

Dear Dr. Fayyazuddin,

In your letter to me you said "The above manuscript has been reviewed by a new referee, as you had requested."

This is not exactly true. I wrote a detailed reply to the first referee, and I expected that it would be first sent to him. There was a chance that my arguments would convince him. This is what I asked you to do: "... if my present reply does not resolve the dispute, and the referee continues to act in the same way, then please employ another referee." It appears that you employed a second referee right away.

I also said "My paper is deeply rooted in general relativity and can be objectively evaluated only by someone who has competence in this field, not merely in astrophysics, as seems to be the case with the present referee."

This request was also ignored. The second referee clearly did not even care to read my paper - he just looked through my correspondence with the first referee (it seems he only read my first reply - if at all), and he dismissed my paper out of hand by issuing a statement that reads like a press release on the gamma ray bursts. His conclusion may be stated as "since we have an explanation, attempts at new explanations are unwelcome". His claim that there is a generally accepted explanation of long gamma ray bursts is incorrect - there are a few competing explanations. Censoring out attempts at a new one is not a scientific attitude.

It hurts to be kicked out the door so unceremoniously, without factual arguments - especially after 15 years during which I published 20 papers in your journal, and acted as your loyal reviewer in many more cases.

Yours

Andrzej Krasinski