MATHEMATICS & NATURE
Mathematics, Physics & Logical Sciences

Year 2026 Vol. **6**
MATHEMATICS

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19650970

Article ID: MN202603
https://mathnature.github.io

Argot Collection of Modular Forms to Fermat Equation

X. D. Dongfang◊东方学帝

Orient Research Base of Mathematics and Physics,
Wutong Mountain National Forest Park, Shenzhen, China

Modular elliptic curves and Fermat's Last Theorem claims to have provided a proof of Fermat's Last Theorem, but in reality, it has no genuine causal connection to the theorem. The entire text relies heavily on the mutual referencing of numerous arbitrarily coined terms; the seemingly abstract logic of this terminology-driven narrative lacks any concrete mathematical operability. Key terms such as the discriminant of curves actually seriously violate common mathematical sense. This article, using a tabular format, analyzes in detail the various logically unnecessary, sensationalist terms, abstract concepts, and connecting phrases in the lengthy narrative of modular elliptic curves, and points out that it always avoids necessary mathematical calculations and logical reasoning, and cannot be argued or verified using concrete mathematical expressions. The original text extensively uses existence assertions rather than mathematical proofs, including citations of viewpoints from other authors rather than logical reasoning, while skipping virtually all necessary and critical proof steps using phrases such as "it can be proved" and "it is well known". By promoting the modular form narrative, *Annals of Mathematics* is apparently motivated not by the pursuit of truth, but by the distribution of vested interests, and has actually led the academic community astray from the essence of mathematics. This is precisely the fundamental reason for the stagnation of modern mathematics and physics.

Keywords: Fermat's Last Theorem; modularity; elliptic curve; Frey curve; Wiles' narrative; jargon; pseudo-proof; Annals of Mathematics; proof by contradiction; logical fallacy; vacuous truth; mathematical methodology.

MSC2020: 00A30–Philosophy of mathematics; 01A60–History of mathematics in the 20th century; 01A61–History of mathematics in the 21st century; 03A05–Philosophical aspects of logic and foundations; 03F03–Proof theory, general; 11D41–Higher degree equations; Fermat's equation; 11F11–Modular forms of weight 2 and elliptic curves; 11G05–Elliptic curves over global fields.

1 Introduction

Recent research has yielded two findings: "The End of Euler Proof of Cubic Fermat Last Theorem" and "Logical Lies of Modularity Grafting on Fermat Equation". The former declares that even the case of exponent 3 in Fermat's Last Theorem has never been truly and rigorously proven. The latter refutes the claim that Fermat's Last Theorem was proven through the modularity of elliptic curves and exposes its lying nature. The inherent difficulty in proving Fermat's Last Theorem stems primarily from the poorly understood complexity of number structures, but the more critical reason lies in the mathematical community's persistent deviation from correct methodologies: misleading, suppressing, and slandering valid approaches, a behavior determined by human nature where honor and interests are paramount.

Leaving aside the meta-logical question of whether there is any necessary causal relationship between the modularity of the elliptic curve $y^2 = x(x-a^p)(x+b^p)$ and whether the Fermat equation $a^p + b^p = c^p$ holds in the rational number field, and focusing solely on the modularity of the elliptic curve $y^2 = x(x-a^p)(x+b^p)$, one finds that in the strange lengthy narrative published in 1995 by the *Annals of Mathematics*, concerning the so-called modularity proof of Fermat's Last Theorem, there is no real understanding of the non-existent class of number structures indicated by Fermat's Last Theorem. Instead, it is filled from beginning to end with jargon to the point that reading it, one cannot help but pound the table and curse. Although cursing is cathartic, it does not solve the problem. One solution is to work together to uncover the truth and let the answer emerge naturally.

