

From: Judi Krzyzanowski [mailto:judi@krzyzanowski.ca]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 12:50 PM
To: J. Marvin Herndon
Cc: Frontiers Editorial Office
Subject: Re: Recent issues with your article "Human and Environmental Dangers Posed by Ongoing Global Tropospheric Aerosolized Particulates for Weather Modification"
Importance: High

Dear Dr. Soulière and Dr. Herndon,

Apologies for my tardy reply in this matter, I have been busy all day with other things.

I just received and replied to an email from Dr. Faraz Alam of the editorial office regarding this issue; however, Dr. Alam failed to mention that the article would be retracted or provide the final statement.

My reply to Dr. Alam, having not read this yet, requested that Dr. Herndon be provided with the complaints and given an opportunity to reply. Further, I suggested that complainants should have the right to publish an open rebuttal letter or article of their own displaying why/how the results or premise of the article are flawed.

I believe this is the only way to have open and transparent science or editorial process, and it is a technique used by many of the best journals (including Science, Nature, etc.). I believe that this format would fit well within your mandate of transparency and openness—for instance your unique “open” peer-review process. I find it strange that you allow an author to see the reviewers' names with their comments, but not allow an author (or guest editor) to see the names or comments of those who wish to have an article redacted.

The article was accepted with minor changes by two peer-reviewers. One reviewer did remove themselves from the process; however, the two other reviewers that I chose were neither known to me (or I believe) Dr Herndon previously.

I am not saying either way whether the criticisms you received have any basis, I haven't seen them. However, considering the openness and transparency that your journal purports, I find this somewhat impetuous reaction rather surprising.

I realize that my job here is done, but having been part of the process (and this correspondence) I thought that I should add my opinion on the matter.

Thanks and kindest regards,

Dr. Judi Krzyzanowski BSc, MSc, PhD

Tel. 613-395-9338 Fax. 1-877-233-2469
Email: judi@krzyzanowski.ca
Web: <http://www.krzyzanowski.ca>

On Jul 15, 2016, at 1:39 PM, J. Marvin Herndon <mherndon@san.rr.com> wrote:

Dear Dr. Soulière,

I consider retracting a peer-reviewed, published article highly unethical if it is done without first presenting the allegations to the author for his response. You might reasonably expect that those who are endangering the public health by covertly spraying a toxic material (coal fly ash) into the air we breathe would take any measures at their disposal to prevent the public from being made aware of that activity. Common sense should tell you that.

When I published the first evidence of that activity in Current Science, the editor received a suite of complaints and a demand for retraction. The editor asked me to respond in writing, which I did. When the editor asked the complainer permission to publish the complaint, that individual backed off. Please read my response as it is germane to the matter at hand: <http://NuclearPlanet.com/csresponse.pdf>

When I published the second peer-reviewed article in a public health journal, criticisms were made, but in this case, I was not provided verbatim copies of the criticisms; the journal retracted the paper based upon false statements. Please read details of the false basis used to retract that paper as it is germane to the matter at hand: http://www.nuclearplanet.com/public_rejection.pdf
In this instance one individual bragged on Facebook that he had personally traveled to visit to the editor, and he took credit for aiding in the retraction.

As an author I must certify that I have no conflicts of interest. The same cannot be said for those professional disinformation people who make false representations to achieve retraction. As should be clear from the statements made in the two previous instances, those who seek to cause retraction do not tell the truth. In the present instance it is fundamentally and ethically wrong to take their statements at face value without giving me an opportunity to refute the allegations made to objective and open minded referees.

But an even more ethically grievous action is to unwarrantedly hide from the scientific community and the public evidence of a global assault on public and environmental health. That is exactly what Frontiers in Public Health is doing without a fair, balanced, and impartial hearing as to the veracity of the complaints. And you cannot do that without my response to verbatim copies of said complaints.

I suggest that you begin again with your investigations, this time conducting same in an ethical way, with my responses to said complaints. You may

understand that the capricious actions undertaken so far, in my view, compromise the integrity of Frontiers in Public Health. And you may understand that the matter will not in any means be closed with such an unwarranted retraction.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Sincerely,

J. Marvin Herndon, Ph.D.

From: Frontiers Editorial Office [<mailto:editorial.office@frontiersin.org>]

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 7:39 AM

To: mherndon@san.rr.com

Cc: Frederick Fenter

Subject: Recent issues with your article "Human and Environmental Dangers Posed by Ongoing Global Tropospheric Aerosolized Particulates for Weather Modification"

Dear Dr Herndon,

I am writing in regard to your article "Human and Environmental Dangers Posed by Ongoing Global Tropospheric Aerosolized Particulates for Weather Modification", published on 30th of June 2016 in Frontiers in Public Health, in the Specialty Section of Environmental Health.

We have been made aware of serious issues concerning the scientific soundness and methodology of your published article. With this message, we inform you that, based on instructions from our Field Chief Editor of Frontiers in Public Health, Prof. Joav Merrick, and in further accordance with our comments and complaints policy, we have published the following expression of concern:

"With this notice, Frontiers states its awareness of several complaints and serious allegations surrounding the article "Human and Environmental Dangers Posed by Ongoing Global Tropospheric Aerosolized Particulates for Weather Modification" published on 30 June 2016. Our Chief Editors, Joav Merrick and Anwar Huq, will direct an investigation in full accordance with our complaints procedures. The situation will be updated as soon as the investigation is complete."

The investigation has advanced swiftly, and based on the complaints received and the seriousness of the issues raised, we are currently planning to retract the article within the next 48 hours with the following statement:

"The journal retracts the 30 June 2016 article cited above. Based on information discovered after publication and reported to Frontiers in July 2016, the article was examined, revealing that the complaints were valid and that the article should be retracted because it does not meet the scientific standards of the Journal. The retraction of the article was approved by the Field Chief Editor of Frontiers in Public Health. The author did not approve the retraction or the notice."

The wording of the last sentence is negotiable to some extent; for this, or for any other question, we are open to receive your comments and feedback within the next 24 hours.

Kind regards,

Marie Soulière, PhD

Senior Manager | Peer Review Operations, Quality and Ethics

Frontiers

www.frontiersin.org

EPFL Innovation Square, Building I

Lausanne, Switzerland

Office T [+44 79 34 46 47 49](tel:+447934464749)

[Loop](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)

Frontiers community journals rapidly rise to become the most cited open-access journals in their fields. Read the [complete performance analysis](#).

For technical issues, please contact our IT Helpdesk support@frontiersin.org or visit our Frontiers Help Center frontiers.zendesk.com