

## Physics and Peer-Review

*J Aetherom Res* 4, 11: 1-40 (2026)

### Can Science be Trusted? A Test of Peer-Review in Physics Journals

Paulo N. Correa

*Aurora Biophysics Research Institute, Concord, Ontario, Canada*

#### Abstract

Together with a co-author, I submitted to five different "prestigious" physics journals a communication regarding a critically novel understanding of the mass-energy of the electron and its nonrelativistic coupling to kinetic energy, along with a different model of its cosmological creation that connects the production of the cosmic heat bath to the emission of ultra-high energy (UHE) cosmic ray primaries. Not a single submittal received a peer-review, the communication being dismissed offhand with no legitimate explanations. The result conforms to the notion that at present only reports which appear to extend or rehabilitate existing physics models (like the Standard Model) are considered to be deserving of institutional publication, excluding thereby any reports that question those models or worse, that propose a new and possibly better one. Peer-review is a failed social experiment. It should no longer be trusted as a screening of what is, or is not, science.

## Introduction

Though we are not fools for punishment, we had to test whether our epoch had, in nearly 2 decades since our last test of peer-review physics journals [1-2], undergone some miraculous opening of its scientific intelligence to basic - very, very basic - physics, in fact, foundational physics.

It is not true that a scientific revolution requires - or should require - conservation of most paradigms of the theory it overthrows: a simple example is the Copernican revolution. A revolutionary new understanding of what the electron is and how it variously moves in different physical processes (e.g. conduction current, phase states, plasma discharges, etc) would fundamentally alter many scientific endeavours, in particular those in the fields of electrodynamics and thermodynamics, not to mention energy conversion technology. Given the extreme importance of understanding whether the rest mass of the electron is, or is not, indicative of a mass-energy that possesses a fine-structure and a dynamic topogeometry, we decided to condense and systematize in a single paper our aetherometric demonstration [3-6], that, indeed, *based on the most stringent available experimental values of electron parameters* (rest mass, charge, voltage, rest "electronvoltage", "mass-annihilation" energy, Compton frequency and wavelength(s), Bohr radius, etc, etc) the electron mass-energy constitutes a discrete energy singularity with structure both at the Bohr and Compton scales.

Accordingly, we composed a communication that integrated in detail the substance of our aetherometric discoveries regarding the electron. It was ultimately intended as the third chapter of our volume IV of AToS, but before publication, we wanted to see if we could obtain from the much-vaunted "Open Societies" of physicists one single serious review of it, even if it be a detailed criticism that pointed out our errors - in calculation or in understanding.

When it comes to the electron, the "Physics of the Center" has laid its dogma in the Standard Model: the electron is just a point-mass devoid of structure which when it envelops a nucleon with its "imagined motion", forms a cloud of probability waves that surround the nucleon like a diffuse ring. Conversely, the "Physics of the Margin(s)" - that still holds to semi-classical models - holds that the electron has structure but only at some Fermi scale. The two paradigms limit in fundamental ways the domains of

electrodynamics and particle physics. Our communication, as the reader can ascertain by reading it in reference [7], demonstrated how the ordinary (non-intranuclear) electron is an elastic torus that spans two distinct conformations; and how its properties account for all the known pertinent data, whether referred to rest or motional states.

The second part of the paper addressed the aetherometric model of cosmological leptogenesis. It was necessarily more speculative, but it introduced a novel physico-mathematical method to "think" energy, in particular massfree energy, whether on its own or in its relation to mass-energy. Massfree energy and power multiplicities were treated as capable of complex superimposition in phase-aligned and commensurate Space- and Time-manifolds. This property was shown to be a fundamental attribute of a cosmic lattice composed of continually flowing massfree ambipolar energy (radiation) in different states of superimposition. Along with foundational determinations of the characteristics of the undisturbed cosmic lattice, its gyrogravitic moment was identified and shown to be the proximal driver of the magnetic-field wavespeed characteristic of all leptons. Then, the paper went on to demonstrate how the lattice is disturbed both by the creation of leptons (marked by the cosmic microwave background radiation) and the conservation of their mass-energy, tying the former to lattice folding processes that necessarily result in Ultra-High-Energy (UHE) cosmic radiation primaries. Finally, in the three appendices to the paper, aetherometric computations were made easy to any reader or reviewer, along with the demonstration of the analytical and physical differences between massfree particles, such as an ambipolon or a photon, and massbound particles, such as the electron.

The submittal was - and is! - a far-reaching communication that explained all the known anomalies by a consistent analysis and theory, and cast a systematic new light on the interpretation of existing experimental data. Some physicist had to read it, check the computations for errors and accuracy, understand what was being said and how, realize the implications of the new concepts and functions, and then provide an expert opinion. But not an opinion on whether the text fits in with the current consensus, which it obviously does not and never purported to do! Rather, an opinion on whether the paper communicates a plausible and falsifiable theory compatible with the known facts and, though fundamentally different from the ongoing consensus, deserves or not, on its own merits, to be published. That should have been the sound scientific basis for a reviewer's opinion. It should also have been the ethical duty of the editors of all five physics journals

that we applied to - which amounts to sending it for review - even if as a result it would be shot down with a few paragraphs that, somehow critically, demolished our arguments.