The modularity of elliptic curves is a concept that has been packaged with jargon to appear profound. It is necessary to first explain the nature of modularity. Modularity, in a nutshell, is as follows: given an elliptic curve, define several mathematical characteristic quanti-

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3644-5170

ties from different perspectives, then define an equation among these characteristic quantities. If the equation holds, the curve is defined to be modular; if it does not hold, it is defined to be non-modular. Wiles would need only to compute a concrete example, such as the modularity of $y^2 = x(x-27)(x+64)$, and the whole world would know whether his logic is correct. This is precisely one of the consensuses that Wiles and Ribet should have reached within an hour. Yet the two authors with different views on the modularity of the same elliptic curve tacitly understood each other and remained silent. Strangely, they performed no concrete computation whatsoever from beginning to end, instead using mountains of jargon to circle around countless times, leading readers to believe that they actually knew how to compute. The final impression left on readers is that they never truly understood modularity computation. Is the mathematics community's fervent pursuit of awarding Wiles the title of "genius" somewhat hypocritical?

Wiles' bloated narrative hardly qualifies as a mathematical paper. The glossary below lists a multitude of terms that Wiles has compiled. Each entry is accompanied by a brief explanation, pointing out one by one how the jargon in this so-called paper evades the computations that must be performed but were not or could not be completed, making it impossible for readers to verify whether the logic is true. With this, everything becomes clear. Readers are invited to revise the explanations themselves, thereby gaining a more accurate understanding of the art of how a large number of terms－which are not actually theory－hijack Fermat's Last Theorem under the guise of modularity. That such a non-mathematically reasoned pseudo-paper has been hailed as a major breakthrough of the century inevitably raises the question of whether peer reviewers were bought with money to cast affirmative votes. Although this suspicion could be negated or affirmed if Wiles made public his relevant bank statements, this is clearly not the mathematical logic that readers truly care about.

2 List of Wiles' Stacking Terminology

This chapter lists the key terms used in Wiles' lengthy narrative in tabular form. Each entry includes a brief explanation, and by revisiting Wiles' original text, readers will clearly see how the technique of using terms to define other terms circumvents calculations and prevents readers from verifying their logical validity.

No.	**Term/Phrase**	**Section/Page**	**Why it avoids computation & verification**
1	Galois representations	Ch.1 (p.444)	Never writes down an explicit matrix; gives no concrete Galois element mapped to a specific matrix; the reader cannot verify any property.
2	p-division points	Ch.1 (p.444)	Mentioned only abstractly; no concrete coordinates or orders of torsion points are computed.
3	irreducible	Ch.1 (p.444)	An abstract property; never verified via characteristic polynomials or eigenspaces.
4	semistable	Ch.1 (p.444)	An abstract condition; never linked to a computable discriminant or prime factorization of a specific equation.
5	modular	Ch.1 (p.444)	The central empty concept: asserts "existence" of a modular form but never writes a single coefficient of its q-expansion.
6	lifting	Ch.1 (p.444)	Abstract operation; gives no explicit construction of a lift from a mod p representation to a p-adic one.
7	commutative algebra	Ch.1 (p.444)	A vague reference; gives no concrete ring, ideal, module, or their generators and relations.
8	class number problem	Ch.1 (p.444)	Mentioned but not solved; relies on other work; the logical connection to the current problem cannot be verified.

