



Open letter to seismologists, geologists, geophysicists, planetary and space weather scientists.  
August 3, 2015

My name is Ben Davidson. I produce an daily online video report on the sun and earth, and have provided that daily report online every day (weekends and holidays included) since fall of 2011. There are over 235,000 subscribers to our reports but they are not passive; we act as a unit- searching, thinking, and sharing. It is a very rewarding experience for a science enthusiast, especially when the dedication and careful observations bare fruit.

Since December 2, 2013 I have been working towards the publication of a study on how the solar polar magnetic fields trigger large earthquakes. Until July 22, 2015, I believed that this manuscript was going to be published in *Earthquake Science* by Springer (EQS), but that hope has faded under odd circumstances. My co-authors, Dr. Christopher Holloman and Dr. Kongpop U-yen, and I have expended much effort to bring this manuscript together, and it is my hope that you will take some time to review it and provide comment.

Brief Timeline of Events: In the Jan 1, 2014 daily report I first hypothesized the dependence of M8+ earthquakes on variations in the solar polar fields. From Feb-July of 2014, the Ohio State University Statistical Consulting Service took the hypothesis and turned it into a mathematical algorithm. Result: extremes-in-magnetism and magnetic reversals of the solar poles proliferate M8+ seismicity. On Dec 2, 2014, we submitted a manuscript to EQS. On Feb 12, 2015 we received comments about the order of paragraphs and some terminology changes, but with a "recommendation for publication" after "minor revisions." The window for submitting a revision was to be open for two weeks - but was mistakenly closed after only a few days. After a week of emails back and forth it was re-opened and we successfully submitted the revisions on March 2. According to the status updates from EQS, review took 3 weeks but then proceeded to go from "Awaiting Decision" back into review, twice.

After 4+ months and two apologies for 'unreasonable delay' we finally received another request for revisions on July 7. We were actually encouraged; each commenting reviewer expressly acknowledged the validity of the relationship, but wanted yet more terminology changes or more focus on the statistics or more discussion. The revision was due before July 22. On July 21 we submitted the revision and received email confirmation from EQS that it was successfully submitted.

At 12:02am (Eastern) on July 22, two minutes after the deadline, we received an email from EQS requesting that we upload a PDF version of our manuscript. Their system auto-generates PDFs and HTML files from the WordDoc files that authors upload; my WordDoc and theHTML file generated by their system were perfect, but the PDF generated by their system was difficult to read. At 2:20am, less than 140 minutes later, our manuscript was removed from consideration for lack of completing the re-upload, and our access to the system was revoked- all while we slept. We received no final review or official decision. After more than 10 days of requesting remediation from EQS, I have recieved no reply and am still locked out of my account; I have decided to self-publish the manuscript. A rejected manuscript would have been one thing- this was different.

On behalf of my co-authors and 235,000+ science enthusiasts- will you review this manuscript?

Ben Davidson

Director, The Mobile Observatory Project; Founder, SpaceWeatherNews.com & SuspiciousObservers.org  
[Ben@ObservatoryProject.com](mailto:Ben@ObservatoryProject.com)