But no, no such review, let alone open discussion of our findings was to be. We found an intransigent and indifferent castle wall. This prompted the present author to write this disquisition on the present state of degradation of science, and physics in particular, one that succinctly exposed the record of our submittal in the present-day context of what has happened to physics and science under the publication tyranny of a hoaxed peer-review.

### Tests of peer-review physics journals

#### 1. Submittal to the Oxford Progress in Theoretical and Experimental Physics Journal (PTEP)

The PTEP Journal is run, reportedly, by the Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, as claimed by both its website and the submittal receipt on p. 6 below. In selecting it, we had hoped for a somewhat open-minded attitude by Japanese physicists. But 3 days after submittal we got a rejection anonymously signed by the "PTEP Editorial Board": "cannot be accepted", as shown on p. 7. With it came an explanation (Rejection Report, p. 8), also anonymous, that showed all the signs of being an AI concoction. It claimed that our paper had 33% of copies and pastes from previous papers, whereas the limit was 31%. We responded on the same day (p. 9), asking for some guidance on which passages of the paper were flagged to produce such a percentage diagnostic. Having obtained no response, four days later we wrote an Appeal to the Editorial Board (see pp. 10-11). With no answer forthcoming to either our guidance-seeking email or to our Appeal, we began to suspect that the contact address provided on the PTEP website was non-operational. After nine days, we decided to exploit the fact that PTEP *is not really a Japanese Journal of anything*, but rather belongs to a large British publishing cartel, Oxford University Press (OUP). We contacted OUP and obtained, in response, a different email address for PTEP, ptephy.oup@aptaracorp.com, as shown in p. 12. This time we got the Editor-in-Chief, one C.S. Lim, to respond and he cursorily dispatched us (p.13). It struck us as amusing that Lim is not a Japanese name, but likely Chinese. A Japanese Journal operated out of England with what sounds like a Chinese editor. Truly diverse. Maybe it did not have a single Japanese reviewer? Over the next 12 days, we reworked the paper, removing some

parts that could be found on other papers of ours and adding entirely new material. By our calculations we had reduced the offending passages to 30%. So we made a new submittal (p. 14). The text of this, the final submittal to this journal and the others below, can now be found at no charge at [aetherometry.com](http://aetherometry.com) [7], referenced by

**Correa PN & Correa AN (2026) "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of the electron mass-energy", Volume IV of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-IV.3.**

The new rejection (p. 15) was accompanied by an unsigned stock "Editor's comments" (p. 16), no longer invoking percentages of any sort as a reason, but solely denying out of the blue that our "results contribute to the current advancement of theoretical or experimental physics". Where is the proof for such a ridiculous statement? If the submittal proved that the current understanding of electron physics was in error, would that not be an advancement?? Yes, it does not contribute to the current advancement of the Standard Model, but it might contribute indeed to the advancement of physics out of its current quagmire! We wondered whether this "C.S. Lim" was even a human. The whole process appeared AI-curated at best, if not entirely AI-hallucinated at worst... We were stonewalled, shot down by anonymous actors (the Board, right) and gratuitously insulted.

**Subject:** PTEP Online Submission System [Receipt] [No:2505-027]

**From:** ptep@jps.or.jp

**Date:** 2025-05-27, 19:40

**To:** drpcorreia@abrisci.com

Dear Dr. Paulo N Correa,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to PTEP. Your manuscript (Tentative No: T05428) has been formally received by the PTEP Editorial Office. The following information (Paper Number and Received Date) will be referred for subsequent communications.

Paper No: 2505-027

Received: 2025/05/26

You will be informed of the decision of the PTEP Editorial Board after the review process has been completed.

-----  
[For your coauthor(s)]

Any coauthor(s) can access the manuscript's history and the referees' comments at the following URL using the paper number and password.

<https://publication.jps.jp/cgi-bin/ptep/submission/confirm.cgi>

Paper No: 2505-027

Password: wQ1SePato7  
-----

Please note that you (the corresponding author) should use your own account to track the history, read the referee comments, respond to the referee(s), and submit the revised version of the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,  
PTEP Editorial Office  
-----

PTEP Editorial Office  
The Physical Society of Japan  
2-31-22-5F, Tokyo 113-0034, JAPAN  
E-mail: [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp)

**Subject:** PTEP Online Review System [No:2505-027]  
**From:** ptep@jps.or.jp  
**Date:** 2025-05-30, 07:08  
**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com

Dear Dr. Paulo N Correa,

Paper No: 2505-027

We are sorry to inform you that your manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics.

Please refer to the final review report from the Editorial Board at the following URL:

<https://publication.jps.jp/cgi-bin/ptep/submission/submission.cgi>

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity of consideration for your manuscript.

