M Gmail

MDS <maxieds@gmail.com>

JNT article status

7 messages

Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 2:44 AM
To: Steven J Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>

Steven,

I gave a talk at the U Montreal MOBIUS ANT on Thursday of this last week. Andrew Granville and company identified
two problems with the results I stated in my slides for the talk. My reaction was to feel sick and then rack my brain for
what went wrong. I noticed a subtle issue with the way I had applied the Selberg-Delange method. I believe I have
now fixed the problems. The average order and variance asymptotics I have in the new version are matching
numerically very well in my checks.

My first priority is to check, and recheck, the revised draft so I can get the corrected preprint onto the arXiv again for
my JMM talk on April 9. I emailed Jeff Lagarias for advice on how to approach you since I understand well that you
are probably going to be ticked about the technical difficulties again. He suggested to let you know that there is a
problem with the recent JNT submission and ask to have the revision put on hold until further notice. Can you please
do that?

If you want to see the changes, I am happy to furnish my current tentatively revised draft. Just let me know if you want
to see it at this point.

Maxie

Steven Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 2:57 AM
To: Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>
Cc: Steve Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>

Let me think about this and get back to you

Sent from my iPad

> On Mar 21, 2022, at 4:44 AM, Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>
> Steven,
>
> I gave a talk at the U Montreal MOBIUS ANT on Thursday of this last week. Andrew Granville and company
identifiedm two problems with the results I stated in my slides for the talk. My reaction was to feel sick and then rack
my brain for what went wrong. I noticed a subtle issue with the way I had applied the Selberg-Delange method. I
believe I have now fixed the problems. The average order and variance asymptotics I have in the new version are
matching numerically very well in my checks.
[Quoted text hidden]

Steven J Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 6:00 AM
To: Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>

ok

I've given you a revise, but it is on the boundary of revise and reject.

I cannot keep having referees look at it and stop.

Is it possible for you to break this up into smaller papers and have them refereed sequentially?

Unfortunately this is a very technical field and there will be small errors; I've had that in my published works as well. It's much better to fix them in advance, just trying to figure out what is the best strategy.
[Quoted text hidden]

Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 9:23 AM
To: Steven J Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>

Steven,

I think a good plan of attack is for me to give the JMM talk and see if there are any comments given.

Based on the numerical computations of what I'm getting out of these formulas, the version I just revised following the U Montreal talk should be correct and ready to go. Can you give me one more chance to revise? The argument is very similar to the one just submitted with the technical correction.

Maxie
[Quoted text hidden]

Steven Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 10:31 AM
To: Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>
Cc: Steve Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>

Let's touch base after you give your talk.

Is your thesis advisor able to look at this carefully and give an evaluation of the likelihood of it being correct?

Sent from my iPad

> On Mar 21, 2022, at 11:23 AM, Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>
> [Quoted text hidden]

Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 10:50 AM
To: Steven Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>

Steven,

At the talk last week, Andrew Granville suggested that my first advisor at GT, Ernie Croot, should be able to help me with the issues they spotted. I will ask him to do that.

I have been working with Michael Lacey. He is overseeing my thesis which is on a different set of topics in my research. AG mentioned that the JNT paper topics are way out of Lacey's expertise. Lacey has told me he refuses to even look at the article after funding it as a project at the start of 2020 and then basically berating me with mean spirited quasi-randomized non constructive feedback months later, including some intentional sleights abusing my notation with the original $C_k(n)$ replaced by a binomial coefficient, e.g., as in $_nC_k$ (no idea whose idea that was originally; I am not going to speculate). It's kind of a bad situation with my advisor here (please do not repeat that). I do have some good help on my committee from outside of GT.

Jeff Lagarias said something to me about him doing some advising from afar with helping me on the organization and writing style of the last JNT revision. Aside from the issues pointed out last week, the article is substantially improved after the discussions with him. I hope that shows.

Would it help to see a tentative draft with the corrections I made? As for JNT, this would be off the record other than to assure you that it is in better shape with the corrections made since Thursday. And thank you for being reasonable. I will make sure to touch base again either way after the JMM talk.

MDS

[Quoted text hidden]

Steven J Miller <sjm1@williams.edu>   Mon, Mar 21, 2022 at 11:11 AM
To: Maxie Schmidt <maxieds@gmail.com>

let's do things slowly

step 1 is get ready for the talk at the jmm

step 2 is to have a polished paper that you believe is correct, and that someone can attest to (croot would easily fit that bill).

once I have a professional who has said they have carefully looked at it and agree it is worth refereeing, I will restart the review

DO NOT RUSH THIS

take as much time as you need; I cannot ask a referee to start and stop again.
[Quoted text hidden]