Continued on next page

No.	Term/Phrase	Section/Page	Why it avoids computation & verification
9	Galois cohomology	Ch.1 (p.444)	Abstract cohomology groups; no concrete cocycle representatives or orders are computed.
10	Poitou and Tate	Ch.1 (p.444)	Cites theorems without elaboration; the reader must consult external references and cannot verify applicability within the paper.
11	deformation theory	Ch.1 (p.455)	Core jargon (Mazur's framework); gives no concrete example of a deformation, only discusses "existence."
12	universal deformation ring	Ch.1 (p.457)	Abstract ring; gives no explicit generators, relations, or any computable structure.
13	Selmer deformations	Ch.1 (p.456)	Abstract condition; does not compute the order or any element of a Selmer group.
14	ordinary deformations	Ch.1 (p.457)	Same as above.
15	strict deformations	Ch.1 (p.457)	Same as above.
16	flat deformations	Ch.1 (p.457)	Same as above.
17	Gal(Q Σ /Q)	Ch.1 (p.455)	Abstract Galois group; does not specify any concrete prime or extension.
18	W(k)	Ch.1 (p.455)	Ring of Witt vectors; abstract object; gives no concrete elements or computations.
19	Noetherian local algebra	Ch.1 (p.455)	Abstract algebraic concept; gives no concrete instance.
20	trace, determinant	Ch.1 (p.445)	Used to define representations but never computes the numerical value of a trace or determinant for any specific element.
21	Frobenius	Ch.1 (p.445)	Abstract element; does not specify a concrete prime q or compute its characteristic polynomial in any representation.
22	characteristic p	Ch.1 (p.445)	Abstract.
23	Euler system	Ch.1 (p.452)	Mentioned but not constructed; later admitted to be flawed; the reader cannot know which parts are verifiable.
24	complete intersection	Ch.1 (p.450)	Abstract ring-theoretic property; does not verify it for any concrete ring.
25	Gorenstein	Ch.1 (p.451)	Same as above.
26	Hecke ring	Ch.2 (p.479)	Core jargon; does not give explicit generators; the reader cannot know how its elements act on concrete forms.
27	q-expansion principle	Ch.2 (p.479)	Mentioned but never used for a concrete computation; does not write the first few coefficients of any modular form's q-expansion.
28	eigenform	Ch.2 (p.445)	Abstract form; does not write any coefficient of its q-expansion.
29	newform	Ch.2 (p.480)	Same as above.

Continued on next page

No.	Term/Phrase	Section/Page	Why it avoids computation & verification
30	Γ 1(N)	Ch.2 (p.480)	Modular group; does not perform any concrete coset decomposition or action computation.
31	Jacobian J1(N)	Ch.2 (p.480)	Abstract algebraic variety; does not compute its dimension, Tate module, or any computable quantity.
32	Tate module	Ch.2 (p.482)	Abstract object; does not compute its rank as a Zp-module or the concrete Galois action.
33	Weil pairing	Ch.2 (p.481)	Mentioned but not used; does not compute any concrete value of the pairing.
34	multiplicity one	Ch.2 (p.483)	Abstract theorem; does not verify that its hypotheses are satisfied.
35	canonical model	Ch.2 (p.484)	Abstract geometric object; does not give a concrete equation.
36	Neron model	Ch.2 (p.484)	Same as above.
37	Frobenius endomorphism	Ch.2 (p.486)	Abstract.
38	L-function	Ch.2 (p.479)	Abstract function; does not compute its value at any specific point.
39	Eichler-Shimura relation	Ch.2 (p.483)	Cited; does not verify it for the Frey curve.
40	congruence subgroup	Ch.2 (p.445)	Abstract group.
41	Hecke operator Tn	Ch.2 (p.445)	Abstract operator; does not apply it to any concrete form to produce a concrete q-expansion.
42	character χ	Ch.2 (p.445)	Abstract.
43	cusp form	Ch.2 (p.480)	Abstract.
44	weight 2	Ch.2 (p.480)	Abstract.
45	level N	Ch.2 (p.480)	Abstract; does not specify the numerical value of N in relation to a solution of Fermat's equation.
46	modular curve X0(N)	Ch.2 (p.443)	Abstract curve.
47	Selmer group	Ch.3 (p.452)	Abstract group; does not compute its concrete order or elements.
48	minimal Hecke ring	Ch.3 (p.517)	Abstract.
49	complete intersection	Ch.3 (p.517)	Abstract.
50	Hilbert irreducibility theorem	Ch.3 (p.543)	Cited but not applied.
51	CM case	Ch.4 (p.526)	Complex multiplication; abstract.
52	grossencharacter	Ch.4 (p.529)	Abstract.
53	Lubin-Tate group	Ch.4 (p.529)	Abstract formal group.
54	Kolyvagin's method	Ch.4 (p.526)	Cited but not elaborated.
55	Langlands-Tunnell theorem	Ch.5 (p.541)	Cited but not explained.
56	solvable	Ch.5 (p.541)	Abstract group property.

