



SCC Publishing
Michelets vei 8 B
1366 Lysaker Norway

ISSN: 2703-9072

Correspondence:
bobbi_john@jfcbat.
com

Vol. 6.3 (2026)

pp. 88-95

Extract from:

Global Warming, Climate Change, and Scientific Consensus have not been proven. There is no proven Climate Crisis!

A Quantitative Audit exposes Fraudulent Pseudoscience and Fudging of the IPCC's Earth's Energy Imbalance

John F. Clauser

Retired experimental and theoretical physicist, 2022 Physics Nobel Laureate
817 Hawthorne Drive, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, USA

Abstract

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), along with its various collaborators and contributors (IPCC *et al.*), forecast an impending climate crisis with catastrophic consequences for the Earth's population. They predict an alarming increase in the frequency of dangerous extreme weather events and other bad natural phenomena. This work provides a quantitative scientific review of their efforts. It is a whistle-blower report that exposes serious scientific misconduct. It provides a quantitative audit of the bad arithmetic and flawed scientific methodology behind their claims regarding the Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI), global warming, climate change, and an impending "climate change crisis". It shows exactly where their claims amount to quantitatively fraudulent bad science. This work exposes a subtle but critical design flaw of the CERES Terra and Aqua workhorse satellites. The flaw's existence was admittedly known by IPCC *et al.* scientists, and the herein exposed data fudges were used to cover up the flaw. Seriously flawed and fudged pseudoscience was then employed in a massive futile attempt to bolster the original global warming crisis prediction using fudged ocean-temperature-anomaly data. This work also shows that Al Gore's alarmist claim of a "scientific consensus" alleging a proven impending climate change crisis is a total fantasy. Independent climate scientists at 20 different laboratories worldwide used the CMIP5 computer code to perform climate simulations using 43 different climate simulation models. There is vast quantitative disagreement among their variously assumed climate simulation parameters, their calculated predictions and observations. There are also errors clearly evident in the code's assumed physics. This paper's demonstrated conclusion is that contrary to claims by the IPCC *et al.* a positive energy imbalance, global warming and climate change have not been proven! There is no proven climate crisis! The world is correspondingly wasting trillions of dollars by attempting to limit the use of fossil fuels. *If it ain't been proved broke, don't fix it!*

Keywords: Greenhouse effect; radiative forcing;

Submitted 2026-08-10, Accepted 2026-08-11. <https://doi.org/10.53234/scc202608/14>

Table of Contents

1	Introduction
1.1	<i>The IPCC et. al.'s plausible causal chain</i>
1.2	<i>Purpose</i>
1.3	<i>Foreword</i>
2	NOAA's False Claim to have Actually Observed an Increased Frequency of Extreme Weather Events
3	Preliminaries
3.1	<i>What is needed to define global annual average temperature and global warming scientifically?</i>
3.2	<i>What is wrong with using average global temperature as a global-warming metric?</i>
3.3	<i>What is an "anomaly", and what is wrong with the use of "anomalies" as scientific metrics?</i>
3.4	<i>A better global warming metric is clearly needed for scientific purposes. One is actually adopted – EEI</i>
3.5	<i>Some IPCC et al. standard scientific usage and conventions</i>
3.6	<i>Some IPCC et al. pedantic jargon</i>
4	The Earth's Energy Imbalance
4.1	<i>What is meant by Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI)?</i>
4.2	<i>Conservation of energy, the continuity equation, and energy flow through a Gaussian surface</i>
4.3	<i>Application of the continuity equation to the Earth's energy flow to and from outer space</i>
4.4	<i>Ramanathan (1987) published the first power-flow diagram using satellite data</i>
4.5	<i>The Top-of-Atmosphere (TOA) power-imbalance arithmetic is simple</i>
4.6	<i>Power-flow diagrams are now routinely used to report the Top-of-Atmosphere power imbalance (EEI)</i>
5	Satellite Observational Data
5.1	<i>Measuring the TOA power imbalance using satellites should be simple. Shouldn't it?</i>
5.2	<i>Second generation satellite data, unfortunately, are admitted to be insufficiently accurate!</i>
5.3	<i>What went right with the Terra and Aqua 5.3satellite plan?</i>
5.4	<i>What went wrong with the Terra and Aqua satellite plan? – The fatal flaw</i>
6	Some Definitions: Fudge, "Constrainment", and Scientific Misconduct
7	What Did the IPCC et al. do when the TOA Satellite Data Were Finally Recognized to Be Insufficient to Determine the Existence of Global Warming?
7.1	<i>Hansen et al. (2011) recommended the use of flawed ocean-heat-content anomaly data as an alternative to the flawed Terra and Aqua data</i>
7.1.1	<i>Flawed ocean-temperature and heat-content anomaly data are acquired at the "Bottom-of-Atmosphere"; There is NO Gaussian surface for OHCA data</i>
7.1.2	<i>Flawed ocean-temperature anomaly data acquisition is from a multiplicity of different areas that do not cover the whole Earth</i>
7.1.3	<i>Flawed ocean-heat-content anomaly data come from two very different datasets</i>
7.1.4	<i>Ocean temperature anomaly data components are irregularly taken and claimed to be poorly recorded</i>
7.1.5	<i>Data from both XBT and ARGO datasets are under-sampled and/or fabricated</i>

