

Correctness, proof completeness, and novelty audit

Bounded orbits of nonquasiunipotent flows on homogeneous spaces

Dmitry Y. Kleinbock, G. A. Margulis

Reviewed source	Author-hosted published text · American Mathematical Society Translations, Series 2, volume 171 (1996), pages 141–172
Exact version	Version of record
Journal citation	Dmitry Y. Kleinbock and G. A. Margulis. Bounded orbits of nonquasiunipotent flows on homogeneous spaces. American Mathematical Society Translations, Series 2, 171 (1996), 141–172.
DOI	10.1090/trans2/171/11
Audit date	August 23, 2026
Scope	Statements, proofs, and novelty
Important limitation. AI-generated analysis. This report is not a correctness certificate or a substitute for expert scrutiny.	

SUMMARY

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

Statements

Correct The bounded-orbit theorem for nonquasiunipotent one-parameter subgroups, its representation-theoretic and geometric inputs, and the stated extensions are correct at their printed scope. The main construction has a formal branch-indexing defect, but the defect has a direct verified repair and does not change the theorem.

Theorem 1.1: The bounded-orbit conclusion follows after a branch-dependent return-time repair

Author copy, printed pages 1–5 and 21–23 · Theorem 1.1 and Section 4.2

Correct

For a nonquasiunipotent one-parameter subgroup of a semisimple group acting on a finite-volume homogeneous space, the paper constructs a positive-Hausdorff-dimension set of points with bounded forward trajectories. The local tree construction, mixing estimate, and dimension calculation are valid. In the last compactness step, return times must be indexed by the marked translate chosen along each nested branch; with that correction, consecutive returns have uniformly bounded gaps and compact interpolation gives boundedness for every time.

Source: [Author-hosted published text](#)

Section 2: The uniform mixing and smooth-partition inputs have the needed strength

Author copy, printed pages 8–15 · Theorem 2.4.3, Corollary 2.4.4, and Lemma 2.4.7

Correct

The paper isolates the representation-theoretic hypothesis required for uniform exponential matrix-coefficient decay and then derives the family-uniform estimate used in the counting argument. The smooth bump and product estimates retain their dimension and derivative losses. Corollary 2.4.4 is therefore a valid ambient exponential-mixing input, including for its later use in the dependence graph.

Source: [Author-hosted published text](#)

Sections 3 and 5: The tessellation and extension statements preserve the hypotheses used in the proof

Author copy, printed pages 16–21 and 24–30 · tessellation construction and generalizations

Correct

The expanding-horospherical tessellation has the required bounded overlap, scale control, and boundary regularity. The later variants alter only the representation or invariant submanifold used to supply those same quantitative inputs; they do not silently remove a spectral or geometric hypothesis needed by the argument.

Source: [Author-hosted published text](#)

Proofs

Contains incorrect or incomplete proofs

The analytic and geometric core is sound, but the final return-time recursion is not defined on the branch states created by the preceding line. A branch-dependent recursion repairs the proof without changing any estimate. One nearby symbol error is harmless.

Equations (4.4)–(4.8): The return-time recursion ignores the marked branch

Author copy, printed page 22 · equations (4.4)–(4.8)

Incomplete as written · verified repair

A child cylinder is defined using a marked translate γ and the next state $\gamma g_{t(y)}y \in K$. Equation (4.6), however, defines a single branch-independent quantity $t_{j+1}(y) = t(y) + t_j(g_{t(y)}y)$. The unmarked point $g_{t(y)}y$ need not lie in K , so the right side can be undefined; different children can also use different γ . Consequently equation (4.7) does not follow from (4.4)–(4.6) as printed. For the repair, fix $h \in A_\infty(x)$ and choose a compatible infinite chain of nested cylinders, recording its marks γ_j . Put $y_0 = x$, $y_{j+1} = \gamma_j g_{t(y_j)}y_j$, and $\tau_{j+1} = \tau_j + t(y_j)$. Unrolling the depth- j cylinder representation leaves a residual element $v_j \in V$ and gives $g_{\tau_j}hx = v_j y_j$. The final mark in that depth- j representation was selected precisely so that $Vy_j \subset K$, hence every displayed return lies in K . Since all increments lie in $[T, T']$, compact interpolation between successive returns proves (4.8).

Source: [Author-hosted published text](#)

Equation (4.4) paragraph: The density function has one wrong argument

Author copy, printed page 22 · paragraph preceding equation (4.4)

Typo

The density is written once as $\delta(y, k, t(y))$, although the compact target throughout the construction is K . The unique correction is $\delta(y, K, t(y))$. The same paragraph and all estimates use the compact set K , so the typo has no mathematical effect.

Source: [Author-hosted published text](#)

Sections 2–4 and Appendix: The remaining quantitative estimates and dimension argument close

Author copy, printed pages 8–23 and 30–32

Correct and complete

Exponential mixing controls the proportion of admissible children, boundary estimates control losses near partition walls, and the mass-distribution calculation yields the announced lower bound on Hausdorff dimension. The appendix supplies the required representation-theoretic decay at exactly the uniformity used earlier. None of these steps depends on the defective branch-independent notation in (4.6).

Source: [Author-hosted published text](#)

Novelty

No non-novelty findings No non-novelty findings.

METHOD

Exact-source disclosure

This audit evaluated only the linked journal version of record. An arXiv preprint, accepted manuscript, or later correction is not silently substituted for that source.

Sources checked

1. [Author-hosted published text](#)

Audit instructions

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 $\dots$ for inline mathematics and $\dots$ 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