



Patrick Michaels

CLIMATE OF FEAR

MY PROFILE

MY HEADLINE GRABS

MY RSS FEED

OP/ED

Peer Review And 'Pal Review' In Climate Science

Jun. 16 2011 - 6:46 pm | 235 views | 0 recommendations | 4 comments

Publishing in the scientific literature is supposed to be tough. Submit a manuscript to a reputable journal and it will go through "peer review," where

your equals



criticize your work, send their comments to a journal editor and then the editor will decide whether to accept your submission, reject it outright, or something in between.

In order to limit any bias caused by personal or philosophical animosity, the editor should remove your name from the paper and send it to other experts who have no apparent conflict of interest in reviewing your work. You and the reviewers should not know who each other are. This is called a "double blind" peer review.

Well, this is "the way it is supposed to be." But in the intellectually inbred, filthy-rich world of climate science, where billions of dollars of government research money support trillions of dollars of government policy, peer review has become anything but that.



Show all activity

PATRICK'S NEW POST
Peer Review And 'Pal Review' In
Climate Science

PATRICK'S NEW POST

Fewer French Fried: The Paradox
Of Urban (And Global) Warming

3 Share

5

11

0

Share

MOST POPULAR

MY POSTS	All Posts Last 24 Hours	
.00000	Economics? How oodoo Climate	18,992 views
2. The Great Tornadoes Of 2011 Put In Perspective		4,453 views
3. Chevrolet: Where Federal Subsidies Run Deep		2,624 views
4. The Environmental Protection Agency Comes- a-Copper		2,156 views

1 of 3 6/17/2011 9:21 AM

There is simply no "double blindness." For reasons that remain mysterious, all the major climate journals leave the authors' names on

5. Sound, Fury And The Policy 1,786 views Of Climate Change

2 of 3 6/17/2011 9:21 AM

3 of 3 6/17/2011 9:21 AM