- 7.1.6 *Lyman et al. (2010) use three very different data-acquisition time-periods for flawed OHCA data – 1=XBT only, 2=XBT-ARGO time-varying mix, 3=ARGO only*
- 7.1.7 *Levitus et al. (2000) analyzed XBT-only ocean-heat-content-anomaly data for the 45-year period, 1950 – 1995. The results are consistent with EEI = 0*
- 7.1.8 *Four-step conversion by Lyman et al. (2010) of recorded Bottom-of-Atmosphere temperature data to a single number Top-of-Atmosphere EEI estimate*
- 7.2 *Hansen et al. (2011) select the Lyman et al. (2010) OHCA data analysis from among various other analyses for use in AR5 (2013). It exhibits the largest TOA EEI*
- 7.3 *Ocean-heat-content anomaly data analyzed by Lyman et al. (2010) – scientific misconduct #2*
- 7.4 *Ocean heat-content anomaly data further analyzed by Loeb et al. (2012) – continuing scientific misconduct #2*
- 7.5 *Power imbalance analysis summary by Stephens et al. (2012)*
- 7.6 *Stephens and l’Ecuyer publicly retract the fudged Stephens et al. (2012) results*

8 The IPCC et al. proceed from AR5 (2013) to AR6 (2021)

- 8.1 *There are totally insufficient downward-radiation monitoring surface data from BSRN weather stations and buoys*
- 8.2 *A problem with the CMIP5 code - it uses seriously flawed physics*
- 8.3 *How big are the typical CMIP5 discrepancies between observations and simulations (‘biases’)” that Hansen et al. (2013) admit to?*
- 8.4 *CMIP5 simulations are totally incapable of explaining, even approximately, the Earth’s observed temperature anomaly history as adopted by AR5(2013)*
- 8.5 *CMIP5 computer modelling is pathetically incapable of simulating the Earth’s annually varying albedo*
- 8.6 *CMIP5 simulations are all in violent disagreement with observed data and with each other. The disagreement indicates a total lack of consensus among climate scientists!*
- 8.7 *Power-imbalance analysis by Wild et al. (2015) - Scientific misconduct #5*
- 8.8 *Power-imbalance analysis by Wild et al. (2019)*
- 8.9 *Johnson, Lyman and Loeb (2016) and Loeb et al. (2018) overwrite the EBAF public satellite-database with fudged OHCA data*
- 8.10 *Fudged power-imbalance analysis by the IPCC’s AR6 (2021)*

9 How Badly Have the Books Been Cooked?

- 9.1 *Tabulated results of the EEI audit*
- 9.2 *Correcting the Loeb et al. (2018), Wild et al. (2015), and AR6 (2021) fraudulent dodgy data adjustments reverses their analyses’ conclusions*
- 9.3 *List of methods used for small fudges*
- 9.4 *The Loeb et al. (2009) Small fudges, method 2 is expanded and used for huge fudges*
- 9.5 *Scientific misconduct tally*

10 Conclusions

Appendices

- Appendix A** *Generally accepted standards in science for claiming experimental proof of the hypothesis: $|x| \leq \sigma_x \cdot N$*
- Appendix B** *Actual altitudes and relative importance of the three most important atmospheric sunlight-energy transfer processes*
- Appendix C** *Wild et al. (2019) power-flow diagram components - Clear sky and Cloud Radiative Effects (CRE)*
- Appendix D.1** *The power-flow diagram arithmetic is dishonestly fudged using flawed arithmetic!*

