Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, C15277–C15278, 2013 www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/10/C15277/2013/

© Author(s) 2013. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



Interactive comment on "Where do winds come from? A new theory on how water vapor condensation influences atmospheric pressure and dynamics" by A. M. Makarieva et al.

A. Nenes (Editor)

nenes@eas.gatech.edu

Received and published: 25 January 2013

The authors have presented an entirely new view of what may be driving dynamics in the atmosphere. This new theory has been subject to considerable criticism which any reader can see in the public review and interactive discussion of the manuscript in ACPD (http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/10/24015/2010/acpd-10-24015-2010-discussion.html). Normally, the negative reviewer comments would not lead to final acceptance and publication of a manuscript in ACP. After extensive deliberation however, the editor concluded that the revised manuscript still should be published – despite the strong criticism from the esteemed reviewers – to promote

C15277

continuation of the scientific dialogue on the controversial theory. This is not an endorsement or confirmation of the theory, but rather a call for further development of the arguments presented in the paper that shall lead to conclusive disproof or validation by the scientific community. In addition to the above manuscript-specific comment from the handling editor, the following lines from the ACP executive committee shall provide a general explanation for the exceptional approach taken in this case and the precedent set for potentially similar future cases: (1) The paper is highly controversial, proposing a fundamentally new view that seems to be in contradiction to common textbook knowledge. (2) The majority of reviewers and experts in the field seem to disagree, whereas some colleagues provide support, and the handling editor (and the executive committee) are not convinced that the new view presented in the controversial paper is wrong. (3) The handling editor (and the executive committee) concluded to allow final publication of the manuscript in ACP, in order to facilitate further development of the presented arguments, which may lead to disproof or validation by the scientific community.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 24015, 2010.