Continued on next page

No.	Term/Phrase	Section/Page	Why it avoids computation & verification
57	weight one newform	Ch.5 (p.541)	Abstract.
58	Deligne-Serre lemma	Ch.5 (p.542)	Cited.
59	Gorenstein ring	Appendix (p.546)	Abstract ring-theoretic concept.
60	complete intersection	Appendix (p.546)	Same as above.
61	Fitting ideal	Appendix (p.546)	Same as above.
62	discrete valuation ring	Appendix (p.545)	Same as above.

3 List of Phrases of Wiles Escaping Reasoning

The following phrases, which run throughout Wiles' text, are not related to specific mathematical objects, but rather are narrative connecting devices used to skip actual steps of reasoning. They prevent the reader from deriving the logical chain of conclusions from the premises.

No.	Jargon Phrase	Why it avoids computation & verification
63	"It is easy to see that..."	Shifts the burden of verification to the reader; provides no derivation.
64	"One checks that..."	Same as above; does not explain how to "check."
65	"It follows that..."	Skips the intermediate deductive steps.
66	"By a theorem of..."	Relies on an external result without verifying that its hypotheses are satisfied in the current context.
67	"can be shown that"	Passive voice; does not specify who shows it or how.
68	"there exists"	Existence assertion; gives no construction or algorithm.
69	"we may assume"	Reduces the problem arbitrarily; does not prove that the reduction is without loss of generality.
70	"without loss of generality"	Same as above.
71	"the proof is similar"	Avoids repeating an argument; does not guarantee that "similarity" actually holds.
72	"we omit the details"	Skips crucial steps directly.
73	"as explained in..."	Defers reasoning to an external reference; the paper is not self-contained.
74	"the universal property"	Abstract category-theoretic evasion; gives no concrete construction.

4 The Essence of Verifying Mathematical Theories

Suppose a leading mathematics journal published a statement endorsed by numerous celebrities: There is a good dog in heaven, and God bless you every day. Would the mathematical community be obliged to believe it simply because it appeared in that journal? Of course not. Yet the same community expects the world to accept Wiles' narrative as true, not because it contains verifiable mathematics, but because six experts approved its publication and thirty years have passed without refutation. This is not mathematics. Mathematics is a subject of extensive verification through sustainable reasoning.

In the case of Wiles' narrative, the claim is not about a good dog in heaven, but about six top experts who allegedly verified it. The mainstream consensus is that abstraction is not error, that replacing computation with terminology is legitimate theory, that complex terminology and obscure descriptions are precisely symbols of profound logic and extensive knowledge, and that for over thirty years no one has been able to refute it. These claims serve a common function: to shut down further questioning. Once the narrative of six experts and three decades of silence is in place, the other is expected to stop asking for concrete verification and simply accept the narrative as settled.

But the absence of refutation over thirty years is not evidence of the strength of Wiles' narrative. It is evidence that very few mathematicians have actually read Wiles' narrative from beginning to end. Wiles' narrative contains no mathematical reasoning, only preaching, so filled with jargon, and so lacking in concrete computation that most have relied on secondary accounts, on the testimony of some so-called experts, or on the simple fact that it was published in the *Annals of Mathematics.* A text that is not read cannot be refuted. A text that is not understood cannot be refuted. A text that is treated as sacred cannot be refuted. Thirty years of silence is not a badge of honor; it is a depiction of avoidance.

The essence of mathematical verification is not that a few appointed experts have pronounced a proof correct. Verification means that the logical chain can be repeatedly examined and reconstructed by anyone who takes the time to understand it. The Pythagorean theorem is not considered true because Pythagoras himself proved it; it is considered true because generations of mathematicians have been able to prove it from different angles, using different methods, and have always arrived at the same conclusion. No single authority, no matter how eminent, can substitute for this collective, open, and ongoing process of verification.

If the verification of Wiles' narrative truly rested on the judgment of six individuals, then what happens after those six individuals are gone? Does the narrative die with them? This is not mathematics; it is an appeal to authority, a reliance on a closed circle of narrative whose own reasoning is not made fully public and replicable. Whether it existed or not cannot be confirmed. Mathematics does not advance by acclamation. It advances by demonstration.

The claim that the Frey curve is both modular (by Wiles) and non-modular (by Ribet, assuming a solution to Fermat's equation) must be verifiable from the same starting assumptions by any competent mathematician, not merely accepted on the testimony of a handful of experts. Until such verification is possible, the so-called proof remains a matter of faith, not mathematics.