Appendix D.2	Tracking the BAD PENNY value
Appendix D.3	The Loeb <i>et al.</i> (2009) dodgy “data adjustment” technique is first used to make small fudges
Appendix D.4	Wild <i>et al.</i> (2015) introduce a new method for (mis)representing a number that has been “adjusted” using the Loeb <i>et al.</i> (2009) dodgy technique
Appendix D.5	Data fudging via creative round-off
Appendix E.1	Loeb <i>et al.</i> (2009)’s dodgy data adjustment small-fudging technique is extended by Loeb <i>et al.</i> (2018) to make huge fudges
Appendix E.2	Wild <i>et al.</i> (2015 and 2019) extend the Loeb <i>et al.</i> (2009) data “adjustment” technique to make huge fraudulent fudges that totally reverse the analysis conclusions
Appendix F	Two different 2025 US government-sponsored reports give diametrically opposite conclusions
Appendix G	The oceans’ epipelagic zone and thermocline
Appendix H	The very strong reflectivity (albedo) at shallow incidence on a smooth dielectric surface like water or glass creates bright sun glare
Appendix I	Claude Monet’s impression of bright morning sun glare

1. Introduction

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), along with its various collaborators and contributors (IPCC *et al.*), forecast an impending climate crisis with catastrophic consequences for the Earth’s population. They predict an alarming increase in the frequency of dangerous extreme weather events and other bad natural phenomena. This work provides a quantitative scientific review of their efforts. *It is a whistle-blower report that exposes serious scientific misconduct.* It provides a quantitative audit of the IPCC *et al.*’s bad arithmetic and scientific methodology regarding their claims of the Earth’s Energy Imbalance (EEI), global warming, climate change, and an impending “climate-change crisis”. It shows that their claims amount to quantitatively fraudulent bad science.

Importantly, it exposes a subtle but critical flaw in the design of the workhorse CERES Terra and Aqua satellites. The satellites were effectively totally blind to specular reflection of sunlight from the ocean surface – sun glare! After a decade of observation, the satellites yielded a ridiculous result that was obviously flawed. “Aw [expletive] What do we do now?” The flaw was in the choice of using a MODIS line-scan camera rather than using a panoramically-viewing pyranometer to measure the Earth’s outgoing-radiation power flux. The scan-line is not parallel to the sun-glare’s directional reflection-stripe. To cover up the flaw, the satellite data were literally overwritten with data from a seriously flawed study of ocean-temperature-anomaly rate-of-increase measurements, that, in turn, was badly and fatally skewed by time-varying Southern-Ocean-fraction composition and by erroneous fabricated anomaly-offset corrections. Many data fudges were needed for the satellite-flaw’s cover up. The data fudges and incriminating evidence are all published and hiding in plain sight. The fraudulent assertions are fully documented herein by simply identifying and displaying the flawed published arithmetic and methodology. This paper shows exactly where to find the fudges for fact checking.

Conclusion: Global warming and climate change have not been proven. There is no proven crisis. The world is wasting trillions of dollars by attempting to limit the extraction and use of fossil fuels.

1.1 The IPCC *et. al.*’s plausible causal chain

The IPCC *et al.* start by assuming a highly plausible climate-change model that consists of a causal linked chain. 1. Extraction and consumption of fossil fuels is assumed to cause increasing

atmospheric CO₂. Increasing CO₂ is actually observed via the Keeling curve from Mauna Loa. 2. Increasing CO₂ is assumed to cause *a positive* Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI). Said positive energy imbalance is claimed to be observed via satellite and rising ocean heat-content "anomaly" observations. 3. A positive Earth's Energy Imbalance, if present, is expected to cause global warming. Global warming is claimed to be observed, based on observations of a rising global average "temperature anomaly", almost all of which is irregularly and sparsely recorded almost exclusively in urban land areas. 4. Global warming is assumed to cause climate change. Said change is claimed to be observed as an increasing frequency of extreme weather events. An increasing frequency of extreme weather events is claimed to be well documented by NOAA's historical weather data. 5. The claimed-observed increasing frequency of extreme weather events then forebodes a predicted climate crisis and other bad stuff.

Break any one link of this chain, however, and the whole chain collapses.

