

Some people alerted me to [this Mochizuki LEAN Project led by Fumiharu Kato](#), and so I reached out to Kato and Kedlaya with my concerns. Also included here are my comments on the situation.

April 15, 2026, 4:14 PM

Dear Prof. Kato,

I read the [announcement](#)<sup>1</sup> regarding the LEAN project about Mochizuki's work in which you and a few others are involved with. From 2018—to date, I have mathematically supported Mochizuki's claims even when almost no one outside Japan was willing to stand by his claims. I provided a robust defence of his work (and my work has provided a precise approach to understanding and establishing his claims). So I feel that Mochizuki's fight with me has been completely unnecessary. In my defense I should say that while Mochizuki and I have very different views of the relevant Teichmüller Theory, I have arrived at my theory with a far more precise toolkit, having followed his ideas and the theory of tempered fundamental groups (which I learned from your notes of Andre's lectures) and I have credited Mochizuki wherever due. This has made my conclusions about Mochizuki's assertions far harder to dismiss for his critics. I should also say that Mochizuki's 2024 criticism of my work was based on a poor reading of my work, but unperturbed by the unpleasant personal asignations he had thrown at me, I have addressed all the shortcomings in my 2025 updates. I am an admirer of Mochizuki's work but I have not hesitated to provide professional mathematical criticism (of Mochizuki, Scholze and others) when I felt it was necessary.

On the Zen University Page for this project you (Prof. Kato) say that “We have assembled an exceptional team of experts and have engaged in rigorous discussions over the past year. As a result, we have gained a clearer understanding of what we currently understand and what remains unresolved.” Implicit in your statement is the acknowledgement that his papers have some unresolved issues—a fact I was the first to point out correctly and clearly within the framework envisaged by Mochizuki under which he has made his claims. [As you, and many at RIMS, know I have the longest engagement with Mochizuki's Teichmüller Theory works (even predating his abc-papers).]

Therefore I am surprised (and deeply troubled) that my work (both in highlighting some of the issues with his papers and also providing necessary precision wherever needed) does not get credited in your formal verification endeavor. I believe it would be professional on the part of the verification team to at least acknowledge my work.

cc: Akio Tamagawa (RIMS, Kyoto)

Sincerely,  
Kirti Joshi

## 1 Comments added May 7, 2026

- (1) Still awaiting response from F. Kato.
- (2) **Kato also asserts:** “What must be stated carefully here is that, at the present stage, we have not yet reached a final conclusion as to whether those points constitute mathematical gaps or whether they derive from limitations in our own understanding.” In contrast to this statement by F. Kato, [even as recently as October 2025 Mochizuki has asserted](#), that “IUT is mathematics that is well understood by quite a number of professional mathematicians and has been verified countless times since its release in August 2012” (see [\[Mochizuki, 2025, Page 1, 1.1\]](#)). So according to Mochizuki, there are no issues with his paper and members of his research group, including some who are involved with this LEAN Project are experts on his proof (for my discussion of gaps in [\[Mochizuki, 2021b\]](#), see [\[Joshi, 2025\]](#)).
- (3) While conversations surrounding this new LEAN enterprise may be exciting to many, the issues which have been raised to date have been *strictly* about the printed and published version [\[Mochizuki, 2021b\]](#). One of the key issues with Mochizuki's proof is the key notion of Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures<sup>2</sup>, which is imprecisely defined therein, and the necessary precision to validate various claims made by Mochizuki cannot be supplied from within his framework, and without which the proof is incomplete. With the precise definitions and the ‘Rosetta Stone’ given in my work, it would certainly now be possible to directly or indirectly provide the needed precision in [\[Mochizuki, 2021b\]](#) to achieve or assert LEAN certification.

