 PM, Chief Editor JCLI wrote:

Dear Dr. Gergis,

I'm weighing in at this time because of a need for some clarification. Your latest email to John characterizes the error in your manuscript as one of wording. But this differs from the characterization you made in the email you sent reporting the error. In that email (dated June 7) you described it as "an unfortunate data processing error," suggesting that you had intended to detrend the data. That would mean that the issue was not with the wording but rather with the execution of the intended methodology.

Would you please explain why your two emails give different impressions of the nature of the error?

Regards,
Tony Broccoli

On 6/14/2012 9:48 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649 Dear John

Just to clarify, there was an error in the words describing the proxy selection method and not flaws in the entire analysis as suggested by amateur climate skeptic bloggers.

Over recent days we have been in discussion with colleagues here in Australia and internationally about the use of detrended or non detrended data for proxy selection as both methods are published in the literature.

People have argued that detrending proxy records when reconstructing temperature is in fact undesirable (see two papers attached provided courtesy of Professor Michael Mann).

While anthropogenic trends may inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to reconstruct interannual variations. However, in an exercise of this nature we are also intrinsically interested in reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable to retain trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability of the proxies to reconstruct this information.

Both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that both are supported in the literature. Thus we believe that either approach is entirely justifiable.

In terms of revisions to our paper, we plan to compare the influencing of using detrended and non detrended proxy selection in a supplementary section but it is very unlikely to result in a rewrite of the paper. Instead, there will be correction of the correct method used in the paper and reference to additional supplementary material where appropriate.

Given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, my strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course follow your advice on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, we hope to hear from you again soon.

Yours sincerely

Joelle Gergis on behalf of the coauthors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761

<http://climatehistory.com.au> <<http://climatehistory.com.au/>>

On 14/06/12 2:55 PM, "Hayley Charney" <hcharney@ametsoc.org>
<[x-msg://2233/hcharney@ametsoc.org](mailto://2233/hcharney@ametsoc.org)> > wrote:

> CC: broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org
<[x-msg://2233/broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org](mailto://2233/broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org)> , lbuttner@ametsoc.org
<[x-msg://2233/lbuttner@ametsoc.org](mailto://2233/lbuttner@ametsoc.org)>

>

> Dear Dr. Gergis:

>

> Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2012 informing us of a significant
> error in the analysis of your study. We immediately removed the Early Online
> Release (EOR) of your paper from our website (it was removed by the afternoon
> of June 8), and production of your paper was put on hold.

>

> After consulting with the Chief Editor regarding your situation, my decision
> is to rescind the acceptance of your manuscript for publication. My
> understanding is that you will be redoing your analysis to conform to your
> original description of the predictor selection, in which case you may arrive
> at a different conclusion from your original manuscript. Given this, I
> request that you withdraw the manuscript from consideration.

>

> Please let me know if you and your co-authors agree to the paper being
> withdrawn.

>

> I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing the error to my attention.
> I invite you to resubmit your work as a new manuscript once the necessary
> analyses are done, and the manuscript rewritten.

>

> Sincerely,

> John Chiang

> Editor

> Journal of Climate

>

>

29

Re_The_status_of_your_submission_JCLI-D-11-00649_5.txt
 Subject: Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
 Date: Monday, 25 June 2012 6:05 PM
 From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
 To: JOHN CHIANG <jch_chiang@me.com>, Chief Editor JCLI
 <jcled@envsci.rutgers.edu>
 Cc: Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>, Laura Buttner <lbuttner@ametsoc.org>, Raphael Neukom [REDACTED], David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>
 Conversation: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649

Dear Tony and John

Sorry for the delay in responding to your emails. I have been on leave over the past week but am now back in regular email contact.

Just to clarify our position:

The message sent on 8 June was a quick response when we realised there was an inconsistency between the proxy selection method described in the paper and actually used. The email was sent in haste as we wanted to alert you to the issue immediately given the paper was being prepared for typesetting.