Increasing atmospheric CO₂, is clearly observed via the Keeling curve. That observation is probably the only good science in the whole chain. Extraction and use of fossil fuels are claimed by the IPCC *et al.* to cause the observed increase of the atmospheric greenhouse gas, CO₂. While the associated linked observation may indeed be valid, it doesn't really matter, because the chain thereafter is herein proven to be false. The IPCC *et al.* assume all links to be true but never actually prove them to be true with observational data. This work breaks the remaining links, by requiring observational proof of the claimed links, and by demonstrating that computer modelling, by itself, provides insufficient proof.

The IPCC and its contributors were tasked with determining the Earth's climactic parameters and ascertaining the magnitude of the threat that its predicted warming has to society. To accomplish these tasks, they use computer modelling and observational data from satellites, ocean bathymetry, and a global network of surface radiation and temperature measurements to determine important parameters for the Earth's climate. From these calculations and measurements, they have attempted to determine the so-called Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI), along with other climatic parameters, including the Earth's associated global average surface-temperature history, and the Earth's natural power-balance feedback-stability strength.

1.2 Purpose

It is the purpose of this paper to show that, contrary to claims by the IPCC *et al.*, global warming and climate change have not been proven, and that there is no proven climate crisis. Importantly, this work exposes a subtle but critical design flaw of the CERES Terra and Aqua workhorse satellites. The satellites were effectively blind to specular reflection – sun glare – reflected from the ocean surface. The flaw's existence was admittedly known by IPCC *et al.* scientists. *Herein exposed data fudges were then used to cover up the flaw, once it was recognized. Seriously flawed pseudoscience and fudged data are then employed in a massive attempt to bolster the original global-warming crisis prediction using fudged ocean-temperature-anomaly data.*

Unfortunately, with missing crucial satellite data, the IPCC *et al.*'s remaining assembled data, as referenced in the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (2021), are woefully insufficient to prove the existence of global warming. Neither do remaining data clearly prove a positive Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI), nor do they prove climate change. Available data do not prove an impending "climate change crisis". Importantly, the tabulated audited EEI data, shown in Section 9.1 of this work, are shown to be mostly fudged. Moreover, Section 9.2 shows that when these fudged data are restored to their original un-fudged values, there is no evident proven energy imbalance, no proven global warming, and hence no proven climate change. *To the contrary, all available observational data are fully consistent with no energy imbalance and no global warming.*

Additionally, this work also shows that Al Gore's alarmist claim of a "scientific consensus" alleging a proven impending climate-change crisis is a total fantasy. Independent climate scientists at 20 different laboratories worldwide used the CMIP5 computer code to perform climate simulations using 43 different climate simulation models. There is vast *quantitative* disagreement

among their variously assumed climate simulation parameters and their calculated predictions. Huge disagreement is both with each other and with observational data. Worse yet, the CMIP5 code, itself, is shown in Sections 8.2 – 8.6 to exhibit bad physics. It is totally incapable of simulating, even closely, the observed Earth's temperature anomaly history, let alone its observed annually oscillating albedo history. Despite these huge discrepancies, the various simulation results all suspiciously concur on an extremely precise value for their “best-guess” EEI value.

The paper's demonstrated overall conclusion is that contrary to claims by the IPCC *et al.*, global warming and climate change have not been proven, and there is no proven climate crisis! Indeed, the half-century-long IPCC program has shown itself to be dishonest and incapable of demonstrating any such proof. The world is correspondingly wasting trillions of dollars by attempting to limit the extraction and use of fossil fuels. *If it ain't been proved broke, don't fix it!*

1.3 Foreword

In what follows, Section 2 first dispatches NOAA's claims that there is an observed increasing frequency of extreme weather events. Those claims are demonstrated to be false.

Section 3 provides some needed important preliminary comments along with a more detailed introduction to the IPCC program. First, it asks and answers the basic question - What is needed scientifically to define global annual average temperature and global warming? It shows that measurements of global temperature for use as a global warming metric are impossible, let alone totally impractical. It also gives a highly critical discussion of the IPCC *et al.*'s repeated use of and reliance upon so-called “anomaly measurements”, particularly the various measurements of temperature anomalies, and especially of ocean temperature anomalies. Fortunately, given that a better global warming metric is clearly needed for scientific purposes, one was actually adopted by the IPCC *et al.* That metric is the Earth's Energy Imbalance, of EEI. Unfortunately, it is not always used by much of the work done by the IPCC *et al.* Section 3 ends with a clarification of some standard scientific terminology and conventions. It also translates some IPCC *et al.* jargon that is frequently confusing, misleading, vague, and/or pedantic.