---

<sup>1</sup>Last time I checked this link was 4/18/2026 at 2:48PM MST

<sup>2</sup>Here are some of the many places Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures are used by Mochizuki: [\[Mochizuki, 2021b, Pages 7, 24, 25, 29, 33, 35, 105, 111, 209, 212, 214, 228, 229, 248, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 265, 269, 270 274, 329, 330, 340, 358, 368, 369, 370, \(II, Cor. 4.11, Page 390\), 391, 453, 454, 458, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 487, 488, 489, 490, 561, 462, 463, 464, 487, 488, 489, 490, 561, 562, 570, 571, \(III, Theorem 3.11, Page 573\), \(III, Remark 3.11, 580\), 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 589, 590, \(III, Corollary 3.12, Page 597\), 598, 600, 604, 606, 607, 608, 609, 615, 619, 620.\]](#)

- (4) From 2018-until the posting of the above [project](#) in April 2026, there has been a systematic denial of any issues in [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] by some members of Mochizuki’s research group and mudslinging [[Mochizuki, 2022](#)], [[Mochizuki, March 2024](#)] at anyone who pointed them out and especially at me for providing the relevant mathematics required to prove Mochizuki’s claims.
- (5) I brought my concerns about the lack of creditation to my work by this LEAN Project Team to Kiran Kedlaya’s attention, to which Kedlaya replied “no comments.”
- (6) Note that on the [LEAN Project announcement page](#) K. Kedlaya now dismisses the (almost decade long) controversy<sup>3</sup> surrounding Mochizuki’s claims as a “miscommunication.”
- (7) This may be an attempt by some members of the group to change the narrative, and use it to dislodge all mathematical criticism of the published paper [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] (which still has gaps) and avoid giving credit to my work which has brought the issues in [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] to light with mathematical precision. [Notably, according to Kato, the [LEAN Project Team](#) began its work in 2024, and so it has had the hindsight provided by my work (available from 2020) and [[Joshi, 2025](#)].]
- (8) At a key conceptual level the proof requires working with distinct versions of Arithmetic (more precisely, with distinct Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures). [See footnote 2 on page 1.]
- (9) My work has already rigorously demonstrated the required existence and non-triviality of the Arithmetic Teichmüller Theory, with a precise definition of Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures (and detailed their properties [[Joshi, 2021](#)], [[Joshi, 2023b](#)]), upon which Mochizuki’s claimed proof rests (see footnote 2 on page 1). [Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures, and their role in [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)], was a key point in my extensive discussions with Peter Scholze in May-June 2024, and notably, in the printed paper [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)], Mochizuki does not provide any evidence of the required non-triviality of the theory.]
- (10) Let me also remark that the [LEAN Project Team](#) has put out a [video by Mochizuki](#). I watched this video twice and found that Mochizuki offers no new insights or substantive content about [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] over and beyond what he has repeatedly said since 2012 (and in his survey [[Mochizuki, 2020](#)]). Unfortunately, the real issues with [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] are in the lack of details, and not about whether LEAN will validate it or not in the future.

Here are some examples:

- (a) the “gluing” discussed by Mochizuki in the video at time [24:11](#) is established in [[Joshi, 2024a](#), (‘Rosetta Stone’) §8, Theorem 8.8.3 and see Remark 8.8.6 for why Mochizuki’s usage of the term ‘gluing’ is misleading] (for a fuller discussion of this point see item (g) below);
- (b) for a clear and unambiguous construction of  $\Theta$ -Links discussed at time [33:06](#), see [[Joshi, 2024a](#), §4, Theorem 4.2.2.1];
- (c) Mochizuki’s Log-Link discussed at time [34:28](#) is detailed in [[Joshi, 2024a](#), §8.9].
- (d) My demonstration of the existence of Mochizuki’s Indeterminacies (see [37:31](#)) is [[Joshi, 2024a](#), §8.11.2].
- (e) My construction of Mochizuki’s Hodge Theaters (see [44:20](#)) (arising from distinct arithmetic and geometric data—a point needed in his [[Mochizuki, 2021a](#), Theorem 3.11, Corollary 3.12]) is in [[Joshi, 2024a](#), §10].
- (f) Mochizuki mischaracterizes (see [1:01:19](#)) the debate regarding [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] as about the implication Theorem 3.11  $\implies$  Corollary 3.12. *This implication is not the main issue at all.* The core issue with [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)] has been whether (or not) the theory described by him is non-vacuous. Especially, this non-vacuousness is needed for a robust formulation of these two assertions (and he fails to establish its non-vacuousness in the print version [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)]). The core strategy of Mochizuki’s proof is an averaging of arithmetic quantities as arithmetic (i.e. Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures) itself varies. The non-trivial portion of Theorem 3.11 (and hence Corollary 3.12) is that there exists an adelic set (which Mochizuki calls the multi-radial representation) which is obtained by collating a suitable tuple of  $\theta$ -values i.e. tuple of suitable powers of Tate parameters (at various primes)—each tuple contributing to this set arises from distinct Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures (while the relevant elliptic curve or a set of elliptic curves remains fixed)—i.e. it is the (non-trivial) variation of Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures which is a vital point and must be demonstrated (and it is missing in the print version of [[Mochizuki, 2021b](#)]). Corollary 3.12 deals with the volume of this adelic set and hence its existence is predicated on the existence of (distinct) Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures (see footnote 2 on page 1).

