

Correctness, proof completeness, and novelty audit

Convergence and combinatorics of the Reverse algorithm

Hiroaki Ito, Niels Langeveld, Jörg Thuswaldner

Paper	arXiv:2602.14142v3
Source version	Submitted 9 July, 2026; v1 submitted 15 February, 2026; announced February 2026.
Audit date	August 16, 2026
Prompt	Standardized prompt
Novelty cutoff	February 15, 2026
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	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 ergodicity theorem and the factor-balancedness criterion are supported. The negativity and explicit upper bound for the second Lyapunov exponent are not able to be verified because the decisive 4^{12} -cylinder computation is reported without the calculation or an auditable error certificate.

Theorem 1.3: Ergodicity of the Reverse algorithm

Pages 5 and 8–10 · Theorem 1.3 and Section 3 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Correct

The induced transformation whose branches end in symbol 4 is full. Recurrence together with the zero measure of the Rauzy gasket gives positive matrix blocks almost everywhere and hence almost-everywhere topological convergence. Lemma 3.2 controls the row-sum ratio after a final M_4 , yielding the uniform Rényi constant 2^3 . The Rényi criterion therefore proves ergodicity of the induced map, and the standard inducing argument transfers it to f_R with the previously established invariant probability measure.

Theorem 1.4: The numerical Lyapunov bound is not independently verifiable from the supplied material

Pages 5 and 12–13 · Theorem 1.4, equation (4.6), and Remark 4.5 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Not able to verify

The analytic reduction is explicit: a negative value of $(1/12) \int_{\Delta} \log \|D^{(12)}(x)\|_1 d\mu(x)$ implies the result. The sign then depends on the claimed finite estimates $L_1(12) < 0.024002$ and $L_2(12) < -0.044610$, obtained by maximizing over nearly 4^{12} cylinders. The paper states that each summand was evaluated to 18-digit precision with error below 10^{-18} , but gives neither code nor interval endpoints, rounding rules, exact cylinder data, or per-operation bounds from which that assertion can be checked; the arXiv source bundle contains only the TeX and bibliography. The margin is large compared with the claimed aggregate error, but the decisive numerical values themselves cannot be reconstructed or certified from the available evidence.

Theorem 1.5: Positive density of the contracting block implies factor balancedness

Pages 5 and 13–18 · Theorem 1.5 and Section 5 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Correct

The substitution estimates first control how letter-balance constants change under every generator. Occurrences of $(\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3)^9$ provide seven consecutive contracting triples, while the intervening blocks have a uniform operator bound. Positive occurrence density makes the resulting geometric series converge, so all shifted languages are letter balanced. Grouping each run of σ_4 with the following σ_i produces proper substitutions without changing the language, and the cited proper-sequence theorem then gives factor balancedness.

02 / PROOFS

Proofs

Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs

The analytic Lyapunov reduction is correct, but its sole numerical input is not accompanied by enough data to verify the asserted upper bounds. The balancedness proof also omits the separated-occurrence selection required by its factorization, although a verified greedy-thinning repair is available.

Section 3: Inducing and Rényi-condition proof

Pages 8–10 · Lemmas 3.1–3.3 and Proposition 3.4 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Correct and complete

For almost every coding, recurrence may be applied after an occurrence of 4, giving a repeated positive block and shrinking cylinders. Appending M_4 replaces the three row sums by their pairwise sums. The strict triangle inequality of Lemma 3.2 then bounds the largest-to-smallest new row-sum ratio by 2, and the cubic Jacobian formula gives a branch-independent bound below 8. These facts supply all four hypotheses of the cited ergodicity criterion on the full-measure induced system.

Equation (4.6): The computer-assisted sign estimate lacks a checkable certificate

Pages 12–13 · definitions of L_1, L_2 , equation (4.6), and Remark 4.5 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Not able to verify

The formulas for L_1 and L_2 do give upper bounds for the two integral pieces: positive cylinder maxima are paired with upper density bounds and negative maxima with lower density bounds. What remains is the finite assertion

$$L_1(12) + L_2(12) < -0.020608.$$

Eighteen-digit working precision by itself does not establish a 10^{-18} error for each term, and no executable calculation or interval certificate is supplied. Repair classification: No repair supplied. Publishing the cylinder enumeration together with directed-rounding bounds for every maximum, volume, density factor, logarithm, and final sum would make this step auditable.

Lemma 5.9: The accumulated balance constant has its indices reversed

Page 17 · first paragraph of the proof of Lemma 5.9 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Typo

After applying $n - m$ substitutions, Proposition 5.2 gives the constant

$$\frac{44}{7}C + 4(n - m),$$

not the printed $\frac{44}{7}C + 4(m - n)$. The next displayed estimate already uses $C + (n - m)$, and iterating the preceding proposition forces the positive sign. Correcting the order of the indices is unique and leaves every subsequent bound unchanged.

Proposition 5.10: The selected block occurrences must be nonoverlapping

Pages 17–18 · definition of (ℓ_k) in the proof of Proposition 5.10 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Incomplete as written

The factorization using intervals $[\ell_{k-1} + 21, \ell_k)$ requires $\ell_k \geq \ell_{k-1} + 21$, whereas the manuscript chooses only a strictly increasing occurrence sequence. This leaves overlapping intervals and does not justify the displayed factorization. Repair classification: Verified repair. Greedily retain the first eligible occurrence at least 21 positions after the preceding retained occurrence. Thinning by a fixed separation preserves positive lower density up to a fixed factor, so $g_k = o(k)$ and the contraction series remain valid.

Section 5: Projection, contraction, and proper-blocking arguments

Pages 13–18 · Lemmas 5.1–5.9 and proof of Theorem 1.5 · arXiv:2602.14142v3

Correct and complete

The letter-count identities verify the balance loss for each substitution. The extremal-ray computation gives the stated projection norm, the block $B_{\sigma_1}B_{\sigma_2}B_{\sigma_3}$ contracts the relevant hyperplane by $5/7$, and the intervening products have uniform norm at most 10. After the local occurrence-selection correction above, seven contractions per selected block yield $10(5/7)^7 < 1$. The final proper blocking satisfies the hypotheses of the cited factor-balance theorem.

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:2602.14142v3](#)

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.