



22.7.2006

James Famiglietti
Editor-in-Chief, Geophysical Research Letters

Re: GRL manuscript “Statistical analysis of climatic time series: uncertainty and insights”,
formerly titled “Long-term persistence and uncertainty on the long term”
(GRL 2006GL026709) by Demetris Koutsoyiannis and Alberto Montanari

Dear Jay,

Thanks again for allowing a resubmission of a revised version of our paper. We understand your point about the “strength of the strongly negative review” and the expertise and track record of Reviewer #1. If we did not have the negative feeling because of the rejection of our paper, we would regard it a honor to receive a review from this reviewer, with this expertise and strength.

In any case, we are very satisfied that, despite its strength and negative attitude, this review did not locate any error on our paper. All reviewer’s arguments are based on his interpretations. Obviously, our interpretations are different from those of the reviewer. Despite the strong critical review and the references the reviewer suggested, we were not convinced to adopt his interpretations. Rather we are more confident now that our own interpretations and views are more consistent. We could write a chapter with arguments on that. However, we preferred not to diverge from the actual objectives of our paper. At the same time, we briefly discuss in the introduction our disagreement with reviewer’s interpretation and better explain our own views.

In our opinion, the fact that a manuscript, without being erroneous, triggers such a strongly negative review may indicate that the manuscript is publishable. Publication of such a manuscript may be good for the scientific dialogue and even for the disagreeing reviewer, because he will have the opportunity to express publicly his strong disagreement and prove publicly the inconsistency of our opinion. We will be happy to compare the two interpretations in the future, for instance if the reviewer challenges our views with a discussion of our paper, if the latter gets published. Of course, we take the full responsibility of what we write and we will be happy to make this discussion publicly and formally.

We have considered seriously the comments of this reviewer. We did not find anything to correct in our manuscript, because the reviewer did not suggest any error. However, as you will see, we rewrote most part of the paper, also changing entirely the title, the abstract and the introduction, most part of the conclusion, and several other parts, in order to make our text more resistant against the strength of the reviewer. You can locate the changes we did in the annotated manuscript copy that we submit, in addition to the regular manuscript. In addition, we submit a detailed report with replies to the review comments. We are afraid that this reviewer perhaps will not like the revised submission more than the initial one. We trust, however, that this will not be the only criterion of your decision.

We really hope and look forward to a positive decision for our manuscript.

Best wishes,

Demetris (also on behalf of Alberto)

✉ ΗΡΩΩΝ ΠΟΛΥΤΕΧΝΕΙΟΥ 5
157 80 ΖΩΓΡΑΦΟΥ

✉ HEROON POLYTECHNEIΟΥ 5
GR-157 80 ZOGRAPHOU, ATHENS, GREECE

☎ +30 210 772 2831 – 📠 +30 210 772 2832 📧 dk@itia.ntua.gr – <http://www.itia.ntua.gr/dk/>