Therefore, the question the mathematical community must face is not whether Wiles' narrative is beautiful or deep, but whether it can be verified in the only way that mathematics recognizes: through open, repeatable, and concrete logical steps that any trained mathematician can follow. The six experts will not be available forever. The thirty years of silence is not a substitute for verification. If the narrative cannot stand on its own without the authority of its certifiers and without the willingness of the community to read it, then it does not stand at all.

5 Conclusions and Comments

This glossary contains a total of 74 items of jargon from Wiles' strange lengthy article on the modularity of elliptic curves and Fermat's Last Theorem. The common characteristics of this jargon are:

(a) **No concrete numerical values**: The entire paper provides no concrete a, b, c nor any computational result obtained by substituting coefficients into the Frey curve.

(b) **No verifiable constructions**: Galois representations, modular forms, Hecke rings, deformation rings all appear only as existing objects, never written out in concrete form.

(c) **Reliance on external authority**: Extensive citations of others' theorems (Langlands, Tunnell, Ribet, Mazur, Hida, etc.) serve as a "crutch" for the argument, rather than self-verification.

(d) **Narrative in place of reasoning**: Phrases such as "it can be proved that", "it is easy to see that", "as is well known" are used to skip crucial steps, making it impossible for the reader to trace the logical chain.

From this, it can be seen that the so-called modularity theory of Fermat's equation is not a proof but a "dictionary of terminology + citation index + narrative prose". Any attempt to find genuine mathematical reasoning within it will ultimately face nothing but a maze of these 74 items of jargon.

Although having discovered numerous mathematical theorems, as a professional worker in the field of physics, the author did not know Wiles personally. However, from exchanges twenty years ago with so-called top experts in Chinese mathematics and theoretical physics, the author discovered that the phenomenon of using jargon and narrative to conceal ignorance is very natural and widespread in academia. Based on the fact that for over thirty years no one has been able to clearly explain Wiles' so-called theory, and instead they merely declare themselves to understand the theory of a genius, the author infers that Wiles' article exhibits the same style. After reading, the author realized that Wiles' article is not a mathematics paper at all; there are many things of which he remembers only the concept but does not understand. For example, for a higher-order equation, it might be speculated that Wiles would be completely unable to list all the conditions for the equation to have a solution, while the author would be able to do so. This is a significant difference between an ordinary author and the genius Wiles. In fact, from Frey to Ribet to Wiles to the *Annals of Mathematics*, their performance shows that they never truly understood what Fermat's Last Theorem was trying to prove. The *Annals of Mathematics*'s glorification of a jargon-piling superman as a century's genius is an act of extreme ignorance, immorality, and inhumanity. To those who claim to have verified Wiles' so-called proof: where is your verification process, your conscience, your knowledge, your moral integrity? How can so much jargon possibly pass your verification?

In the so-called mainstream theoretical circles, there are very few people who engage in logical reasoning, but quite a few who engage in sophistry. Various sophistries exist:

> **Wiles**' work is essentially abstract existence argumentation, not computational verification. The structuralist methods of modern number theory he uses are themselves legitimate mathematics. Computational verification is 19th-century mathematics; the mathematics of the late 20th century has ascended to a higher level of abstraction.
>
> **Galois** representations are functorial. One does not need to write out the matrix for each element, but one only needs to know their characteristic polynomials (given by Hecke operators) and local properties (controlled by deformation conditions). This is sufficient for rigorous reasoning.
>
> **This** is precisely the essence of proof by contradiction. One assumes a solution to Fermat's equation exists, then under a unified hypothesis (the existence of the Frey curve), one derives two contradictory conclusions. This fully conforms to logic. There is no illegitimate distinction between external and internal.
>
> **Every** term (modular form, Galois representation, Hecke algebra) has a precise definition. They are highly complex but completely legitimate mathematical objects. To consider them jargon is merely due to a lack of twenty years of professional training. This does not constitute a mathematical refutation of the proof.

