Author's comments to the Referees Report, for "Comments on "Finsler Geometry and Relativistic Field Theory"" by S. S. Shahverdiyev

The referee considered the second and the last paragraphs of the paper only. He/she consciously(?) omitted the rest of the paper, where it is demonstrated that (63) in the paper by R. G. Beil is not correct. Therefore, all conclusion based on (63) are not correct.

The authors objections to the article by Beil have long since been answered. The answers appear in publications cited in the article itself, so they should not have to be repeated here. The author should look first at Refs. 4, 5, 6, and 7 for information as to the development of Finsler geometry over the last 60 years. He should then study the 15-year history of the Beil metric beginning with Ref. 19.

After studying the above literature, it becomes obvious that the first 14 pages of paper by R. G. Beil (in FP(2003)) is combination of Refs. 12 and 19. In my paper I commented last 6 pages of the paper in question (FP(2003))beginning with eq. (60). Unfortunately, the above literature given by the referee does not give answer to my objection about correctness of eq. (63) and those in the rest of the paper.

His main objection to the Beil theory seems to be simply that it is different from his own General geometry. He claims that his theory appeared long time before(2002) the Beil article in question (2003).

Actually, the objection is that in the paper on General Geometry (2002) it is shown that electromagnetism can not be geometrized in the framework of Riemannian geometry (and therefore in the framework of Finsler geometry) in contrary to the results of the paper by R. G. Beil (see the first and the second paragraphs of the submitted paper)

He needs to check the date on Ref. 19 and subsequent work by Beil and several others. Also he should examine Ref. 4 and work by, for example, J. G. Vargas and S. Ikeda cited in papers in Beils list of references for prior geometric generalizations very similar to his own.

This information modifies the second paragraph of the paper leaving all its results unchanged.

Specifically, the questions he raises as to condition (60) have been answered in Ref. 18.

Unfortunately, Ref. 18 is not available in the libraries of two Institutions.

And I do not know how my objections may be answered if it is very well known that charge of a particle depends neither on its velocity nor on the potential of external electromagnetic field?

The equivalence questions are dealt with in Ref. 12. The explicit appearance of e/m is discussed in Refs. 18 and 22.

Ref.22 is also unavailable. If explicit appearance of e/m indeed considered in Ref. 22 I will modify the last paragraph. This modification also does not change any results of the paper.

This paper is not suitable for publication in Foundations of Physics .

The paper is submitted to "FP", because paper by R. G. Beil is published in it. So, there must not be any objections about suitability of the paper for "FP".

The referee's report leads to modification of the second paragraph only, leaving all results of the paper unchanged. Therefore, the decision not to publish the paper is not supported.