---

<sup>3</sup>See [[Castelvecchi, 2020](#)]*—The latest announcement seems unlikely to move many researchers over to Mochizuki’s camp. “I think it is safe to say that there has not been much change in the community opinion since 2018,” says Kiran Kedlaya, a number theorist at the University of California, San Diego, ...*

Mochizuki’s proof (and the formulations of his Theorem 3.11 and Corollary 3.12 as given in [Mochizuki, 2021b]) is deeply problematic because Mochizuki fails to establish that the averaging he proposes in the arithmetic case is non-trivial. [Precise discussion of this is in Section 2.]

- (g) Neither (mathematical) Universes nor (mathematical) Species are used in the main body [Mochizuki, 2021b, Pages 38-700] of Mochizuki’s paper—so any inclusion of these in the LEAN code would necessarily constitute a “patching” of the printed paper [Mochizuki, 2021b].
- (h) Let me elaborate on the point (a) above, using an example which Mochizuki discusses at 29:15.
  - i. Mochizuki asserts that one has a “gluing” of two pairs of (perfect Monoid with Group-action data) where the monoids are related by some  $n^{\text{th}}$ -power map (for some  $n \geq 1$ ):

$$G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}_p}^{\triangleright, pf} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow m^n} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}_p}^{\triangleright, pf} \curvearrowleft G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}.$$

