

Correctness, proof completeness, and novelty audit

Linear forms of a given Diophantine type

Oleg N. German, Nikolay G. Moshchevitin

Paper	arXiv:0812.4896v3
Source version	Submitted 26 September, 2009; v1 submitted 29 December, 2008; announced December 2008.
Audit date	August 20, 2026
Prompt	Standardized prompt
Novelty cutoff	December 29, 2008
Paper license	arXiv non-exclusive distribution license
Scope	Statements, proofs, and novelty only

Important limitation. AI-generated analysis. This report is not a correctness certificate or a substitute for expert scrutiny. A Correct status may coexist with yellow typos or minor formal corrections that do not affect substantive soundness. It means that this audit found no unresolved substantive error under the stated criteria; it is not formal verification and should remain open to expert challenge and correction.

SUMMARY

01	Statements	Contains unsupported statements
02	Proofs	Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs
03	Novelty	No non-novelty findings

This independent report links to the source paper on arXiv; it does not reproduce or redistribute that paper.

01 / STATEMENTS

Statements

Contains unsupported statements

The quantitative existence assertion in Theorem 5 and its consequence for an individual linear form are verified by the nested half-ball construction. The claimed continuum of such forms is not established: the printed construction fixes its initial data and makes a determined successor choice, producing one limit for each of only two initial half-balls. The uncountability clause of Theorem 4 therefore inherits an unresolved multiplicity obligation. The pointwise inequalities and constants remain correct.

Theorem 5, existence part: A linear form with the prescribed best-approximation order exists

Pages 5–11 · Theorem 5 and proof · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Correct

For every non-increasing ψ with $\psi(1) \leq (9\gamma)^{-1}$, the induction produces increasing best-approximation vectors m_k and nested half-balls Ω_k . Their common limit α satisfies

$$\psi(|m_k|) - 4\gamma\psi(|m_k|)^2 < \|\langle \alpha, m_k \rangle\| |m_k|^2 \leq \psi(|m_k|) + \gamma\psi(|m_k|)^2$$

for every k . The determinant and radius bounds in Lemma 3 give precisely the two error terms in this display.

Theorem 5, multiplicity clause: The claimed continuum of forms is not obtained by the proof

Page 5 and pages 10–11 · final sentence of Theorem 5 and conclusion of its proof · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Not able to verify

The proof fixes m_1, m_2, α_1 , permits only the two initial half-balls, and then defines m_{k+2} by successive minimality conditions, defines α_{k+1} by two equalities, and selects the unique half-ball nearest the preceding support. It concludes only that the resulting nested sequence has a common point α . No infinitely branching family, free parameter, or injection from a continuum-sized set is supplied. Integer translations produce only countably many forms. A Cantor-type branching repair may be possible, but it is neither stated nor verified here.

Theorem 4, quantitative inequalities: The individual-form consequence of Theorem 5 is valid

Pages 4–5 · Theorem 4 and its reduction to Theorem 5 · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Correct

Choose $A = (9\gamma)^{-1}$ and $B = 4\gamma$. At a best approximation m_k , Theorem 5 gives both required sides. If $|m_k| \leq |x| < |m_{k+1}|$, best-approximation minimality and monotonicity of ψ give the lower bound for x from that for m_k . The infinitely many m_k give the upper inequality infinitely often. Thus the quantitative property holds for each form furnished by Theorem 5.

Theorem 4, uncountability: The uncountable-set conclusion depends on the unproved multiplicity clause

Page 4 · Theorem 4 · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Not able to verify

The text calls Theorem 4 a corollary of Theorem 5. Its assertion of an uncountable set therefore requires the final continuum clause of Theorem 5, not merely the verified construction of one form. Because the proof does not establish that clause, it does not establish uncountability either. The displayed occurrence of $\langle \alpha \alpha, x \rangle$ in the lower inequality is separately a harmless duplicated-symbol typo for $\langle \alpha, x \rangle$.

02 / PROOFS

Proofs

Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs

The geometric induction correctly proves existence and the stated two-sided estimates after a uniquely determined sign correction in its initial vector. It does not prove that continuum many distinct limit forms arise, although that is a central part of Theorem 5 and is needed for Theorem 4's uncountability conclusion.

