

Authors Feedback:

I cannot understand the following statement: <<Part 2 ... The manuscript suffers from both mathematical and logical errors.>>
This is the second Reviewer's comment that "suffers from both mathematical and logical errors". For example,

Second Reviewer's comment

3. In the author's mathematical exercise..... 2

(

My objection) This is an entirely mistaken arguing. In particular, I nowhere state that the distance between starting points A and B is equal to d .

Second Reviewer's comment

4. The author indicates that the "simplified" Lorentz transformation time equation is used for non-inertial reference frames. This is not correct.....

(

My objection) Where is such an indication?

Second Reviewer's comment

5. However, the author's arguments are not fleshed out with mathematics or Minkowski diagrams and are presented as statements of fact without an in-depth discussion of the error. ...

(

My objection) Please, take a look on the formulae 1-7, dealing with the Minkowski's world according to the relativistic laws. Diagrams play a subsidiary role and cannot substitute mathematics. I don't deny a possible existence of the length contraction paradox, but it must be found yet.

The complexity of rotating systems consists in the non-Euclidean geometry, but it does not abolish validity of the well-known formula

$$\Delta\tau = \int \sqrt{1 - (V(t)/c)^2} dt.$$

Second Reviewer's comment

6. ... the manuscript misses the point of the main paradox and does not provide satisfactory rebuttals for the other points.

(

My objection) This thoroughly distorted conclusion is a direct consequence of the reviewer's misunderstanding of the issue, noted above.

I kindly ask the second Reviewer to point out my would-be "mathematical and logical errors".