- ii. One of the key issues is how to provide distinct geometric and arithmetic data (more precisely, distinct arithmetic holomorphic structures) which witnesses such a relationship—because in [Mochizuki, 2021a, Theorem 3.11 and Corollary 3.12], the left-hand side and the right-hand side of this isomorphism make separate (and distinct) contribution to the  $\Theta$ -values set (my proof of such isomorphisms witnessed by distinct arithmetic holomorphic structures is [Joshi, 2024a, Theorem 8.8.6]). Notably, Mochizuki’s usage of the term “gluing” here is a complete misrepresentation of what the theory requires (according to his own assertions about arithmetic holomorphic structures—see footnote 2 on page 1).
  - iii. The mere existence of such isomorphisms in no way justifies the non-vacuous-ness of Mochizuki’s claimed theory, just as the mere existence of homeomorphisms of a sphere with  $g$  handles does not itself validate the existence of moduli or Teichmüller Theory of Riemann surfaces of genus  $g$ . [The isomorphisms above are implied by the existence of arithmetic holomorphic structures, but are not an evidence of their existence.]
  - iv. This illustrates one of the many problems which occurs in [Mochizuki, 2021b]. For a full discussion of the issues and how they may be circumvented via my approach to Arithmetic Holomorphic Structures, see [Joshi, 2024a] (for a summary, see [Joshi, 2025]). [As the references to my work in (a)–(g) indicate, my proof of non-vacuousness is detailed in [Joshi, 2021], [Joshi, 2023b], [Joshi, 2024a].]
- (11) Let me say this clearly: the published papers on IUTT [Mochizuki, 2021b] has gaps, my work (and [Joshi, 2024a, ‘Rosetta Stone’]) can be used to fill the gaps at the time of LEAN coding without there being any need for anyone to acknowledge the gaps.
  - (12) Mochizuki’s fight with my work is incredibly bewildering and stupefying: I have detailed a very precise and canonical approach to his own work. I have done my due diligence and I have sent Mochizuki my preprints and updates regularly<sup>4</sup>. Ivan Fesenko said to me in an email (June 2024) that Mochizuki has been forwarding my emails to his research group.
  - (13) Since my email to Kato has been met with silence, it is perhaps possible that this LEAN Project may attempt to retain priority for Mochizuki. Notably, Kato acknowledges the Scholze-Stix Report but fails to mention my work (available in 2024) or my reports [Joshi, June, 2024], [Joshi, 2025] (which explicate the gaps in [Mochizuki, 2021b], and discuss how they are fixed by my work). I am deeply troubled that the LEAN Project Team have not been willing to acknowledge my work which has been available to them before the project commenced. I find this highly unprofessional.
  - (14) Unfortunately it is clear to me that, even though I have done all the work, the view some mathematicians are taking is that only mathematicians of established stature can participate in this conversation about [Mochizuki, 2021b] and only certain mathematicians of stature should be believed to be correct (irrespective of the mathematical evidence). Mochizuki has certainly made it clear in [Mochizuki, March 2024] that this is precisely what he believes in.
  - (15) In the context of (14) I should say that, I was the first to introduce perfectoid fields and relevant mathematics into anabelian geometry and used it successfully in the context of [Mochizuki, 2021b]. To me this is the natural evolution of mathematical ideas considered in [Mochizuki, 2021b]. But I should also point out that, in the context of Mochizuki’s prior work on Teichmüller Theory ([Mochizuki, 1996], [Mochizuki, 1999]), I had successfully brought in new ideas and techniques ([Joshi und Pauly, 2015], [Joshi, 2017]) which has led to substantial progress in those theories ([Wakabayashi, 2022],[Wakabayashi, 2014]).

---

<sup>4</sup>Mochizuki and Scholze were sent updated version [Joshi, 2024b] in October 2024.

## 2 Why I assert [Mochizuki, 2021b] has gaps

Mochizuki’s core strategy for the proof of the *abc*-conjecture is averaging arithmetic quantities, such as Tate parameters of an elliptic curve, over distinct versions of Arithmetic. Here by ‘averaging,’ I mean averaging in the sense of integration and computing volumes. [We know that this is Mochizuki’s strategy because in the proof of [Mochizuki, 2021b, IUT IV, Theorem 1.10], the main term is estimated using a key estimate for (the logarithm of) the volume of a suitable set.

It will be useful to understand the case of complex elliptic curves. Elliptic curves with parameters  $\tau$  and  $-1/\tau$  are isomorphic as complex algebraic curves of genus one (equivalently: biholomorphic as connected compact Riemann surfaces). The elliptic curves for  $\tau$  and  $-1/\tau$  give distinct Schottky parameters

$$q_1 = e^{2\pi i\tau} \text{ and } q_2 = e^{-2\pi i/\tau}$$

for the same i.e. isomorphic elliptic curves. And manifestly, these are distinct Schottky parameters for the same elliptic curve. Teichmüller Theory comes in because  $\tau$  and  $-1/\tau$  correspond to distinct points of the upper-half plane which is the Teichmüller space in genus one ([Imayoshi und Taniguchi, 1992, Chapter 1]). So it makes sense to consider the Schottky parameter as a function on the complex Teichmüller Space and integrating or averaging it makes complete sense (and is generally non-trivial).