Lemma 3: The basis switch and half-ball containment close the induction step

Pages 7–10 · Lemma 3 and proof · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Correct

The affine-lattice choice of m_{k+2} gives the required norm interval and determinant interval. Lemma 2 transfers the integral-level lattice from $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}(m_k, m_{k+1})$ to $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}(m_{k+1}, m_{k+2})$. The distance formula for the new center, together with the radius estimate and the definition of γ , puts the new ball strictly inside the old one. Selecting the half nearer the old support makes m_k uniquely best below $|m_{k+1}|$, while the divisibility corollary handles vectors outside the new lattice.

Induction base: The first vector needs the opposite sign

Page 11 · displayed definition of m_1, m_2, α_1 · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Typo

Lemma 3 assumes $\langle m_k, m_{k+1} \rangle \leq 0$, but the printed base has $m_1 = (1, 0)$ and a positive first coordinate for m_2 , so the text's claim that assumption 1 is satisfied is false. Replace that first coordinate by its negative:

$$m_2 = \left(- \left\lceil \sqrt{(2\gamma\psi_1)^{-1} - \gamma^2} \right\rceil, 3 \right).$$

Norms, determinants, the integral-level lattice generated with m_1 , and all later estimates are unchanged, while the scalar product becomes nonpositive. This is a uniquely repairable sign typo.

Final estimate: Determinant control and radius control give the two error margins

Page 11 · conclusion of the proof of Theorem 5 · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Correct

Lemma 3 gives

$$\psi_k^{-1} \leq \frac{|\det(m_{k+1}, m_{k+2})|}{|m_k|^2} < \psi_k^{-1} + 3\gamma < (\psi_k - 3\gamma\psi_k^2)^{-1}.$$

The new half-ball has $R_{k+1}|m_k|^3 \leq \gamma\psi_k^2$. The first relation locates the center value and the second bounds its variation throughout Ω_{k+1} , yielding the lower margin $4\gamma\psi_k^2$ and upper margin $\gamma\psi_k^2$ exactly as stated.

Continuum conclusion: No branching argument is supplied

Pages 10–11 · iteration and final sentence of the proof · arXiv:0812.4896v3

Incomplete

The iteration proves the existence of a nested sequence and one common point. It neither exhibits infinitely many stages with two admissible successors nor varies the initial data over a continuum while preserving the induction hypotheses. The phrase 'which proves Theorem 5' therefore skips the proof obligation created by 'Moreover, there is a continuum of such α .' Because the next theorem uses that multiplicity, this is not merely an editorial omission.

03 / NOVELTY

Novelty

No non-novelty findings

No non-novelty findings.

METHOD

Scope and decision rules

This audit addressed only the correctness of central statements, the correctness and completeness of proofs, and evidence-backed non-novelty. It did not evaluate importance, exposition, style, suitability for publication, or author reputation.

An adverse finding is included only where the report can give a direct calculation, counterexample, formal contradiction, or a verifiable source establishing the precise claim. An inability to verify is kept distinct from a demonstrated defect. Technical compression is not treated as incompleteness when the omitted reasoning is recoverable and correct.

Before any finding was recorded, the argument was closed under immediate, mechanically checkable consequences of facts already established. An observation was suppressed when the printed conclusion followed by elementary logic, direct substitution, weakening, inclusion, or verified monotonicity and no substantive proof obligation or textual correction remained.

Typographical errors and minor formal corrections remain fully visible in yellow with their locations and repairs. When such a defect is unambiguous, local, and harmless to the paper's substantive conclusions, it does not lower the overall statements or proofs status from Correct.

The novelty panel reports only central results for which a verifiable primary source predating the earliest public version that contains the result proves the same statement up to notation, or from which the statement follows directly and immediately. It contains no positive novelty certifications and no entries based merely on an unsuccessful literature search.

All mathematical expressions in this report are compiled by LaTeX. The web presentation independently validates and renders the corresponding expressions with KaTeX.

