

Correctness, proof completeness, and novelty audit

Partition regularity of Pythagorean pairs

Nikos Frantzikinakis, Oleksiy Klurman, Joel Moreira

Paper	arXiv:2309.10636v5
Source version	Submitted 27 July, 2026; v1 submitted 19 September, 2023; announced September 2023.
Audit date	August 18, 2026
Prompt	Standardized prompt
Novelty cutoff	September 19, 2023
Paper license	CC BY 4.0
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	Correct
02	Proofs	Correct
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

Correct

All three central levels of the result are supported. Theorem 1.2 proves the positive multiplicative-density statement from which Theorem 1.1's finite-color partition regularity follows. Theorem 1.5 applies the same aperiodic/pretentious dichotomy to level sets of multiplicative functions. The required integer, nonzero, distinctness, and color or level-set conditions are retained in each deduction.

Theorem 1.1: Partition regularity of Pythagorean pairs

Pages 4–9 · Theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.5 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct

Theorem 1.1 proves that every finite coloring contains the stated monochromatic Pythagorean-pair configuration, with the required positivity and distinctness conditions. The deduction selects a color class having positive upper density along a multiplicative Følner sequence and applies the stronger density theorem to that class. The parametrization produces integer coordinates after the common dilation, and the zero and diagonal parameter sets have zero contribution. Thus the theorem does not rely on an additive-density assertion for a color class.

Theorem 1.2: Multiplicative-density regularity

Pages 5–7 · Theorem 1.2 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct

For a set of positive upper density along a multiplicative Følner sequence, the theorem produces parameters whose classical Pythagorean parametrization places all required coordinates in the set. The correspondence measure has the same density, and the spectral positivity estimate gives a strictly positive limiting multiple intersection. Lower-order zero and diagonal parameters cannot account for that positive limit, so a genuine configuration exists.

Theorem 1.5: Pythagorean configurations in multiplicative level sets

Pages 7–9 · Theorem 1.5 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct

The level-set theorem separates multiplicative functions according to pretentious distance. In the aperiodic case the uniformity estimate forces cancellation unless the required configuration appears; in the pretentious case concentration around the model character supplies the positive correlation. The alternatives and threshold hypotheses in the statement match this split, and complex-valued level sets are approximated by finitely many arcs before the density argument is applied.

Corollary configurations: Nonzero and distinct solutions

Pages 8–9 and 37–43 · corollaries and Section 6 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct

The exceptional algebraic loci on which a parametrized coordinate vanishes or two target entries coincide are explicitly separated. Their density in the parameter boxes tends to zero, while the main spectral correlation has a positive limit. The resulting solution therefore satisfies the nonzero and distinctness clauses of the stated corollaries, not just the underlying quadratic identity.

02 / PROOFS

Proofs

Correct

Proofs of Theorems 1.6–1.8 and deduction of the main results. The multiplicative correspondence principle converts the target density into an integral of triple correlations over the spectrum of the dilation action. Aperiodic characters are controlled by the uniform multiplicative-function estimate, whereas pretentious characters concentrate near an Archimedean/Dirichlet model whose contribution is positive. The Pythagorean polynomial identity is inserted before taking the spectral limit. Approximation errors are uniform on the finite parameter boxes, and degenerate parameter values form a lower-order set. The argument therefore yields a positive count of genuine configurations along the original multiplicative Følner sequence.

Spectral representation and concentration: Proofs of Theorems 1.6–1.8 and deduction of the main results

Pages 13–49 · Sections 2–7 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct and complete

The multiplicative correspondence principle converts the target density into an integral of triple correlations over the spectrum of the dilation action. Aperiodic characters are controlled by the uniform multiplicative-function estimate, whereas pretentious characters concentrate near an Archimedean/Dirichlet model whose contribution is positive. The Pythagorean polynomial identity is inserted before taking the spectral limit. Approximation errors are uniform on the finite parameter boxes, and degenerate parameter values form a lower-order set. The argument therefore yields a positive count of genuine configurations along the original multiplicative Følner sequence.

Sections 2–4: Multiplicative correspondence and character split

Pages 13–31 · Sections 2–4 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct and complete

The invariant measure obtained from the Følner sequence reproduces all finite dilation intersections. Spectral resolution of the commuting dilation operators turns the relevant average into an integral over multiplicative characters. The aperiodic estimates are uniform over the polynomial parameter boxes; the structured characters are controlled by the stated concentration theorem. Truncation to finitely many characters and dominated convergence justify the order of limits.

Sections 5–7: Parametric substitution and deductions

Pages 31–49 · Sections 5–7 · arXiv:2309.10636v5

Correct and complete

The classical two-parameter Pythagorean identity is substituted into the positive correlation with all common scaling factors tracked. Degenerate subvarieties are negligible, and positivity yields actual integer points. Selecting a positive-density color proves Theorem 1.1; retaining the correspondence set proves Theorem 1.2; applying the character analysis to multiplicative-function level sets proves Theorem 1.5. Each step uses the same density normalization, so no incompatible subsequence is introduced.

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:2309.10636v5](#)

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.