

Maxie — My frustration
stems from : I point out serious
errors. You say 'oh I can fix it'
and the error is not addressed.

I have looked at 3 versions
of the argument that all have
mistakes in logic and what look
like same conceptual errors.
I cant be doing this.

I still have serious reservations about this approach — as I have explained, the expected result seems to be well beyond what one would expect as a 1st result on a very famous problem.

Your revisions continue to make same conceptual errors. I feel like my attention to each new revision is a game of tracing the appearance of same errors further and further down the proof tree.

That suggests that you really need some new ideas. And that I should stop reading these manuscripts.

I will not read another manuscript until Labor Day.

What you should do is stop working on this until you have some new ideas.

Rules for next version

I stop reading if I see

- Old error/confusion not addressed
- "monotonicity principle"
- Elementary mistake in analytical reasoning.
- Faulty application of summation by parts.
Their use in oscillatory sums is highly suspect.

I will not read next version for 3

months, i.e. Dec. 1