Mochizuki wanted to achieve the arithmetic version of this picture, and he surmised correctly that there should exist a theory of arithmetic holomorphic structures<sup>5</sup> and Teichmüller Theory which achieves this. As evidence of such a theory, Mochizuki offers, using quite ingenious group theoretic methods in [Mochizuki, 2021b], a long list of identifications between many different types of mathematical objects and many different categories. But these identifications are consequences of the existence of arithmetic holomorphic structures, and not a proof of their existence; and Mochizuki’s group theory approach is simply too inadequate to prove any reasonable quantitative version of the assertion one needs. Now Mochizuki does have some determination of theta values in [Mochizuki, 2009]. But that proof does not establish that different arithmetic holomorphic structures (in his algorithmic sense of the word) provides two quantitatively distinct Tate parameters needed in [Mochizuki, 2021a, IUT3]. Without this one cannot rule out the possibility that one has “algorithmically produced” the same Tate parameter. And because the central portion of Mochizuki’s argument is to average over Schottky (Tate) parameters, to avoid the possibility that this is not trivial averaging, one must know *a priori* that the Schottky, Tate parameters are distinct (without establishing this, by the **Principle of Occam’s Razor**, one can declare this averaging procedure as unnecessary and irrelevant, and conclude that there is no proof of the *abc*-conjecture by this method).

*One of the reasons<sup>6</sup> why Mochizuki’s proof fails to be complete is because [Mochizuki, 2021b] does not establish the existence of distinct arithmetic holomorphic structures (and his group-theoretic framework is not adequate to do this). It is because of this lacuna, he is unable to prove that the averaging he proposes in the arithmetic case is, a priori, non-trivial.* This is the weakest, but critical, link in the chain of reasoning presented in [Mochizuki, 2021b]<sup>7</sup>. Even though Scholze did not articulate things this way, Scholze recognized (in 2018)<sup>8</sup> that this failure sinks Mochizuki’s theory, but then he went on to assert in [Scholze, 2021; Scholze und Stix, 2018] that the theory is vacuous, not recognizing that this is an issue with Mochizuki’s proofs and methods, and a robust version of the theory might (still) exist. A fact which I proved later (starting with [Joshi, October 2020]), and I also later demonstrated [Joshi, 2021, Proposition 4.3.1] how the required theory also emerges from Scholze’s work on Diamonds [Scholze, 2017].

In my ‘Untilts of fundamental groups’ Paper [Joshi, October 2020], I showed that by working with Berkovich spaces (and untilts of perfectoid fields) one can genuinely distinguish Tate parameters because they give rise to non-isomorphic Berkovich analytic spaces (and arithmetic data) while preserving the isomorphism class of all the groups (and monoids-with-group action pairs) Mochizuki considers, and also the isomorphism class of the elliptic curves over  $p$ -adic fields and over number fields (see [Joshi, 2021, Theorem 7.4.3 and §10]).

The correct version of the theory (as detailed in my papers) works because different arithmetic holomorphic structures do contribute different Tate parameters for the same elliptic curve. By ‘different’ I mean completely different elements ([Joshi, 2024a, Proposition 6.6.1]) in a suitable and *natural ring* (in [Joshi, 2024a], this ring is essentially a product of Fargues-Fontaine rings for all primes). This eliminates the “Occam’s Razor” argument mentioned above (and also eliminates all the other ambiguities which occur in the printed version of [Mochizuki, 2021b]).

---

<sup>5</sup>Mochizuki coined the term arithmetic holomorphic structure in [Mochizuki, 2021b].

<sup>6</sup>For a discussion of other issues with the Mochizuki’s proof see [Joshi, 2024b], [Joshi, 2025].

<sup>7</sup>Perhaps sensing this, Mochizuki has vociferously denounced anyone (Scholze-Stix (2018), myself (2024)) who has voiced this concern see [Mochizuki, 2018], [Mochizuki, March 2024]. In fact, Mochizuki has penned 254 pages ([Mochizuki, February 2019], [Mochizuki, 2022], [Mochizuki, March 2024], [Mochizuki, 2025]) denouncing anyone who has asked this question! If this question had a simple mathematical answer in [Mochizuki, 2021b], wouldn’t it have been easier to enlighten us all by precisely documenting it?