Now that we have had more time to extensively liaise with colleagues and review the existing research literature on the topic, there are reasons why detrending prior to proxy selection may not be appropriate. The differences between the two methods will be described in the supplementary material, as outlined in my email dated 14 June.

As such, the changes in the manuscript are likely to be small, with details of the alternative proxy selection method outlined in the supplementary material. The careful checking and analysis will take a little time but we expect to submit the revised manuscript for consideration by the journal again before the end of July. Like any other revised paper, we would expect it to be sent for peer review again.

As I mentioned previously, given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, our team's strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course accept your decision on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, please know we appreciate your support with this.

All the best

Joelle

--
 Dr Joelle Gergis
 Climate Research Fellow
 School of Earth Sciences
 University of Melbourne,
 VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
 Ph: +61 3 834 49868
 Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 17/06/12 1:35 AM, "JOHN CHIANG" <jch_chiang@me.com> wrote:

Apologies - I meant to write "It was on this basis that I requested that you withdraw the paper ". -John

Re_The_status_of_your_submission_JCLI-D-11-00649_5.txt
On Jun 16, 2012, at 11:30 PM, John Chiang wrote:

Dear Joelle:

Just a quick addition to Tony's email query, and clarification on my decision letter (dated June 14).

Both Tony and I read your initial email (dated June 8 for me, I'm in Taipei) to mean that you had intended to detrend during the predictor selection, but that subsequently you had discovered that you had not. Given that you had further stated that "Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper." we had further took this to mean that you were going to redo the analysis to conform to the description of the proxy selection in the paper.

Assuming this to be true, my reasoning was that since you are likely to use a different subset of proxies in the recalculation, it allows for the possibility of a significantly different result and conclusion. It was on this basis that I requested that you resubmit the paper (and not because of flaws in the analysis method). I understand that the results may well remain essentially the same after the redo, but this is not something that I can assume to be true.

I hope this clarifies my decision. I'll wait for your response to Tony's query before I get back to you on your June 14 email?

Best regards,
John

On Jun 15, 2012, at 7:21 PM, Chief Editor JCLI wrote:

Dear Dr. Gergis,

I'm weighing in at this time because of a need for some clarification. Your latest email to John characterizes the error in your manuscript as one of wording. But this differs from the characterization you made in the email you sent reporting the error. In that email (dated June 7) you described it as "an unfortunate data processing error," suggesting that you had intended to detrend the data. That would mean that the issue was not with the wording but rather with the execution of the intended methodology.

Would you please explain why your two emails give different impressions of the nature of the error?

Regards,
Tony Broccoli

On 6/14/2012 9:48 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649 Dear John

Just to clarify, there was an error in the words describing the proxy selection method and not flaws in the entire analysis as suggested by amateur climate skeptic bloggers.

Over recent days we have been in discussion with colleagues here in Australia and internationally about the use of detrended or non detrended data for proxy selection as both methods are published in the literature.

People have argued that detrending proxy records when reconstructing temperature is in fact undesirable (see two papers attached provided courtesy of Professor Michael Mann).

while anthropogenic trends may inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to reconstruct interannual variations. However, in an exercise of this nature we

Re_The_status_of_your_submission_JCLI-D-11-00649_5.txt
are also intrinsically interested in reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable to retain trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability of the proxies to reconstruct this information.

Both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that both are supported in the literature. Thus we believe that either approach is entirely justifiable.

In terms of revisions to our paper, we plan to compare the influencing of using detrended and non detrended proxy selection in a supplementary section but it is very unlikely to result in a rewrite of the paper. Instead, there will be correction of the correct method used in the paper and reference to additional supplementary material where appropriate.

Given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, my strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course follow your advice on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, we hope to hear from you again soon.

