Authors Feedback:

At present time I have nothing to revise in my paper (Manuscript № Ms_PSIJ_28188). We must now face reality: the second Reviewer could not point the finger at my would-be "mathematical and logical errors". Instead of admittance his previous faults, he piles up some new. For instance:

i) "…the author did not use d in the calculations." -- No! I did.

ii) "The author calculated the time with the normal velocity in gamma and then divided this by gamma with the relativistic addition velocity calculation. This use of the relativistic addition velocity equation does not make sense, as it should have been used just once at the beginning. Therefore, I still think that the mathematics is incorrect." – A very strange opinion! Any restriction does not exist in special relativity theory. Someone may use the relativistic formula for velocity addition as many times as it is necessary to implement the Lorentz transformation. In my "mathematics" the first transition does not demand relativistic addition (resulting in the fifth equation), but the second transition demands relativistic addition (resulting in the seventh equation).

But sadly that is not a whole story. The second Reviewer say: "The mathematics presented in equations 1-7, even if it was correct, would not alter this fact. … Even if the author corrects the mathematics in equations 1-7, it would not address the central point of the paradox". Why such an evasive style "***even if***"? Mathematics cannot be "semi-mistaken". It is either true or false. I don't refuse the continuation of discussion, but under an obligatory condition: the second Reviewer must openly acknowledge his errors. After that, I will try to explain his remaining delusions.