



Gmail

Mikhail Skopenkov <mikhail.skopenkov@gmail.com>

RE: Editor's decision on MATH-D-18-00266R1

Mikhail Skopenkov

<mikhail.skopenkov@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 14, 2020 at

12:00 PM

To: Elena Baroncini <noreply.sif.baroncini@gmail.com>, Imp@sif.it,
Kanishkaa Sridhar <kanishkaa.sridhar@springernature.com>

Dear Editors,

Thank you for your answer. Unfortunately, it does not contain the requested information on "any real mathematical (or physical) errors, which the author feels the necessity to be informed of":

Even after the previous major revisions, this paper is not written at a suitable level of rigour for a mathematical physics journal. It is not the referee's job to point out every point of imprecision, and while the revisions address the specific points the referees indicated, these were examples of a general concern with the paper, not an exhaustive list of changes to make. While the results have some interest to the community, the presentation remains insufficiently mathematical after major revisions and so not appropriate for this journal.

Surely, there is no need to list all the errors (in particular, imprecisions), but a single example is really expected. At least to prevent unjustified damage to the author's reputation and circulation of a possibly wrong opinion of the work.

1. Could you give just ONE explicit example of a mathematical error in the revised manuscript?

Notice that the reports and editorial comments to the original submission **neither** contain such an example. Most of the particular issues discussed in the valuable reports reduced just to identification of chains and cochains, that is, identification of vectors and linear functions in space R^n with a fixed distinguished basis, which is absolutely correct mathematically. The author should emphasize once again that the reports were very useful anyway.

Unfortunately in the decision letter you received the comments by the Associate Editor on your paper after the major revisions were not displayed

Since you have written that the original decision letter was incomplete, and to make sure that the opinion of the editors is now expressed fully and correctly:

2. Could you send a complete official decision letter signed by the managing editor, with the reason for the rejection - mathematical errors - clearly indicated, and containing either one explicit example of such an error in the revision, or an explicit statement that the editors take back their earlier words on such errors?

It sounds a matter of fact that writing that a manuscript is mathematically incorrect requires at least one example of a mathematical error. But contemporary standards can be different, and the author would like to ask colleagues and community for consultation. For that purpose, and to make the correspondence more responsible, let me ask:

3. Do you have any objections, if the author makes the whole correspondence with the journal public (including submitted manuscript, the reviews, the editorial comments, the response to the reviews, the revision, e-mails, and the complete official decision letter)?

Best Regards,
MS

[Quoted text hidden]