Section 4 provides detailed definitions of “net global power/energy imbalance” or Earth's Energy Imbalance (EEI). It shows how the use of assumed conservation of energy, the continuity equation, and energy flow through a Gaussian surface is applied to measurements of the Earth's energy flow at the Top-of-Atmosphere to and from outer space. It shows how EEI is calculated and conventionally reported (and frequently misreported) using power-flow diagrams. Unfortunately, the same arguments do not work for power-flows measured at the Bottom-of- Atmosphere that use only Gaussian-surface segments.

Section 5 describes the satellite-data collection program. The original program to measure EEI was to use satellite observation of energy flow at the so-called Top-of-Atmosphere. Initial data from the ERBE satellite gave promising results for that pursuit. Unfortunately, after many years of observation using the Terra and Aqua satellites, their data are found to be insufficiently accurate to determine EEI so as to prove or disprove the global-warming hypothesis. Actually, they measured a hugely positive value for EEI, which is obviously very wrong! While the random errors were small enough, the problem was traced to a systematic flaw in the design of Terra and Aqua. The satellites were effectively blind to specular reflection of sunlight from the ocean surface – sun glare – that is radiated back out into space!

The program's dark side began when the TOA satellite data were finally recognized to be incapable of proving the existence (or non-existence) of global warming. Hansen *et al.* (2011) and Loeb *et al.* (2009) proposed the use of ocean-temperature-anomaly data as a weak substitute for the missing satellite data. To cover up the flaw, the satellite data were literally overwritten with data from a seriously flawed study of ocean temperature anomaly rate-of-increase measurements, that, in turn, was badly fatally skewed by time-varying Southern-Ocean-fraction composition, and by erroneous fabricated anomaly-offset corrections. A time-derivative of the results was fatally flawed because of this added extraneous time dependence.

Working definitions of the words fudge, “*constraint*”, and scientific misconduct, are given in Section 6. Section 7 then describes the fudging of ocean temperature anomaly data via its presentation as fudged ocean-heat-content anomaly data, all taken at the Bottom-of-Atmosphere with a highly questionable linkage to the Earth’s Top-of-Atmosphere Energy Imbalance. The fudged results then form the basis for the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report, AR5 (2013). Section 8 details the progressively massive data fudging used in the progression from AR5 (2013) to the IPCC’s Sixth Assessment Report, AR6 (2021).

Reporting data that is measured at Bottom-of-Atmosphere and claiming without proof that it is the same as Top-of-Atmosphere data, as is done by Loeb *et al.* (2012) (see Sect. 7.4), and then overwriting the Top-of-Atmosphere data in the EBAF satellite public database with different data values chosen to match data that is measured at Bottom-of-Atmosphere, as is done by Loeb *et al.* (2018) (see Sect. 8.9), clearly qualifies as a “*bait and switch*” hoax!

Section 9 summarizes just how badly the IPCC *et al.*’s books have been cooked. It first tabulates the results of this work’s audit of published EEI values. It goes on to show how the resulting conclusions regarding global warming are actually reversed when corrected values are used instead. It proceeds to list details of the various dishonest fudging methods that were employed. Finally, it provides a summary of six cases of scientific misconduct that are exposed by this work. The paper’s conclusions are given in Section 10.

A second forthcoming paper addresses the net result of these data fudges. It shows that because of these fudges the IPCC *et al.* have clearly misidentified the dominant process that controls the Earth’s climate. They have ignored the big numbers of the problem and focused on the small numbers that are associated with rising atmospheric CO₂ concentration. That paper shows that the actual dominant process is the cloud-variation-thermostatic feedback mechanism. The process provides a highly stable atmosphere and temperature, and it fully cancels the negligible destabilizing effects of CO₂. It also shows confirmatory experimental evidence for this process and shows that it is fully consistent with existing observational data.

10. Conclusions

There is no positive Earth’s Energy Imbalance (EEI) that has been observably proven. There is no proven global warming. There is no proven long-term climate change. There is no observed increased frequency of extreme weather events. There is no climate-change crisis!