<sup>8</sup>Scholze emphasized this point to me during our conversations in May-June 2024.

## In Summary

Just to validate the existence of Mochizuki's strategy of the proof of the *abc*-conjecture in Mochizuki's papers, one needs to establish

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Number field } L \\ + \\ \overbrace{\text{an arithmetic holomorphic structure AHS on } L}^{\text{this needs to be quantified precisely (see footnote 2)}} \\ + \\ \overbrace{\text{a proof that a choice of an AHS generally provides distinct Tate parameters of the elliptic curve over } L}^{\text{this Mochizuki does not prove}} \end{array}$$

The main proof also needs other things predicated on this as well. [All of these points and other needed assertions are established in my work on Arithmetic Teichmüller Spaces.]

The current criticism (see [Joshi, 2025], [Joshi, 2024b]) of [Mochizuki, 2021b] is not about the implication Theorem 3.11  $\implies$  Corollary 3.12 of [Mochizuki, 2021a]. The criticism has to do with the subtler fact that the published version of [Mochizuki, 2021b, Pages 38-700] is not adequate for a robust and unambiguous formulation of these two (main) assertions of [Mochizuki, 2021b, IUT III].

In my opinion, this [LEAN Project](#) rewinds the clock back to 2018 and ignores the progress my work on Arithmetic Teichmüller Spaces has made in transparently addressing the core mathematical issues which have surrounded [Mochizuki, 2021b].

## References

- [Castelvecchi 2020] CASTELVECCHI, Davide: Mathematical proof that rocked number theory will be published. In: *Nature* 580 (2020), S. 177–177
- [Imayoshi und Taniguchi 1992] IMAYOSHI, Yoichi ; TANIGUCHI, Masahiko: *An Introduction to Teichmuller Spaces*. 1st ed. 1992. Tokyo : Springer Japan, 1992
- [Joshi 2017] JOSHI, Kirti: The degree of the dormant operatic locus. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2017), Nr. 9, S. 2599–2613
- [Joshi 2021] JOSHI, Kirti: Construction of Arithmetic Teichmuller Spaces I. (2021). – URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11452>
- [Joshi 2023a] JOSHI, Kirti: *Construction of Arithmetic Teichmuller Spaces II: Proof a local prototype of Mochizuki's Corollary 3.12*. 2023. – URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.01662>
- [Joshi 2023b] JOSHI, Kirti: Construction of Arithmetic Teichmuller Spaces II( $\frac{1}{2}$ ): Deformations of Number Fields. (2023). – URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10398>
- [Joshi 2024a] JOSHI, Kirti: *Construction of Arithmetic Teichmuller Spaces III: A proof of Mochizuki's Corollary 3.12 and a Rosetta Stone*. 2024. – URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2401.13508.pdf>
- [Joshi 2024b] JOSHI, Kirti: Construction of Arithmetic Teichmuller Spaces IV: A proof of the *abc*-conjecture. In: *Available at arxiv.org* (2024). – URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2403.10430.pdf>
- [Joshi 2025] JOSHI, Kirti: *Final report on the status of the Mochizuki-Scholze-Stix Controversy*. 2025. – URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2505.10568>
- [Joshi June, 2024] JOSHI, Kirti: *The status of the Scholze-Stix Report and an analysis of the Mochizuki-Scholze-Stix Controversy*. June, 2024. – URL <https://math.arizona.edu/~kirti/report-on-scholze-stix-mochizuki-controversy.pdf>
- [Joshi October 2020] JOSHI, Kirti: *Untiltls of fundamental groups: construction of labeled isomorphs of fundamental groups (2020 Version)*. October 2020. – URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.05748>
- [Joshi und Pauly 2015] JOSHI, Kirti ; PAULY, Christian: Hitchin-Mochizuki morphism, opers and Frobenius-destabilized vector bundles over curves. In: *Adv. Math.* 274 (2015), S. 39–75. – URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2015.01.004>