Sources checked

1. Source paper: [arXiv:0812.4896v3](#)

arXiv acknowledgement

Thank you to arXiv for use of its open access interoperability. This service was not reviewed or approved by, nor does it necessarily express or reflect the policies or opinions of, arXiv.

APPENDIX

Standardized prompt

You are a mathematical auditor. Evaluate only the correctness of the paper’s central statements, the correctness and completeness of its proofs, and evidence-backed non-novelty. Do not make editorial comments or evaluate importance, exposition, style, or suitability for publication. Keep the report neutral, precise, and professional.

PART 1 — CORRECTNESS OF THE MAIN STATEMENTS

Identify the paper’s central statements and assess each one separately using exactly one of these outcomes:

- *Correct: the statement has a correct, verifiable proof; or, despite a defect in the printed proof, you can give a fully verified repair or independent proof.*
- *Incorrect: you can give strong formal evidence that the statement as written is false, preferably a counterexample or a complete contradiction.*
- *Not able to verify: the supplied proof does not establish the statement, and you can neither supply a fully verified proof nor disprove it.*

For every adverse or unverified outcome, restate the exact claim and hypotheses, identify its location in the reviewed version, and give the decisive reasoning. Do not infer that a theorem is false merely because its printed proof is defective.

Assign the overall statements status by the following priority:

1. *Contains wrong statements, if at least one central statement is Incorrect.*
2. *Contains unsupported statements, if no central statement is Incorrect but at least one is Not able to verify.*
3. *Correct, if every central statement is Correct, apart from any typographical or minor formal findings allowed by Part 4.*

PART 2 — CORRECTNESS AND COMPLETENESS OF THE PROOFS

Audit the proofs of the central statements and every material internal or cited input on which they depend. For each proof or proof segment, use the narrowest supported outcome:

- *Correct and complete: every substantive step is verifiable and no case or crucial nontrivial step is missing.*
- *Incorrect as written: a displayed calculation, inference, lemma, or cited application is formally false or inapplicable.*
- *Incomplete as written: a necessary substantive step or case is missing, even though no explicit contradiction has been proved.*
- *Not able to verify: the available paper and sources are insufficient to decide whether the step is valid.*

Do not flag omitted routine details, compressed arguments, or “analogously” steps when the omitted reasoning is recoverable and correct. For every defect, identify its smallest exact location, explain its downstream dependency, and classify any proposed repair as one of:

- *Verified repair: supply enough reasoning to verify that the repair works throughout every affected use.*
- *Plausible repair only: describe the possible repair but do not treat it as established.*
- *No repair supplied.*

Assign the overall proofs status by the following priority:

1. *Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs, if at least one proof is Incorrect as written or Incomplete as written.*
2. *Contains unverified proofs, if there is no proved incorrectness or incompleteness but at least one material proof is Not able to verify.*
3. *Correct, if all audited proofs are Correct and complete, apart from any typographical or minor formal findings allowed by Part 4.*

PART 3 — NOVELTY OF THE MAIN STATEMENTS

This is a one-sided, evidence-only check. Evaluate only central results. Report a result only when a verifiable primary source, publicly available before the earliest public version of the paper that contains the result, proves the same statement up to a change of notation, or when the result follows directly and immediately from such an earlier theorem.

For each non-novelty finding, provide the earlier source, its public date, the exact theorem or proposition, and an explicit hypothesis-and-conclusion mapping. A later source cannot establish non-novelty. Do not flag a result merely because an easier proof exists or because it follows through a nontrivial argument. Do not flag a result that the paper itself explicitly presents as known, a survey item, or an alternative proof.

Mention only statements that meet this non-novelty threshold. Say nothing about statements for which no such evidence was found: do not certify novelty, list unsuccessful searches, or add statement-level “no prior source found” entries. If the list is empty, the section may say only “No non-novelty findings.”

