


From: Jorge E. Hirsch jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu 
Subject: Re: Your_manuscript BG14421 Hirsch
Date: November 1, 2019 at 23:40
To: prb@aps.org
Cc: jhirsch@ucsd.edu
Bcc: jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu



Dear Dr. Melikyan,

Thank you for sending me the referees' reports. As you will recall, in the first round you obtained 2 referee reports that agreed that my paper should not be published but giving diametrically opposed reasons, that contradicted each other.

Something similar (not quite as bad) is happening here. The two referee reports give reasons not to publish my paper that are both wrong and are unrelated to each other.

I am convinced that if you showed to the third referee what the other referee (first referee) said, the third referee would tell you that the first referee is wrong. I hope you will do that.

I have written answers to both referees' reports explaining why they are wrong. Would you be willing to send my answers to the referees and invite them to consider them, and also to send to each referee the report of the other referee?

I believe the third referee is very likely to agree that my objection to his/her report is well founded, and that he/she will also agree that the report of the first referee is not well founded.

I am not so sure about the first referee, since he/she seems to have ignored my first response to him/her. But I did try again, explaining the key issue, which is crystal clear, carefully.

I would appreciate if you could respond to me without delay whether you are willing to do this. I am attaching my responses to the latest reports.

Thank you and I look forward to hear from you as soon as possible. Regards,
Jorge E. Hirsch