



**From:** Jorge E. Hirsch [jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu](mailto:jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu)

**Subject:** Re: BG14421 Hirsch

**Date:** December 5, 2019 at 09:56

**To:** [prb@aps.org](mailto:prb@aps.org)

**Cc:** [jhirsch@ucsd.edu](mailto:jhirsch@ucsd.edu)

**Bcc:** [jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu](mailto:jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu)

---

Dear Dr. Melikyan,

Your Editorial Board Member agreed with me that the criticisms of Referee 2 and Referee 3 were invalid.

I sent you yesterday a short, clear and unambiguous explanation for why the EBM reservation with respect to the first referee criticism is easily clarified. I am sure the EBM will agree.

It makes no sense to “count referees” and make editorial decisions based on rigid rules, when some of the referees are clearly mistaken, as other referees and the EBM agree. Assuming of course you make scientific rather than political decisions.

I would appreciate if you would reconsider your decision, send my short explanation to the EBM, and invite him to respond. I will certainly abide by whatever decision you make after that.

Thank you for considering this request. I look forward to hear from you.

J. E. Hirsch