

On Questions and Comments Concerning
Inter-universal Teichmüller Theory (IUT)

(1) First of all, it should be recalled that, as of December 2015, the various “preparatory papers” used in IUT have all been published in mathematical journals and, moreover, thoroughly studied and understood by quite a number of mathematicians (such as the speakers at the Oxford workshop in December 2015 and the RIMS workshop in July 2016).

(2) As of July 2016, a 45 page survey on IUT by S. Mochizuki, a 36 page survey on IUT by I. Fesenko, and a 21 page exposition by S. Mochizuki on IUT from the point of view of Bogomolov’s proof of the geometric version of the Szpiro Conjecture have been published in mathematical journals/conference proceedings. Moreover, Y. Hoshi has written two 80 to 90 page surveys on IUT in Japanese that are currently being refereed. Also, S. Mochizuki recently released a 115 page survey (in preprint form) on his web site.

(3) As of July 2016, the four papers on IUT have been thoroughly studied and verified in their entirety by at least four mathematicians (other than the author), and various substantial portions of these papers have been thoroughly studied by quite a number of mathematicians (such as the speakers at the Oxford workshop in December 2015 and the RIMS workshop in July 2016). These papers are currently being refereed, and, although they have not yet been officially accepted for publication, the refereeing process is proceeding in an orderly, constructive, and positive manner.

(4) In the years since the release of the four papers on IUT in August 2012, a number of individuals (not all of whom are professional mathematicians) have made vague, sweeping comments that lack any solid justification (e.g., based on substantive mathematical content), for instance, on the internet, concerning these papers.

Such vague, sweeping comments can never result in
true mathematical progress.

Meaningful progress in the field of mathematics can only be achieved by focusing on

specific, detailed, mathematically substantive content.

Moreover, focusing on such specific, detailed, mathematically substantive content, as a matter of standard practice, is ultimately in the best interests of all parties involved.

(5) One fundamental reason for emphasizing, as in (4), the importance of focusing on such specific, detailed, mathematically substantive content is that only by **recording such content explicitly**, for instance, in the form of an e-mail or short PDF file, can this content be

scrutinized in detail by other mathematicians.

Here, the phrase “other mathematicians” should be understood to include not only the author (in this case, S. Mochizuki) of the papers in question, but also other mathematicians currently involved in the various activities referred to in (1), (2), and (3), as well as mathematicians who may become involved in activities related to IUT at some future date, whether that future date arises in the next few months or several decades later, i.e., at a date when all of the mathematicians who are currently involved with IUT are deceased or no longer mathematically active.

(6) With regard to oral questions posed during the talks of the RIMS workshop in July 2016, in order to ensure that the **workshop functions** in an **orderly** and **productive** manner, the organizers of the workshop would like to request that, in addition to the points raised in (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) above, participants take the following points into account:

- (a) Questions should be posed in a polite and neutral way.
- (b) Questions (that concern content of a more serious nature than an obvious error or misprint) should not be posed in a rushed or irreverent manner, but only after due time and consideration have been given to their content.
- (c) Speakers should not be interrupted for substantial periods of time during the main portion of their talks (unless this is absolutely necessary).