

Comments

This proposal was considered by the Committee, the panel ST (Physical Sciences and Engineering). Unfortunately it was rejected, already at the Stage I of evaluation, with the justification:

"The track record of the Applicant is strong, but the Proposal leaves room for improvement. (i) Decisions on which concepts to explain and which to leave undefined were not consistent or well thought out. (ii) The significance of the proposed research was poorly described. In particular, vague references to "some celestial mechanics phenomena" and "interests of leading probabilists" are not adequate: the Committee needs to see concrete and detailed evidence of relevance."

It is my strong belief that the evaluation was unfair and did not meet basic scientific standards.

* In particular (i) was supported only by examples in Expert1's review, that $\text{Fr}(\Omega)$, grand orbit, and double inclusion were not defined. No other arguments have been brought to my attention.

* The references in (ii) were taken out of context.

* Neither the rating of my "track record" was maximal, nor the "scientific level of research or tasks to be performed".

Expert1 wrote that my "track record" was not outstanding; only Expert2 noticed that I was an invited speaker at the International Congress of Mathematicians, Rio de Janeiro, 2018. This proposal has many common features with my invited address there.

Impact of the project on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline was given 1 point in the scale 0-3, and innovative nature received 2 points in the scale 0-4. This must have disqualified the project.

I have revealed here a short description (the one evaluated by the panel) of my proposal to share its, hopefully inspiring, content with potentially interested readers.

Feliks Przytycki
Warszawa, January 2021