PART 4 — TECHNICAL AND EVIDENTIARY RULES

1. *Criticism must never be overstated. Call a statement incorrect, a proof incorrect or incomplete, or a result non-new only when strong formal evidence supports that exact judgment. Otherwise use Not able to verify where that outcome exists, or remain silent in the novelty section.*

2. *Review a specified paper version. Give exact page, theorem, equation, or proof locations; restate relevant quantifiers and hypotheses; and check domains, endpoints, parameter ranges, constants, and dependencies explicitly. Apply a defect only to the regimes and downstream results that actually depend on it.*

3. *Immediate-consequence closure*: when deciding whether a conclusion is supported, treat the argument as including every immediate formal consequence of facts established earlier in the paper and available at that point. An immediate formal consequence is a local, mechanically checkable inference using only definitions already in force, elementary logic, direct substitution or renaming, weakening of an inequality or set inclusion, or a monotonicity or symmetry property explicit in a definition or already proved.

4. Such an inference must introduce no new lemma, estimate, construction, case analysis, limiting or compactness argument, external result, or new issue of uniformity or parameter dependence. Check the direction of monotonicity and the dependence of every threshold or constant explicitly. Do not exchange pointwise and uniform conclusions, change exceptional sets, interchange quantifiers or limits, or extend an endpoint under this rule unless the required fact was already established.

5. If the claimed conclusion follows after immediate-consequence closure, it is fully supported. Do not report a gap, unsupported statement, minor formal correction, or recommendation to add an explanatory sentence, and do not mention the suppressed item in the report. This suppression does not apply to a genuine typographical error as defined below, because a typo is a literal notation defect that still requires a textual correction. For example, if $P(\delta)$ is proved for every sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and P is immediately monotone in the required direction, then the claim that $P(\delta)$ holds for every $\delta > 0$ requires no correction; the omitted monotonicity step is exposition rather than an audit finding.

6. Immediate-consequence closure permits reconstruction of an omitted inference; it does not permit silent alteration of the printed domain, hypotheses, or quantifiers of an intermediate statement later invoked outside its stated scope. If formal validity requires changing the text of that statement or its stated range, report the appropriate finding even when the repair is easy. Thus a result stated only for $t > 0$ and subsequently applied at $t = 0$ remains a formal scope mismatch unless the endpoint case was separately established before the application.

7. Apply this mandatory gate before recording any adverse, unverified, typographical, or minor formal finding: (a) identify the exact assertion or inference alleged to be defective; (b) reconstruct the strongest conclusion following from the preceding argument after all admissible immediate formal consequences are added; (c) identify the specific defect that remains — a formally demonstrated falsehood, a concrete nontrivial unresolved proof obligation, or a genuine domain, hypothesis, quantifier, or notation mismatch requiring a textual correction; and (d) state the evidence and minimal repair. If no specific defect remains, or if the only possible addition would be explanatory, suppress the finding entirely. Use Not able to verify only when a precise, nontrivial unresolved obligation can be identified.

8. A typographical error is an incorrect symbol, index, exponent, sign, variable name, or notation mismatch whose unique intended correction is mechanically determined from the surrounding text and does not alter the mathematical argument. Report it in yellow as *Typo*, with the printed text, correction, exact location, and reason it is harmless. It does not lower an overall status.

9. A minor formal correction is a boundary, endpoint, or displayed parameter-range defect that can be repaired consistently in every affected statement by a local change, without a new argument, without invalidating any related result or application, and without creating another substantive defect. Report it in yellow as *Minor formal correction*, with the same details. It does not lower an overall status.

10. Do not use either minor category if more than one materially different repair is possible; if the repair changes the substance or scope of a central result; if an excluded case is used later; if the correction fails to propagate consistently; or if a new mathematical idea is required. In such cases use the strongest substantive classification actually supported by evidence.

11. Write every mathematical expression as valid, compilable LaTeX. Use ... for inline mathematics and

...

for displayed mathematics, with balanced delimiters and braces. Do not leave raw LaTeX commands outside math delimiters.

12. Separate theorem truth from the correctness of the printed proof. A theorem can be *Correct in Part 1* because of a fully verified independent proof while its printed proof is adverse in Part 2. Conversely, a defective proof alone never licenses an *Incorrect theorem classification*.

Organize the report under Parts 1–3 and apply Part 4 throughout. Do not add editorial commentary, scores, rankings, recommendations, or a list of suppressed observations.

END OF REPORT

Each claim in this prototype report remains open to independent challenge and revision.