

From: prb@aps.org
Subject: BG14421 Hirsch
Date: December 5, 2019 at 09:16
To: jhirsch@ucsd.edu

Re: BG14421
Thermodynamic inconsistency of the conventional theory of
superconductivity
by J. E. Hirsch

Dear Dr. Hirsch,

We regret that the outcome of the review process was negative, but the evaluation of manuscripts in PRB should generally be restricted to two rounds. We do make exceptions to the two-round rule in some cases, mainly when the remaining required changes after two rounds are minor.

This manuscript has been considered by three referees in two rounds of review, and by an Editorial Board Member after an appeal. Given that none of them were persuaded by your arguments, and none of them recommended publication, we must conclude the review of this manuscript. The only recourse at this stage is an appeal to the APS Editor in Chief. I include below the relevant paragraph from our Policies and Practices:

"The author of a manuscript rejected subsequent to an Editorial Board review may request that the case be reviewed by the APS editor in chief. This request should be addressed to the editors, who will review the file and, if appropriate, forward the entire file to the editor in chief. Such an appeal must be based on the fairness of the procedures followed and must not be a request for further scientific review. The questions to be answered in an appeal to the editor in chief are, were our procedures followed appropriately and did the paper receive a fair hearing? A decision by the editor in chief is the final level of review."

Yours sincerely,

Ashot Melikyan
Associate Editor
Physical Review B
Email: prb@aps.org
<https://journals.aps.org/prb/>