Yours sincerely

Joelle Gergis on behalf of the coauthors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au> <<http://climatehistory.com.au/>>

On 14/06/12 2:55 PM, "Hayley Charney" <hcharney@ametsoc.org>
<x-msg://2233/hcharney@ametsoc.org> > wrote:

> CC: broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org
<x-msg://2233/broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org> , lbuttner@ametsoc.org
<x-msg://2233/lbuttner@ametsoc.org>

>
> Dear Dr. Gergis:
>
> Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2012 informing us of a significant
> error in the analysis of your study. We immediately removed the Early Online
> Release (EOR) of your paper from our website (it was removed by the afternoon
> of June 8), and production of your paper was put on hold.
>
> After consulting with the Chief Editor regarding your situation, my decision
> is to rescind the acceptance of your manuscript for publication. My
> understanding is that you will be redoing your analysis to conform to your
> original description of the predictor selection, in which case you may arrive
> at a different conclusion from your original manuscript. Given this, I
> request that you withdraw the manuscript from consideration.
>
> Please let me know if you and your co-authors agree to the paper being
> withdrawn.
>
> I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing the error to my attention.

Re_The_status_of_your_submission_JCLI-D-11-00649_5.txt

> I invite you to resubmit your work as a new manuscript once the necessary
> analyses are done, and the manuscript rewritten.

>
> Sincerely,
> John Chiang
> Editor
> Journal of Climate
>
>

Subject: Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
 Date: Friday, 29 June 2012 6:18 PM
 From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
 To: John Chiang <jch_chiang@berkeley.edu>
 Cc: Tony Broccoli <broccoli@envsci.rutgers.edu>, Laura Buttner <lbuttner@ametsoc.org>, Hayley Charney <hcharney@ametsoc.org>, Gwendolyn Whittaker <gwhittaker@ametsoc.org>, John Chiang <jchiang@atmos.berkeley.edu>, Raphael Neukom [REDACTED] David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, Ailie Jane Eyre Gallant <agallant@unimelb.edu.au>, "s.phipps@unsw.edu.au" <s.phipps@unsw.edu.au>
 Conversation: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649

Dear John

Many thanks for taking the time to reassess the status of our manuscript and how we should proceed.

Our team would be very pleased to submit a revised manuscript on or before the 27 July 2012 for reconsideration by the reviewers.

As you have recommended below, we will extensively address proxy selection based on detrended and non detrended data and the influence on the resultant reconstructions.

Please let me know when the online submission system will be reset allow me to update the manuscript files.

Thanks again for the opportunity to clarify and improve our study.

All the best

Joelle

--
 Dr Joelle Gergis
 Climate Research Fellow
 School of Earth Sciences
 University of Melbourne,
 VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
 Ph: +61 3 834 49868
 Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 29/06/12 7:45 AM, "John Chiang" <jch_chiang@berkeley.edu> wrote:

Dear Joelle:

Thank you for your response (dated June 25) to our prior email query. I've discussed your case again with Tony, and have come to a decision regarding the handling of your manuscript.

I will allow the modifications to your manuscript to be accepted as a revision, to be submitted on or before July 27, 2012 (EST) - so a month from today. Upon

receipt, the manuscript will be sent out for re-evaluation.

Please note that this is a hard deadline, in order to keep the revision schedule within reasonable limits. If the revision is not submitted by July 27, the paper will be rejected.

In the revision, I strongly recommend that the issue regarding the sensitivity of the climate reconstruction to the choice of proxy selection method (detrend or no detrend) be addressed. My understanding that this is what you plan to do, and this is a good opportunity to demonstrate the robustness of your conclusions.

I hope this is acceptable to you and your co-authors, and I look forward to seeing your revised manuscript.

Sincerely,
John Chiang

On Jun 25, 2012, at 1:29 AM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649
Dear Tony and John

Sorry for the delay in responding to your emails & I have been on leave over the past week but am now back in regular email contact.

Just to clarify our position:

The message sent on 8 June was a quick response when we realised there was an inconsistency between the proxy selection method described in the paper and actually used. The email was sent in haste as we wanted to alert you to the issue immediately given the paper was being prepared for typesetting.

Now that we have had more time to extensively liaise with colleagues and review the existing research literature on the topic, there are reasons why detrending prior to proxy selection may not be appropriate. The differences between the two methods will be described in the supplementary material, as outlined in my email dated 14 June.

