

From: Jorge E. Hirsch jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu 

Subject: Re: Your_manuscript BG14421 Hirsch

Date: September 17, 2019 at 11:37

To: prb@aps.org

Cc: jhirsch@ucsd.edu Hirsch jhirsch@ucsd.edu

Bcc: jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu



JH

Dear Dr. Melikyan,

Thank you for sending me the second referee report.

I would like to point out to you that the second referee report directly contradicts the first referee report. The first agrees dissipation occurs in the process I consider, the second says it does not. It is obvious that they cannot both be correct. I am very surprised you rejected the paper based on two reports that say exactly the opposite on physics, yet agree on their "opinion" that the paper should not be published. If the latter is the only thing an editor considers then we don't need editors, machines could do their job. I rather would like to assume this was an inadvertent mistake on your part.

I am attaching a response to the second referee report, where I quote excerpts from Tinkham's book that categorically refute this referee. I ask you to consider the paper further. Otherwise I would like to start a formal appeal process. I will try to reach you by phone to discuss this further.

Sincerely,
Jorge E. Hirsch