

Author's Feedback :

Attached is my response to this reviewer, which is the same attachment I sent along with a pdf file of version 3 of my manuscript, which included the changes, outlined in his last report. This reviewer claims that I am ignoring his complaints, but in fact he is ignoring the changes I have already made in version 3 in response to his comments. He continues to make the same complaints, even though I have addressed them in version 3 of the manuscript. He appears not to be reading version 3 or else version 3 has not been sent to him. I regard this handling of my manuscript as at best confused and at worst unethical.

Version 3 contains no mistakes or ambiguities, as suggested by the journal editor. The differences with this reviewer which remain are stylistic only. All of his substantive comments have already been addressed in version 3. I do not understand why he is ignoring these changes. For example look at his item 19), which I responded to by including the equation which he wants in version 3.

In summary I have worked very hard to satisfy all five of the reviewers. I am not revising this manuscript further. As I understand it, four of the reviewers have recommended publication. I expect the journal editors to make a decision without further ado.

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide some comments, which are against the SDI peer review guidelines