

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

# Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-08/msg01428.html>

---

- *From:* Martin Brown <|||newspam|||@nezumi.demon.co.uk>
  - *Date:* Fri, 08 Aug 2008 13:20:34 +0100
- 

Eeyore wrote:

bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx wrote:

James Arthur wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Jim Thompson wrote:

James Arthur wrote:

Joerg wrote:

[http://www.climateaudit.org/?page\\_id=354](http://www.climateaudit.org/?page_id=354)

This  
shows  
how  
much  
political  
hardball  
seems  
to  
be  
played  
in  
that  
"scientific"  
world.  
Pretty  
sad,  
actually:  
<http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=224>

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

This URL doesn't work. Changing it to end  
?page\_id=224 ended up  
getting me to a blog posting by Steve  
McIntyre on Friday, June 17th,  
2005 at 6:49 am, basically bitching that the  
rest of the world doesn't  
share his particular obsession.

The last  
paragraph is  
shocking:  
"One of the  
first places  
that we  
would  
recommend  
such  
procedures  
is the  
temperature  
data set  
used by the  
IPCC.  
Other  
researchers  
have tried  
without  
success to  
get access  
to the  
supporting  
data. One of  
them shared  
with us the  
response he  
received  
from the  
principal  
author of  
the  
dataset:  
We have  
25 years  
invested in  
this work.  
Why should  
we let you  
look at it,  
when your  
only  
objective is

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

to find fault  
with it? "  
The  
2nd-to-last  
paragraph is  
stunning as  
well. Such  
sloth. The  
work  
shows it.

Sloth? Referees aren't paid.

That doesn't excuse not doing their job. Their job is to double-check the work to help avoid errors. We all make mistakes; this process is supposed to catch them and prevent outright fraud.

Fraud is generally quite rare in academic publications.

Once an experiment has been reported in the literature in most circumstances it will be repeated by others after publication. You cannot avoid the odd individual committing scientific fraud if they are intent on doing so or deluded (eg N-rays). Most get found out pretty quickly and their reputation and research career is wrecked.

A recent high profile example from the biosciences being in Korea.

<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/314/5807/1853>

and

[http://pubs.acs.org/subscribe/journals/esthag-w/2006/feb/business/js\\_fraud.html](http://pubs.acs.org/subscribe/journals/esthag-w/2006/feb/business/js_fraud.html)

Mendel's genetic peas are statistically so close to the theoretical values that it is exceedingly unlikely that the results he reported were exactly what happened for instance. He was still eventually proved right, although it wasn't fully accepted until after his death.

But with the benefit of modern statistics we can see that his reproducibility was too good!

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gregor\\_Mendel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gregor_Mendel)

That isn't the referees primary job, which is to work out whether the authors know what they are talking about.

Sounds like you're trying to make excuses again about the whole concept of peer-review.

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Peer review essentially checks that the equations make sense and the arguments presented are plausible and well constructed.

Why SHOULDN'T they review the data ? Some guy may be perfectly competent but if his raw data is shit, so will be the resulting paper.

If the paper is compromised by bad data someone will notice and publish a better paper. That is how science progresses. Letters pointing out faults or alternative interpretations are common.

How does someone review terabytes of machine readable data anyway on a realistic timescale ?

Regards,

Martin Brown

\*\* Posted from <http://www.teranews.com> \*\*