

Response to editor/referee:

In his/her last report, the referee proposed two ways to move forward with my paper, the second of which was:

”(2) Reword the paper to remove most of the discussion about GRBs. There doesn't seem to be anything wrong with the QSS calculations themselves; pretty much all of the issues are with the interpretation of them as a GRB model. In this case, GRBs could be mentioned briefly as a possible motivation for the calculation, but anything more than that will require the various issues I have highlighted to be properly addressed.”

This is the way I chose, and deleted from the paper as many of the references to GRBs as was possible. (There were a few that I could not remove because then the motivation for this paper would become a mystery. There is no way to hide the fact that GRBs inspired me to write the two previous papers, and the current one is their continuation.) The censored version is now resubmitted.

The changes are so numerous that a list of them would be more difficult to read than comparing the present version page by page to the previous one. I even changed the title to escape the blame for discussing the GRBs, and also changed the abstract. The old Fig. 3 together with the segment of the text that referred to it was removed - this was a material of pedagogical type that is not necessary for understanding the rest of the paper.

Remarks intended solely for the editor:

I feel gagged, and my paper was needlessly maimed. But I prefer this over continuing the discussions with the referee. They were very time-consuming and unproductive. I do have answers to the referee's questions. But now that I fulfilled the necessary condition for accepting my paper, I hope that a possible further discussion can be kept independent of the acceptance problem.

NOTE: THE PAPER NOW HAS A DIFFERENT TITLE. I see no place in the web submission page to mark the change.