If these sophistries hold, then, to put it bluntly, mathematical abstraction would suffice with a single sentence: All conclusions are obviously true.

Can the so-called modularity theory be abstracted further? Absolutely. To make the carnival of the mathematical community more complete and to ensure that Wiles' modularity hijacking requires no further interpretation, here is an even more abstract translation: If Fermat's equation has a solution, then one can forcibly construct that Frey's mother would give birth to an elephant with a golden head; however, there is no elephant with a golden head in the world; therefore, Frey's mother cannot give birth to an elephant, Fermat's equation has no solution in the rational number field, and Fermat's Last Theorem holds. This is the most abstract template of Wiles' logic. Replace the phrase elephant with a golden head with modular curve, replace does not exist with the contradiction between non-modular and modular, and then it is exactly the same. Must the mathematical community continue to sophistically debate constructivity and abstraction?

The author cannot regard what Wiles published in the *Annals of Mathematics* as a paper. Because the essence of a paper lies in its argumentation, whereas Wiles' text has only narration, no argumentation. He says there are Galois representations, but does not specify their concrete form; he says there are modular forms, but does not provide their computational method; he says this proves Fermat's Last Theorem, but does not argue the core causal relationship. His article is nothing but a dictionary of terminology plus citation index plus narrative prose, everything except a paper. To call it a so-called paper is already an overestimation.

6 Postscript

A crucial and essential statement in the abstract is that key terms such as the discriminant of the curve actually seriously violate common mathematical sense; this is a typical example of the macroscopic narrative characteristics of modular elliptic curves, and will be discussed separately.

7 Citation and Writing Statement

Unlike the traditional motivation of cross-referencing literature to boost impact factors, this author only cites relevant literature as well as the sections that have been coveted but suppressed and slandered by the domestic and international mathematics and theoretical physics communities for over forty years. The former guides readers to conduct further reading, while the latter serves as a declaration of the author's expertise. This kind of literature citation mechanism should become the trend.

The glossary of jargon presented in this paper was compiled by the author submitting the lengthy jargon-filled article published in 1995 by the *Annals of Mathematics* to an artificial intelligence (DeepSeek AI), with the instruction to "collect all the packaging terminology in the article that evades logical reasoning", and was then completed with the assistance of the AI. The independent linguistic style of the paper was verified by consulting DeepSeek AI to ensure it would not be misread. The translation process of the article used the highly efficient DeepSeek AI and Google Translate tools.

