

## ***Interactive comment on “Agnotology: learning from mistakes” by R. E. Benestad et al.***

**R.E. Benestad**

rasmus.benestad@met.no

Received and published: 9 June 2013

I want to thank reviewer #1 for dedicating her/his time and effort into reviewing our paper. Such work is immensely valuable, which we try to emphasize in our paper. Furthermore, such feedback may also expose ambiguities in addition to faulty reasoning.

Specific comments are therefore especially helpful, such as the question regarding Dirichlet condition: "For example, based on what fact, the authors claimed that the data in Humlum et al. (2011a) violates the Dirichlet condition?".

In this case, it is condition 4 that is violated: " $f(x)$  is bounded". Here we know that  $f(x)$  represents a small subset of the time series, and which is neither constrained to this time interval nor repeated periodically with the same structure.

It is interesting and surprising to note that both reviews think the paper is too philosoph-

C251

ical, rather just focus more on science. The introduction provides some background information about the problem which we intended to focus on: the degree of confusion about the question about anthropocentric global warming. The discussion is more about practical rather than theoretical issues, with reference to a number of papers.

The view that the paper is either philosophical or scientific is hard to assess, as the definition of the two may be general and wide (e.g. "Philosophy is the study of general and fundamental problems"; "Science is a systematic enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe"). The paper does include both aspects, where the discussion about peer review and reproducing the results is both philosophical about science (the accompanying R-package should be considered as part of this paper, but I realize that we should post this package on this web site).

We think that papers must not necessarily be either scientific or philosophical, but that overlapping the two domains also constitute a valuable contribution to both science and philosophy.

We will try to revise the paper to meet some of the concerns by the reviewer. We hope this will be OK, but we also realize that there will be differences of opinion. This is good - we do not propose to provide the final answer, but we hope that this paper will stimulate more discussions and debate regarding scientific progress, peer review, reproduction of results, and the merit of science.

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 4, 451, 2013.

C252