

**Date:** 2022-12-09 11:15:16

**Last Sent:** 2022-12-09 11:15:16

**Triggered By:** Matthew Huber

**From:** paleoceanography@agu.org

**To:** kelemen@iau.uni-frankfurt.de

**Subject:** 2022PA004598: Decision Letter

**Message:** Dear Dr. Kelemen:

Thank you for submitting "Meridional Heat Transport in the DeepMIP Eocene ensemble: non-CO<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> effects" (2022PA004598) to Paleoclimatology and Paleoclimatology. Unfortunately, our screening for overlap with published works (including those authored by yourself and/or your co-authors) indicates that substantial portions of the manuscript text are identical to portions of text from other works. After careful consideration of your manuscript and these other works, I am returning the manuscript without review.

This is an important topic and one of the important topics that DeepMIP was intended to address so I look forward to the continued progress of this manuscript. But, as identified in the attached cross-check pdf file, there is substantial textual overlap in this manuscript with various previous publications. Some of this is expected for this kind of MIP paper and is not a problem. It is ok if the model descriptions and similar items are overlapping (these should all be included in a section that probably combines methods and data, not just "data"). It is the overlap outside of that section that is problematic. For example, roughly a paragraph that is essentially cut and pasted in from the IPCC report. Please rewrite in your own words sections that are not simple data/model descriptions.

While revising the text, I believe that there are some other presentation issues that should be dealt with before resubmission. This will make the review process take fewer iterations. For example many of the figures are weirdly formatted. If one is not emphasizing the stratosphere it is better to cut off vertical cross-sections at some reasonable height. Similar issues occur in many of the plots, the vertical extent is large with respect to the variations being shown and the patterns are obscured. In many of the diagrams the "key" is in the plot itself and overlays and obscures the data you are trying to show. The discussion of the previous Eocene literature on the topic of changes in heat transport is also incomplete. There are papers on this topic using both coupled and uncoupled models going back more than 20 years (for example Huber and Sloan, 2001). A more complete discussion of what is novel about the results here is certain to arise when we go to review, so it would be good deal with this issue before going out to review.

This decision is not an accusation of plagiarism, but rather a statement that Paleoclimatology and Paleoclimatology simply cannot consider submissions with this level of text overlap. (You can see the instances of overlapping text in the attached report.) If you remain interested in publishing the paper in Paleoclimatology and Paleoclimatology, then please revise the text so that it meets the Paleoclimatology and Paleoclimatology requirements, and submit the revised version.

I am sorry that I am not able to provide better news in this particular case. I encourage you to view AGU's Scientific Ethics For Authors page (<https://www.agu.org/Publish-with-AGU/Publish/Author-Resources/Policies/Scientific-ethics-policy>) and Dual Publication Policy (<https://www.agu.org/Publish-with-AGU/Publish/Author-Resources/Policies/Prior-Publication-Policy>).

You will receive an email with a link to an online survey regarding your experience with the peer review process for this submission. Your comments will help us improve AGU journals and service to authors.

Thank you for your continued interest in Paleoclimatology and Paleoclimatology.

Sincerely,

Matthew Huber  
Editor  
Paleoclimatology and Paleoclimatology