



See next page for explanation

1. you can define the length of a solar cycle two ways: from max to max or from min to min. The blue curves show those lengths with a symbol plotted halfway between max and max and min and min.
2. the pink curves show the average temp anomaly [HADCRU..] over the cycles, again plotted halfway.
3. the scatter plot below the first Figure shows how the pink points correlate with the blue points [pink open circles]. The square of the correlation coefficient is  $R^2 = 0.0324$ , thus NO correlation.
4. One might argue that the correlation is obscured by the clear upwards trend in dT (dashed pink line) [although that upwards trend was the point of F-C&L], and that a clear correlation would emerge if one removed the trend, so the green diamonds in the first Figure are the blue points minus the trend.
5. The second Figure shows that the green points [green filled circles] are very weakly correlated [ $R^2 = 0.2041$ ] with the cycle length. With so few data points a  $R^2$  of 0.2 is not considered significant, but if one absolutely wants to attach significance to it [people peddle all kinds of dubious correlations, so why not this one :-) ], the correlation is *positive*, i.e. longer cycles are warmer than shorter cycles. The opposite of F-C&L
6. In my opinion the whole thing is not substantiated. On top of that F-C&L used a 5-point smooth, so it is impossible to say what the value of the length of 'cycle 23' to use in their 'relationship' would be for cycles until after cycle 25, or for SC24 until after cycle 26. So to say that because SC23 was long, it follows that temps must be cool the past cycle or now is plain nonsense if it would be based on F-C&L.
7. If one in desperations says that the cycle of prior to the current one is the one whose length is correlated with current temperatures, then I also show the 'prior' correlations. Again, none are significant.