

Interactive comment on “Energetic regimes of the global economy – past, present and future” by Andrew Jarvis and Carey King

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 23 November 2020

Dear Authors, Editor and Second Reviewer,

I was as polite as possible because the basics should be always kept, and indeed the research topic of the manuscript poses very stimulating questions.

However, I agree with the second reviewer that the manuscript is truly unprofessional and should be rejected. In my humble opinion, such low quality manuscripts should be rejected at desk.

I praise ESD for its broad scope on the dynamics captured and for the forward looking reviewing scheme, but I fail to see how ESD could add value to the community by sending low quality manuscripts to the reviewers.

Furthermore, just imagine how confusing could it be, that low quality manuscripts pro-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



viding intellectual support to ideas like "there is no meaning on transitioning beyond oil and coal" and "there is no need to implement low-carbon energy" remain having the format and logo of ESD/EGU. Even if the preprints are removed after the discussion phase, this can be confusing in the information-flooded world where we are.

I would like to offer praise to the clarity of the second reviewer, even if it might be undesirable to be so direct at times, it is a good way to reprimand non-professional behaviour in academia.

I would be interested to know what the second reviewer thinks about this particular point: could these badly produced and interpreted results directly or indirectly support the arguments I put within quotations above?

I believe and support that a culture of excellence needs desk rejections from time to time.

Thanks to all for the interesting debate.

Kindest regards.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2020-59>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