There is clearly no quantitative consensus regarding the Earth’s climactic parameters among climate scientists in at least 20 different laboratories worldwide. Instead, there is huge disagreement among them. A (more than) factor-of-2 disagreement among the various EEI estimates based on different investigators OHCA data analyses is also a clear repudiation of Al Gore’s misplaced claims of “*consensus*”.

The world is wasting trillions of dollars with its vain attempts to limit production and use of fossil fuels. *If it ain’t been proved broke, don’t fix it!*

The IPCC and its contributors have fraudulently fudged observational data and have committed *fraudulent scientific misconduct* on multiple occasions in order to claim falsely and dishonestly that there is a positive Earth’s Energy Imbalance and an associated impending climate crisis.

There is a design flaw in the CERES Terra and Aqua satellites that prevents them from measuring the Earth’s Energy Imbalance with an accuracy sufficient to assert the existence of global warming. The satellites are nearly totally blind to strong sun glare from the ocean surface at shallow angles of sunlight incidence. They correspondingly very-significantly underestimate the Earth’s reflected sunlight intensity. The presence of this flaw has been knowingly covered up by IPCC *et al.* climate scientists by their use of fudged ocean-heat-content-anomaly data.

Experimental measurements of the Earth’s Energy Imbalance (EEI), made by the IPCC and its contributors using satellite radiometry and ocean-heat-content anomalies, are all fully consistent with zero energy imbalance and with zero global warming.

The analysis by Lyman *et al.* (2010) of ocean-heat-content anomaly (OHCA) data is seriously flawed. It claims the widely quoted value, $EEI = 0.64 \pm 0.11 \text{ W/m}^2$, subsequently revised to $EEI = 0.6 \pm 0.4 \text{ W/m}^2$. However, a corrected analysis using only homogeneous OHCA datasets is consistent with the result $EEI = 0$. It is also consistent with their reported heat-content variation being solely due to the temporal fractional change in ocean sampling that, in turn, is due solely to a significant extension of the ocean-temperature anomaly sampling activity into more Southern-Ocean areas.

The 45-year history of OHCA data presented by Levitus *et al.* (2000) clearly reveals strong temperature oscillations that are presumably due to ENSO (El Niño) current variations, but no obvious long-term increasing global-warming trend. That is, the OHCA data presented by Levitus *et al.* (2000) are fully consistent with $EEI = 0$. Their results are in sharp contrast to the results by Lyman *et al.* (2010) using a shorter 16-year history of highly flawed ocean-heat-content-anomaly (OHCA) data.

Archived satellite based EEI measurements by Loeb *et al.* (2018) have been fudged to match the ocean heat-content anomaly based fudged EEI measurements so that their noted agreement cannot be used as validation of either one, as has been done by the recent review by the National Academies.

Climate modelling predictions by GISS computer simulations are demonstrably unreliable. The IPCC now agrees and further admits that the RCP 8.5 scenario “*is unrealistic and should be scrapped.*”

There are serious admitted flaws in the theoretical basis behind the CMIP5 computer atmospheric simulation codes and serious structural flaws in their included physics. There is virtually no reliable agreement between CMIP5 simulation and observation. It should be noted further that so-called attribution studies that rely on these computer predictions are also totally unreliable.

Greenhouse gases, including CO₂ have negligible observed influence on the Earth’s Energy Imbalance. (See Appendix B.)

The best measured EEI values are undoubtedly those offered by Stephens and l’ Ecuyer (2015), equal for both measurement sets, at $EEI = 0 \pm 5.6 \text{ W/m}^2$, and from l’ Ecuyer *et al.* (2015), $EEI = 0 \pm 5.0 \text{ W/m}^2$ for both satellite and OHCA data sets combined. Also, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine recent 2025 report misquote l’ Ecuyer *et al.* (2015). They incorrectly cite them as confirming positive EEI and global warming. (See Appendix F.)

Co-Editor: Stein Storlie Bergsmark

Editorial note: The following disclaimer is standard journal text and will be maintained by the editorial office. Please do not edit or delete.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note:

This article reflects solely the views, analyses, and conclusions of the author(s). Science of Climate Change, its editors, and its publisher make no representation or warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the content and disclaim liability for any loss, damage, or other consequence arising from the use of, or reliance on, any material published herein.