

December 5, 2019

Editor in Chief of the American Physical Society  
Professor Michael Thoennessen

Dear Professor Thoennessen,

I am writing to ask that my case be reviewed by you. My paper was rejected by Dr. Melikyan subsequent to an Editorial Board review. I am appealing on the basis that I believe that my paper did not receive a fair hearing.

My paper was reviewed by 3 referees. Referee 1 provided two reports, referees 2 and 3 provided one report each. I submitted detailed responses to each of the points raised by the referees.

The objections of the referees were in contradiction with each other. Therefore, they cannot all be true, by elementary logic. I gave detailed physical arguments for why the three referees were mistaken.

The Editorial Board Member (EBM) concluded that my responses to referee 2 and referee 3 were valid, hence that their objections were invalid. Yet he said "I tend to side with the first referee". He explained his reasoning, and concluded *"If the author thinks otherwise, then he should extend his argument with a clean calculation involving a finite reservoir."*

Such a "clean calculation" was implicit in the response I had given to the first referee (5th paragraph of my response to his second report), but apparently it was not clear enough for the EBM to appreciate it. So upon receipt of the EBM report I wrote it out explicitly, 10 lines of text and 4 very simple equations, that even a first year college student can understand and immediately decide whether it is right or wrong. I submitted it to Dr. Melikyan, requesting that he sends it to the EBM for his consideration.

I have no doubt whatsoever that if the EBM would read what I wrote he would immediately conclude that the objection of the first referee that he had sided with was clearly and completely invalid. There is no ambiguity nor gray area, it's black or white.

Dr. Melikyan refused to submit my "clean calculation" to the EBM, and said that the only recourse at this stage is to appeal to you. That is what I am doing.

My paper is correct and it is important. The EBM will immediately appreciate the validity of the "clean calculation" that I provided per his request to address the single point where he sided with a referee. I request that he is given that opportunity, and that the final decision on publication be based on his recommendation after he reconsiders this point.

Thank you for considering this appeal. Sincerely,  
Jorge E. Hirsch