



From: Jorge E. Hirsch jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu
Subject: Re: Your_manuscript LG18284 Hirsch
Date: December 24, 2019 at 22:58
To: prl@aps.org
Bcc: jhirsch@physics.ucsd.edu

Dear Dr. Schuhmann,

Thank you for sending me the report of the DAE.

According to the DAE report, "*a publication in high-rating journals such as PRL is something more than just informing the physics community on alternative views on basic physical issues. It is a kind of certificate that the idea is checked by experts and is approved by them.*"

I agree 100%. That it precisely what I hoped would happen. But it didn't happen. The three experts selected as referees didn't approve. That can mean one of two things. (a) The paper is not right, or (b) the 'experts' are not really 'experts', i.e., they are wrong.

I submitted detailed responses to each of the referees' reports, explaining why they are wrong. That is where the DAE should come in. He should tell you whether in his view the referees are right, or whether my response to the referees explaining why they are wrong, is right. Alternatively, if he cannot do that because he lacks expertise, he should seek additional expert opinion or ask you to do that.

Instead, this DAE just told you "*I do not think that this is the case here - keeping in mind the clearly expressed attitude of three referees, each of whom is a high-level expert in the field.*" That is, he did not analyze the content of the referee's reports and didn't even read my rebuttals. He simply looked at the names of the referees and their recommendation. Neither did he consider the fact that the reports of referees 1 and 2 directly contradict each other, so they cannot possibly be both right.

You don't need a DAE for that. You simply need a computer that can look up the h-index of the referees and read the last sentence in their report (whether they say "don't publish" or "do publish"). I thought thoughtful PRL editors know better than to accept that kind of 'advice'.

Criteria for publication in PRL are (1) Validity, (2) Importance, (3) Broad Interest. I don't think there is any question that the issue raised in my paper is important and of broad interest. The only open question is its validity. That is precisely why I submitted my paper to PRL.

This DAE did not do advise you on whether the arguments of the referees were right or my rebuttals are right. I request that you please ignore his advice that is not based on any scientific analysis, and seek additional advice.

Thank you for considering these comments. I look forward to hear from you.

Jorge E. Hirsch