- [Mochizuki 1996] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: A theory of ordinary  $p$ -adic curves. In: *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 32 (1996), Nr. 6, S. 957–1152
- [Mochizuki 1999] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Bd. 11: *Foundations of  $p$ -adic Teichmüller theory*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Cambridge, MA, 1999. – xii+529 S
- [Mochizuki 2009] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: The étale theta function and its Frobenioid-theoretic manifestations. In: *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 45 (2009), Nr. 1, S. 227–349. – URL <https://doi.org/10.2977/prims/1234361159>. – ISSN 0034-5318
- [Mochizuki 2018] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: *Comments On the manuscript by Scholze-Stix concerning Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory (IUTCH)*. 2018. – URL <https://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~motizuki/Cmt2018-05.pdf>
- [Mochizuki 2020] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: The Mathematics of Mutually Alien Copies: from Gaussian Integrals to Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory. (2020). – URL <https://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~motizuki/Alien%20Copies,%20Gaussians,%20and%20Inter-universal%20Teichmuller%20Theory.pdf>
- [Mochizuki 2021a] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory III: canonical splittings of the Log-Theta Lattice. In: *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 57 (2021), Nr. 1/2, S. 403–626. – URL <https://ems.press/journals/prims/articles/201527>
- [Mochizuki 2021b] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory I,II,III,IV. In: *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 57 (2021), Nr. 1/2, S. 3–207, 209–401, 403–626, 627–723. – URL <https://ems.press/journals/prims/articles/201525>
- [Mochizuki 2022] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: *On The Essential Logical Structure Of Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory In Terms Of Logical And “ $\wedge$ ”/Logical Or “ $\vee$ ” Relations: Report On The Occasion Of The Publication Of The Four Main Papers On Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory*. 2022. – URL <https://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~motizuki/Essential%20Logical%20Structure%20of%20Inter-universal%20Teichmuller%20Theory.pdf>
- [Mochizuki 2025] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: Report on the Current Situation Surrounding Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory (IUT). (2025). – URL <https://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~motizuki/IUT-report-2025-10.pdf>
- [Mochizuki February 2019] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: Report On Discussions, Held During the period March 15–20, 2018, Concerning Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory (IUTCH). (February 2019), S. 45 pages
- [Mochizuki March 2024] MOCHIZUKI, Shinichi: *Report on the recent series of preprints by K. JOSHI*. March 2024. – URL [https://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~motizuki/Report%20on%20a%20certain%20series%20of%20preprints%20\(2024-03\).pdf](https://www.kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~motizuki/Report%20on%20a%20certain%20series%20of%20preprints%20(2024-03).pdf)
- [Scholze 2017] SCHOLZE, Peter: *Étale cohomology of Diamonds*. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07343>, 2017
- [Scholze 2021] SCHOLZE, Peter: Review of Mochizuki’s paper: Inter-Universal Teichmüller Theory. I,II,III,IV. In: *zbMath Open (formerly Zentralblatt Math)* (2021). – URL <https://zbmath.org/pdf/07317908.pdf>
- [Scholze und Stix 2018] SCHOLZE, Peter ; STIX, Jakob: *Why abc is still a conjecture*. 2018. – URL <https://www.math.uni-bonn.de/people/scholze/WhyABCisStillaConjecture.pdf>
- [Wakabayashi 2014] WAKABAYASHI, Yasuhiro: An explicit formula for the generic number of dormant indigenous bundles. In: *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* 50 (2014), Nr. 3, S. 383–409. – URL <https://doi.org/10.4171/PRIMS/138>
- [Wakabayashi 2022] WAKABAYASHI, Yasuhiro: A theory of dormant opers on pointed stable curves. In: *Astérisque* (2022), Nr. 432, S. ix+296. – URL <https://doi.org/10.24033/ast>
- [Wilkins Article Dated March 28, 2024] WILKINS, Alex: Mathematicians are bitterly divided over a controversial proof. In: *New Scientist* April 6 (Article Dated March 28, 2024), S. 11–11