[1] Fermat, P. Diophantus' Arithmetica. Toulouse (1670).
[2] Lakatos, I. Proofs and Refutations Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, England(1977).
[3] Frey, G. Links between stable elliptic curves and certain Diophantine equations. *Annales Universitatis Saraviensis Mathematicae*, 1, 1–40(1986).
[4] Ribet, K. On modular representations of Gal($\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}$) arising from modular forms. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 100, 431–476(1990).
[5] Wiles, A. Modular elliptic curves and Fermat's Last Theorem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 141(3), 443–551(1995).
[6] Taylor, R., & Wiles, A. Ring-theoretic properties of certain Hecke algebras. *Annals of Mathematics*, 141(3), 553–572(1995).
[7] Diamond F, Shurman J M. A first course in modular forms[M]. New York: Springer, 2005.
[8] Davis, P. J., Hersh, R., & Marchisotto, E. A. The mathematical experience, study edition. Birkhäuser Boston (2012).
[9] Silverman J H. The arithmetic of elliptic curves[M]. New York: Springer, 2009.
[10] Silverman J H. Advanced topics in the arithmetic of elliptic curves[M]. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
[11] Dongfang, X. D. Manifesto of Com Quantum Theory. *Science Window*, 1, 202101 (2021).
[12] Dongfang, X. D. On the Relativity of the Speed of Light. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202102 (2021).
[13] Dongfang, X. D. The Morbid Equation of Quantum Numbers. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202102 (2021).
[14] Dongfang, X. D. Relativistic Equation Failure for LIGO Signals. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202103 (2021).
[15] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Modified Equations of Molecular Dynamics. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202104 (2021).
[16] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Angular Motion Law and Operator Equations. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202105 (2021).
[17] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Com Quantum Equations of LIGO Signal. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202106 (2021).
[18] Dongfang, X. D. Com Quantum Proof of LIGO Binary Mergers Failure. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202107 (2021).
[19] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Modified Equations of Electromagnetic Wave. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202108 (2021).
[20] Dongfang, X. D. Nuclear Force Constants Mapped by Yukawa Potential. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202109 (2021).
[21] Dongfang, X. D. The End of Yukawa Meson Theory of Nuclear Forces. *Mathematics & Nature*, 1, 202110 (2021).
[22] Dongfang, X. D. The End of Klein-Gordon Equation for Coulomb Field. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202201 (2022).
[23] Dongfang, X. D. The End of Teratogenic Simplified Dirac Hydrogen Equations. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202202 (2022).
[24] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Solution of Induced Second Order Dirac Equations. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202203 (2022).
[25] Dongfang, X. D. The End of Isomeric Second Order Dirac Hydrogen Equations. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202204 (2022).
[26] Dongfang, X. D. The End of True Second Order Dirac Hydrogen Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202205 (2022).
[27] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Challenge Solution of Dirac Hydrogen Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202206 (2022).
[28] Dongfang, X. D. Neutron State Solution of Dongfang Modified Dirac Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202207 (2022).
[29] Dongfang, X. D. Ground State Solution of Dongfang Modified Dirac Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202208 (2022).
[30] Dongfang, X. D. The End of Dirac Hydrogen Equation in One Dimension. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202209 (2022).
[31] Dongfang, X. D. Multiple Morbid Mathematics of Dirac Electron Theory. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202210 (2022).
[32] Dongfang, X. D. Broad Spectrum Solutions of Associated Legendre Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 2, 202210 (2022).
[33] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Special Entangled Spherical Harmonic Functions. *Mathematics & Nature*, 3, 202302 (2023).
[34] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Special Entangled Solution of Schrödinger Hydrogen Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 3, 202303 (2023).
[35] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Special Entangled Schrödinger Wave Function of Hydrogen. *Mathematics & Nature*, 3, 202304 (2023).
[36] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Special Entangled Spherical Solution of Laplace Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 3, 202305 (2023).
[37] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang General Entangled Spherical Harmonic Functions. *Mathematics & Nature*, 4, 202401 (2024).
[38] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang General Entangled Solution of Schrödinger Hydrogen Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 4, 202402 (2024).
[39] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang General Entangled Schrödinger Wave Function of Hydrogen. *Mathematics & Nature*, 4, 202403 (2024).
[40] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang General Entangled Spherical Solution of Laplace Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 4, 202404 (2024).
[41] Dongfang, X. D. The Steady-State Entangled Solution of Dongfang Real Wave Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 4, 202405 (2024).
[42] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Brief General Solutions to Congruence Equations. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202501 (2025).
[43] Dongfang, X. D. The Logical Entropy Change of Euler Infinite Descent. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202502 (2025).
[44] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Special Hetero-Euler Comfactor Triple of Fermat Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202503 (2025).
[45] Dongfang, X. D. Redundancy of Ideal Theory and Universality of Meta-Factorization. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202504 (2025).
[46] Dongfang, X. D. On the Hippasus Representation of Integers. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202505 (2025).
[47] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Special Hetero-Euler Coprime Triple of Fermat Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202506 (2025).
[48] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang General Hetero-Euler Coprime Triple of Fermat Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202507 (2025).
[49] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang General Hetero-Euler Comfactor Triple of Fermat Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202508 (2025).
[50] Dongfang, X. D. Dongfang Rational Triple for Euler Diophantine Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202509 (2025).
[51] Dongfang, X. D. The End of Euler Proof of Cubic Fermat Last Theorem. *Mathematics & Nature*, 5, 202510 (2025).
[52] Dongfang, X. D. Logic Mapping of Modular Forms to Fermat Equation. *Mathematics & Nature*, 6, 202601 (2026).
[53] Dongfang, X. D. Logical Lies of Modularity Grafting on Fermat Equationn. *Mathematics & Nature*, 6, 202602 (2026).