As such, the changes in the manuscript are likely to be small, with details of the alternative proxy selection method outlined in the supplementary material. The careful checking and analysis will take a little time but we expect to submit the revised manuscript for consideration by the journal again before the end of July. Like any other revised paper, we would expect it to be sent for peer review again.

As I mentioned previously, given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, our team's strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course accept your decision on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, please know we appreciate your support with this.

All the best

Joelle

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 17/06/12 1:35 AM, "JOHN CHIANG" <jch_chiang@me.com> wrote:

Apologies - I meant to write "It was on this basis that I requested that you withdraw the paper ". -John

On Jun 16, 2012, at 11:30 PM, John Chiang wrote:

Dear Joelle:

Just a quick addition to Tony's email query, and clarification on my decision letter (dated June 14).

Both Tony and I read your initial email (dated June 8 for me, I'm in Taipei) to mean that you had intended to detrend during the predictor selection, but that subsequently you had discovered that you had not. Given that you had further stated that "Although it was an unfortunate data processing error, it does have implications for the results of the paper." we had further took this to mean that you were going to redo the analysis to conform to the description of the proxy selection in the paper.

Assuming this to be true, my reasoning was that since you are likely to use a different subset of proxies in the recalculation, it allows for the the possibility of a significantly different result and conclusion. It was on this basis that I requested that you resubmit the paper (and not because of flaws in the analysis method). I understand that the results may well remain essentially the same after the redo, but this is not something that I can assume to be true.

I hope this clarifies my decision. I'll wait for your response to Tony's query before I get back to you on your June 14 email?

Best regards,

John

On Jun 15, 2012, at 7:21 PM, Chief Editor JCLI wrote:

Dear Dr. Gergis,

I'm weighing in at this time because of a need for some clarification. Your latest email to John characterizes the error in your manuscript as one of wording. But this differs from the characterization you made in the email you sent reporting the error. In that email (dated June 7) you described it as "an unfortunate data processing error," suggesting that you had intended to detrend the data. That would mean that the issue was not with the wording but rather with the execution of the intended methodology.

Would you please explain why your two emails give different impressions of the nature of the error?

Regards,
Tony Broccoli

On 6/14/2012 9:48 PM, Joelle Gergis wrote:

Re: The status of your submission JCLI-D-11-00649 Dear John

Just to clarify, there was an error in the words describing the proxy selection method and not flaws in the entire analysis as suggested by amateur climate skeptic bloggers.

Over recent days we have been in discussion with colleagues here in Australia and internationally about the use of detrended or non detrended data for proxy selection as both methods are published in the literature.

People have argued that detrending proxy records when reconstructing temperature is in fact undesirable (see two papers attached provided courtesy of Professor Michael Mann).

While anthropogenic trends may inflate correlation coefficients, this can be dealt with by allowing for autocorrelation when assessing significance. If any linear trends ARE removed when validating individual proxies, then the validation exercise will essentially only confirm the ability of the proxies to reconstruct interannual variations. However, in an exercise of this nature we are also intrinsically interested in reconstructing longer-term trends. It therefore appears to be preferable to retain trends in the data, so that we are also assessing the ability of the proxies to reconstruct this information.

Both approaches have been widely used in the past, and that both are supported in the literature. Thus we believe that either approach is entirely justifiable.

In terms of revisions to our paper, we plan to compare the influencing of using detrended and non detrended proxy selection in a supplementary section but it is very unlikely to result in a rewrite of the paper. Instead, there will be correction of the correct method used in the paper and reference to additional supplementary material where appropriate.

Given this paper was originally submitted for review on 3 November 2011 and was

extensively reviewed by three expert assessors, my strong preference would be for permission to submit a revision of the original manuscript rather than an entirely new submission. That said, we will of course follow your advice on how best to proceed.

Sorry for the inconvenience caused, we hope to hear from you again soon.

