

Dear Dr. Fayyazuddin,

You did again the same thing as with my previous paper. The current paper is primarily on relativity theory (on properties of the Szekeres models), so it can be competently evaluated only by an expert in relativity. Nevertheless, for referee B you have chosen an astrophysicist who treated my paper as merely a model of a gamma-ray burst, and dismissed it without even pretending that he read it, by the "kill the stranger" reflex. He said that "the model does not seem plausible enough", especially since "there are plausible astrophysical candidates for GRBs". In short, we do not wish to see any new GRB source models because we have some already. Referee B did not point out any error in my paper, he condemned it to nonexistence because he found it useless irrespectively of its detailed contents. This is not how science is supposed to proceed.

My paper must be evaluated for what it really says or does not say, and not for its astrophysical "plausibility", guessed by looking at the abstract only. It has not received fair treatment: referee A is unobjective and seeks for pretexts to reject it (see my replies to him - his arguments are all based on false assertions about my work or irrelevant), referee B is no expert on relativity. There is nothing in their reports that would call for re-editing my paper, so I resubmit it in unchanged form.

Based on your instruction for authors:

<https://journals.aps.org/authors/web-submission-guidelines-physical-review> #exclude

I ask that the following individual be excluded from the refereeing process:

[Personal data of the individual in question omitted from this copy]

The reason: A few years ago, I had criticized his work on two occasions. In one case, this led to rejecting his paper because of trivial computational errors, in the second case my criticism resulted in excluding another erroneous paper of his from a review. He knew my identity in the second case, in the first case he must have guessed it. Ever after, he used every opportunity to try to discredit my work. I believe he is referee A in the current process - I recognize his pompous style, superficial arguments bypassing the heart of the matter, characteristic little errors in English and the intensity of bad will. I had not asked you for this exclusion right at the beginning because I did not expect he would be your referee again.

I hoped for a fact-based discussion with a reasonable person. Unfortunately, this is not happening: referee A, whoever he is, is attacking my results without understanding them, as my replies show, and clearly aims at blocking the publication of my paper for whatever reason he can invent. Such behaviour - blocking the publication of opponent's paper to settle a personal grudge - is un-ethical and should not be tolerated.