

Dear Dr. Tirziu,

The second report of the referee is chaotic - he/she repeats the same objections in various combinations over and over, which makes it difficult to answer them in an orderly way. He/she demands that I explain again things that had been explained in the paper, like the contents of Sec. XI in [Q16] or of Sec. XII in [Q12]. At some points he/she asks questions that I had answered in my first reply (example: [Q26] - [A26]). He/she goes into long digressions on my side remarks that are marginal for the main subject (like the advantages/disadvantages of exact inhomogeneous models in [Q29] - [Q30] or the merits of inflationary models in [Q28]). In [Q17] he/she took two sentences out of context, misinterpreted their meaning and made them seem to be a deficiency of my model. He/she showed his/her lack of expertise in relativity where he/she said that dust models necessarily develop shell crossings [Q30], where he/she mixed up blueshifting with lensing [Q2], and where he/she showed his/her unfamiliarity with the mechanism of blueshifting in [Q11]. These are only selected examples of his/her failings, see my reply for more. Generally, it seems that he/she has read only the introduction and conclusions sections. Please note that again he/she could not point out any wrong statement in my paper, all of his/her objections concern the suppositions on what would happen in the future if the paper were published.

I answered all the comments of the referee as if they were fully competent and serious criticisms. However, it is very frustrating to discuss with someone who does not understand the subject but pretends that he/she does, and in addition has the power to block the publication of my paper. Therefore, if my present reply does not resolve the dispute, and the referee continues to act in the same way, then please employ another referee. 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.