

Welcome Tyler Chen | Sign Out (Home) | My Profile | Contact | Help | About

Proposals

Reviews & Meetings

Awards & Reporting

Fellowships

Manage Financials

Administration

Proposal: 2202805

[Back to Results](#)

Agency

Agency Name: National Science Foundation

Application

Agency Tracking Number: [REDACTED]

Project Title: PostDoctoral Research Fellowship

Requested Amount: \$150,000

Received Date: 10/19/2021

PI/PD: Tyler Chen

Authorized Representative: Tyler Chen

Submitting Institution: Chen, Tyler

SAM Legal Business Name:

Program

Program Title: Workforce (MSPRF) MathSciPDFellow

Program Code: 060Y

Funding Opportunity Number: NSF 16-558

Division/Area of Science: Division Of Mathematical Sciences

Program Contact Name: Tiziana Giorgi

Program Contact Phone: (703) 292-8090

Program Contact Email: tgiorgi@nsf.gov

Application Status History

Status

Status Date

Status	Status Date
Declined	04/06/2022

Cognizant Program Officer Comments

Proposal ID: DMS - [REDACTED]

PI: Tyler Chen

FY22 Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowship Competition

This application was reviewed by Panel C of the FY2022 MSPRF Review Panels among other applications with primary subject classifications corresponding to topics in analysis, applied mathematics, computational mathematics, mathematical biology, probability, or statistics. The application was placed by the panel in the "Recommended" category, meaning that it would be recommended for an award only if sufficient funds were available.

Prudent stewardship of scarce MSPRF funds requires the Division of Mathematical Sciences to prioritize funding using a number of factors, including disciplinary portfolio balance and diversity (gender, ethnic, and institutional). The MSPRF Management Team discussed the panel's recommendations and, by means of a thorough discussion, arrived at the funding recommendations.

This application was ranked roughly in the middle of the "Recommended" group. Comparing to other proposals in the general area of applied mathematics, data science, probability, and statistics, the ranking of this proposal was not sufficiently high to warrant an award recommendation.

Tiziana Giorgi

On behalf of the FY2022 MSPRF Management Team

Stefaan De Winter

Tiziana Giorgi

Yuliya Gorb

Edsel Pena

Andrew Pollington

Ravi Shankar

Sandra Spiroff

Jeremy Tyson

Review Information

Please note: The Sponsored Projects Office (or equivalent) at the submitting organization is NOT given the capability to read the below review information.

Panel Summary

Panel Summary	Release Date
Panel Summary #1	02/08/2022

Process Statement

All proposals submitted to NSF are reviewed according to the two merit review criteria - intellectual merit and broader impacts - as described in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide*. If a proposal is submitted to a specific program solicitation, additional review criteria may also have been used in the merit review of the proposal. Any additional review criteria used in the evaluation of a proposal would be described in the program solicitation to which the proposal was submitted. If the proposal was submitted in response to a funding opportunity that involved both NSF and one or more external funding organizations, then NSF staff may consult with those external organizations before finalizing a recommendation.

Your proposal received an external review, either by *ad hoc* reviewers only, by panel only, or by a mix of *ad hoc* and panel reviews. Some proposals may be considered by more than one panel. Reviewers have knowledge of the science and engineering subfields involved in the proposal as well as potential applications when relevant. The reviewers' fields of specialty are usually complementary within a reviewer group. Sometimes, reviewers with a broader scientific, technical, or management expertise are required for proposals involving substantial size or complexity, partnerships, broad multidisciplinary content, or significant national or international implications.

When a panel is used, individual reviewers, who may be panelists or *ad hoc* reviewers, are usually asked to submit written reviews to inform the panel discussions. If, after a panel has discussed a proposal, the Program Officer believes that additional expert advice would be helpful, they may request post-panel *ad hoc* reviews. During a panel meeting, written summaries of the panel's discussions of proposals are prepared. These summaries are brief synopses of the salient points emerging from the panel's discussion of each proposal, as they relate to the NSF and solicitation-specific review criteria. Copies of all the reviews and panel summaries used in the decision-making process for your proposal are available to you and your co-Principal Investigator(s), if any, on the Research.gov "Proposal Status" screen.

When a panel is used, the panel usually has an opportunity to categorize proposals with respect to their degree of competitiveness or priority for

funding. Panels may decide that the written reviews capture all the salient points and that no further discussion by the panel is warranted; in those cases a panel summary may not be provided.

Panelists and Program Officers with certain conflicts of interest are disqualified from either serving as a reviewer or otherwise participating in the review process. Panelists or Program Officers with conflicts of interest that do not require disqualification are asked to leave the meeting room while the proposal that contains the conflict is discussed and do not otherwise participate in any funding recommendations for that proposal. Any written review received from a reviewer who is identified as having a conflict of interest is not used in the review process.

In reading the reviews, please keep in mind that the reviews are addressed to NSF staff, and not necessarily to you, the Principal Investigator. Occasionally, reviews may contain irrelevant, non- substantive, erroneous or ad hominem statements. The review panel and the Program Officers disregard such statements in arriving at a recommendation for the proposal.

External reviews are advisory; NSF makes the decision to Award or Decline, or in the case of preliminary proposals, to Invite/Not Invite or Encourage/Discourage. While many projects warrant funding, budget limitations necessitate that many of these be declined. In the difficult decision-making process, Program Officers consider the relative strength of each project as well as other factors, such as award balance among sub-disciplines, geographic distribution, types of organizations, and the potential contribution of each award to broadening the participation of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director/Office Head/Office Director or their designee whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for an award (or Invite/Not Invite or Encourage/Discourage in the case of a preliminary proposal). Normally, final programmatic approval is at the division/office level; large or complex awards may receive additional levels of review. Because of the large volume of proposals, this review and consideration process may take six months or longer. Large proposals, particularly complex proposals, or proposals in programs involving external partnerships may require additional review and processing time. Information on funding rates for all NSF divisions can be found at <https://dellweb.bfa.nsf.gov>.

NSF allows resubmission of substantially revised proposals as described in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide*, but encourages investigators to seek the advice of the Program Officer before resubmissions are prepared. Some program solicitations impose restrictions on the timing of resubmissions. Investigators should be aware that the Foundation will treat the revised proposal as a new proposal that will be subject to the standard review procedures.

Information about reconsideration of declined proposals is found in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide*. If you have questions regarding the review of your proposal, please contact the Program Officer who managed your proposal. Contact information is available on [Research.gov](https://www.research.gov).

About Services

- Account Management
- Award Cash Management Service (ACM\$)
- Notifications & Requests
- Project Reports
- Proposal Status
- Public Access

NSF Award Highlights

- Research Spending & Results

Contact

- Contact Help Desk

News & Discoveries

- News
- Discoveries
- Multimedia Gallery

Funding & Awards

- Recently Announced Funding Opportunities
- Upcoming Funding Opportunity Due Dates
- A-Z Index of Funding Opportunities
- Find Funding
- Award Search
- Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG)

Publications & About NSF

- Publications
- About the National Science Foundation
- Careers
- Staff Directory

Feedback ▶

See all NSF social media ▶

[Website Policies](#) | [Budget and Performance](#) | [Inspector General](#) | [Privacy](#) | [FOIA](#) | [No FEAR Act](#) | [USA.gov](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Plain Language](#) | [Contact](#)

The National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, USA Tel: (703) 292-5111, FIRS: (800) 877-8339 | TDD: (800) 281-8749