Yours sincerely

Joelle Gergis on behalf of the coauthors

--

Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au> <<http://climatehistory.com.au/>>

On 14/06/12 2:55 PM, "Hayley Charney" <hcharney@ametsoc.org>
<[x-msg://2233/hcharney@ametsoc.org](mailto://2233/hcharney@ametsoc.org)> > wrote:

> CC: broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org
<[x-msg://2233/broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org](mailto://2233/broccoli.jcli@ametsocmail.org)> , lbuttner@ametsoc.org
<[x-msg://2233/lbuttner@ametsoc.org](mailto://2233/lbuttner@ametsoc.org)>
>
> Dear Dr. Gergis:
>
> Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2012 informing us of a significant
> error in the analysis of your study. We immediately removed the Early Online
> Release (EOR) of your paper from our website (it was removed by the afternoon
> of June 8), and production of your paper was put on hold.
>
> After consulting with the Chief Editor regarding your situation, my decision
> is to rescind the acceptance of your manuscript for publication. My
> understanding is that you will be redoing your analysis to conform to your
> original description of the predictor selection, in which case you may arrive
> at a different conclusion from your original manuscript. Given this, I
> request that you withdraw the manuscript from consideration.
>
> Please let me know if you and your co-authors agree to the paper being
> withdrawn.
>
> I regret the situation, but thank you for bringing the error to my attention.
> I invite you to resubmit your work as a new manuscript once the necessary
> analyses are done, and the manuscript rewritten.
>
> Sincerely,
> John Chiang
> Editor
> Journal of Climate

31

From: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
To: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
Date: Fri, 29 Jun 2012 22:26:19 -0400
Subject: JCLIM Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org

Ref.: JCLI-D-11-00649
Journal of Climate

Dear Dr. Gergis,

This is an official notification that your manuscript "Evidence of unusual late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction spanning the last millennium" has been returned to the peer-review process after acceptance.

We look forward to receiving your revision on or before July 27.

Please upload your revised manuscript, along with a detailed explanation of the changes you have made to the manuscript since it was accepted.

To submit a revision, go to <http://jcli.edmgr.com/> and log in as an Author. Click on the menu item labeled "Submissions Needing Revision" and follow the directions for submitting your revision.

Please go to http://www.ametsoc.org/PUBS/AMSRevCklist06_2011_EM.pdf and download the AMS Guidelines for Revisions. Be sure to meet all recommendations on the guidelines for quickest processing of the revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Dr. John Chiang
Editor
Journal of Climate

Subject: Re: JCLIM Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649
Date: Tuesday, 3 July 2012 12:21 AM
From: Joelle Gergis <jgergis@unimelb.edu.au>
To: John Chiang <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org>
Conversation: JCLIM Decision for JCLI-D-11-00649

Great, thanks again for your help with this

All the best
Joelle

--
Dr Joelle Gergis
Climate Research Fellow
School of Earth Sciences
University of Melbourne,
VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 3 834 49868
Fax: +61 3 834 47761
<http://climatehistory.com.au>

On 30/06/12 12:26 PM, "John Chiang" <chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org> wrote:

> CC: chiang.jcli@ametsocmail.org
>
> Ref.: JCLI-D-11-00649
> Journal of Climate
>
>
> Dear Dr. Gergis,
>
> This is an official notification that your manuscript "Evidence of unusual
> late 20th century warming from an Australasian temperature reconstruction
> spanning the last millennium" has been returned to the peer-review process
> after acceptance.
>
> We look forward to receiving your revision on or before July 27.
>
> Please upload your revised manuscript, along with a detailed explanation of
> the changes you have made to the manuscript since it was accepted.
>
> To submit a revision, go to <http://jcli.edmgr.com/> and log in as an Author.
> Click on the menu item labeled "Submissions Needing Revision" and follow the
> directions for submitting your revision.
>
> Please go to http://www.ametsoc.org/PUBS/AMSRevCklist06_2011_EM.pdf and
> download the AMS Guidelines for Revisions. Be sure to meet all
> recommendations on the guidelines for quickest processing of the revised
> manuscript.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Dr. John Chiang
> Editor
> Journal of Climate