Rebuttal of Karoly et al (April 2016): public release of Coral Sea study
Collation of email exchanges with UniMelb 27-29 July 2016

Exhibit A
Note: Screenshots are employed to overcome copy-paste difficulty with my archived emails.

Dear [Profs] Day and Phillips,

Further to earlier subject advice, this is to confirm that you have been supplied copies of several graphs that succinctly prove the study of 28 June 2016 has false foundations in the way of Coral Sea data. This is not my point of view as you have inferred but it is rooted in the inextricable data. Furthermore that if anyone questioned there might be transcription errors in the data developed from the RCM and hence the conclusions of the authors of that paper. The reproducibility of the results is not entirely direct evidence of reliability, but you can see from the scattered spread of the data in the exhibit.

Here is yet another simple graph that proves the Coral reef line (the study’s sole foundation) is additionally very different to the GBR because the newly released GBR data now unequivocally shows better thermal mass responses on the GBR. (There are several consequences including incorrect study focus solely on Mayday.)

Again, this is hard data from the same source as used by your authors in the study, and again, it can be very easily validated here. [Additional source]

I understand that there is a new study (not available to the public) to be published which uses the new GBR data and instead of it being based solely on Mayday will include the typically latter ‘summer’ months of January and February.

However the problem is not in what may happen in the future but it is an issue we highlighted on the university-partnered widely cited blog. The conversation here:

At stake is that this was deliberately removed from the Public Debate and it is not widely well-realised as illustrated in this Google advanced search of 30 June:

The two exact phrases shown in this screenshot are locked by default, (hyperlinked), and is still going with 4,925 hits on 22 July and 4,940 today. Please note that it is irrelevant to the issue of climate change; the methodologies within the study might be far too for the month of March in the Coral Sea, even putting aside that it had not been peer reviewed. The fact is that the multiple proof markedly empowers that the study continues does not correlate with data and past observations on the GBR.

This is not a doubt; your dissent is over a new study to be published eventually by a peer-reviewed journal. It is about the study of the ocean, with a mood for a remedy for the warming phenomenon that is based on an uncorroborated data and wish-imagining propensity to your apparent dismay. The study never meant to suggest that the recent mass bleaching on the GBR is not serious in this exceptional 1.5-year period but that the same message delivered was wrongly taken to be authentic and true. (And there was no raw data actual data).

Yours sincerely,
Bob Harmsworth (Meteorological engineer retired)

The reply:

David Phillips 27.9

In the matter of a long letter
Dear [Profs] Day and Phillips

I read that Prof Karoly has addressed the issues raised in your various emails. Consequently, we consider the matter closed, and will not be proceeding further responses.

Wrong! Whilst it is true that after several months of silence Prof Karoly quickly responded to Graham Lloyd at the Australian with prompt, in line with a couple four page email, it contained no mention of the main concerns. Furthermore, it was pointed that because there is no policy defense or comforting remedy, the empirical findings of the study of 28 June 2016 has been exposed by Prof Karoly and Phillips.

In this instance, a series of emails I tried to communicate with progress only more succinct emails such as with this email highlighted on 22 July:

There is a lot of information here but I felt the mass bleaching events at 1 and 2 occurred when the Coral Sea temperatures (SST) were below the 30 year period average, otherwise of course this should only happen at higher SSTs. At this time of the year the GBR data were not available and it was found solely on the Coral Sea Line and the typically cool month of Mayday (the hot season). (Meaning that typically cooler month was selected because of its extraordinarily high SST in the big El Nino year of 2015). Also, if the Coral Sea location was used for the GBR then there should have been a mass bleaching at 1 but GRS surveys found coral recovery from 2013 through 2015 (growing heavy cyanobacteria damage area over).

Again there were also revisions in the reply and zero mention of these retracted facts (presented yet again in a new format) so as 13 July I submitted a still more succinct chart (covering fewer failings):

Exhibit B
Hi Karen,

Here is a photo where a part of the GBR is a tad exposed to the atmosphere with potentially different consequences WRT time of day/solar/lunar/cloud cover/wind/bleaching/and whatnot:

Exhibit C

Attachment:
For Karen Day.docx

Hi Karen,

Here is a photo where a part of the GBR is a tad exposed to the atmosphere with potentially different consequences WRT time of day/solar/lunar/cloud cover/wind/bleaching/and whatnot:
As far as I'm aware these conditions do not occur in the Coral Sea as a whole, which has an average depth of 2.4 km (per Wikipedia).

Do you think that there is a possibility of increased biological stress at low tides sometimes such as with UV exposure or hot atmospheric conditions? How do the oceanic Coral Sea SST projections help?

Regards,  Bob_FJ

Collated by Bob Fernley-Jones (mechanical engineer retired) 1/August/2016