On 2010-05-02, at 1:14 PM, Ryan ODonnell wrote:

> Dr. Broccoli,
>
> After discussing this amongst ourselves, my coauthors and I do have a concern that we feel is still outstanding.
>
> Reviewer A is clearly one or more of the authors of S09. While we certainly understand allowing S09 to review our work to ensure that we did not make any substantial mistakes during the replication, given that our replication was exact and the reviewer had no concerns in this area, this issue has been adequately addressed. The reviewer has an obvious conflict of interest - one that led to numerous misstatements of fact. We have provided a thorough response to those misstatements, complete with the calculations that show them to be incorrect.
>
> Our concern is that during re-review, we will find ourselves subjected to a similar barrage of misstatements and unsubstantiated opinion (i.e., like the reviewer's statements that our seasonal trends somehow matched S09's). We feel it would be unreasonable and unfair to expect us to continue to respond to this kind of review. Such a process would essentially amount to gatekeeping by the authors being criticized, which is obviously not in the best interest of the science.
>
> With this in mind, we would like to make two requests. First, does AMS have a written conflict-of-interest policy with respect to reviews? We have been unable to locate such a policy, and if one exists, we would greatly appreciate if one of your editorial staff could forward the policy to us. Second, we would appreciate knowing your plans should Reviewer A raise additional concerns. We feel that it would be unfair to expect us to continue to respond in the same manner as we were required to respond to the initial review.
>
> Lastly, we had one minor observation we would like to make. In your reply, you stated that the majority of the reviewers had recommended major revisions. Our read of Reviews B and C, however, indicate minor revisions. Review A (the review with the conflict of interest) was the only review that recommended major revisions. We were wondering if additional communication between the reviewers had taken place?
>
> Thank you for your consideration.
>
> Best regards,
> Ryan O'Donnell