Sincerely yours,  
PTEP Editorial Office

-----  
  
PTEP Editorial Office  
The Physical Society of Japan  
2-31-22-5F, Yushima, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0034, JAPAN  
E-mail: [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp)

# Paper No: 2505-027

---

## Manuscript Information

**Paper No:** 2505-027

**Title:** Electron fine structure and flux topogeometry: Aetherometric vs. Zitter models

**Author(s):** Paulo N. Correa, Alexandra N. Correa

## Editor's Comments

Dear authors,

Your paper contains too many copies and pastes. As much as 33% in total (maximum 31%) of your entire paper are copies and this is simply unacceptable for an original research paper intended for publication.

[Back](#)

**Subject:** Re: PTEP Online Review System [No:2505-027]  
**From:** "Dr. Paulo Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>  
**Date:** 2025-05-30, 20:37  
**To:** ptep@jps.or.jp

Dear PTEP Editors,

Could you kindly make available to us a report on the specific instances of copy-and-paste that were flagged in our paper? We might be able to reduce those instances by removing parts of the paper, even though we fear that this would make it less understandable to its readers. The research presented in the paper can be understood only in the context of the novel theoretical framework that we have developed, and presented in earlier papers published on our own website. Thus, paradoxically, the need to summarize this framework - and thereby repeat what has already been presented in our earlier work - stems from the very originality of the ideas that the paper discusses. However, if we knew the specific parts of the text that are responsible for the 33% copy-and-paste figure, we could try to reduce it below your 31% limit.

Sincerely,

Dr. Paulo N. Correa  
Alexandra N. Correa

On 2025-05-30 07:08, [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp) wrote:

Dear Dr. Paulo N Correa,

Paper No: 2505-027

We are sorry to inform you that your manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics.

Please refer to the final review report from the Editorial Board at the following URL:

<https://publication.jps.jp/cgi-bin/ptep/submission/submission.cgi>

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity of consideration for your manuscript.

Sincerely yours,  
PTEP Editorial Office

**Subject:** Resending: Appeal in the case of submission [No:2505-027]

**From:** "Dr. Paulo Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>

**Date:** 2025-06-12, 13:59

**To:** ptephy.oup@aptaracorp.com

Dear PTEP Editors,

We have recently sent two emails (one of them being an Appeal) to the address you provide on your website - [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp). Since we have not received any reply - even an automatic acknowledgement - to either of them, we suspect you have not received them. We are hereby re-submitting - to a different email address, provided to us by Oxford University Press - the Appeal we sent on June 3, and would ask that you kindly acknowledge the receipt of the present email.

Yours,

Dr. Paulo Correa  
Alexandra Correa

**Subject:**Appeal in the case of submission [No:2505-027]

**Date:**Tue, 3 Jun 2025 18:23:12 -0400

**From:**Dr. Paulo Correa <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>

**To:**[ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp)

To: The PTEP Editorial Board

Since we have not received any reply to our email of May 30 (quoted below), we would like to formally appeal the seemingly auto-generated "final review report" for our submission [No:2505-027]:

"Your paper contains too many copies and pastes. As much as 33% in total (maximum 31%) of your entire paper are copies and this is simply unacceptable for an original research paper intended for publication."

Here are the reasons for our appeal.

1. In spite of your non-reply to our email of May 30 requesting further details, we are certain that most of the "copies" referred to in the report pertain to a paper of ours, on a different topic, published on our own website and written in the same time period as the paper we submitted to PTEP. Since both papers, in order to be reasonably self-contained, required an extensive summary of the novel theoretical framework that we have developed, these summary sections wound up being near-copies of each other. If the 2% difference between our 33% copy-and-paste and your 31% limit makes our paper "simply unacceptable", we could undoubtedly reduce or modify the summary section in the PTEP submission, provided you would share with us which portions of the text were flagged as copies.

2. On the topic of "original research", the PTEP guidelines state:

"Work submitted for publication must be original, previously unpublished, and not under consideration for publication elsewhere."

However, as far as we know, there is no generally accepted meaning of "previously unpublished". PTEP itself accepts papers whose preprints were published in arXiv. Should the coincidence of 33% of the text of a submitted paper with the authors' own work, published on their own website, be considered a death-blow to the submission's "originality"? In fact, the COPE website - which PTEP quotes in its own guidelines - discusses, at

<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/case/possible-self-plagiarism-andor-prior-publication>

a much more egregious case of a submitted paper being a 100% copy of a paper previously published on the author's own website. COPE members were divided in their opinion on whether releasing a paper on the author's own website constituted "prior publication" - and their final advice was, in brief:

"It is crucial that every journal discusses this at the editorial level and decide what they consider to be prior publication and then puts this information on their website and on the online submission system. There is no general guidance on what is considered prior publication; it has to be an individual journal decision."

As far as we know, the PTEP website does not provide clarification as to what the journal does, or does not, consider to constitute "prior publication". But we want to point out that even in this COPE case of an identical copy, the end of the story was that

"The editorial decision was to reject the manuscript in its current form, but offering the author the option of resubmitting the article following a substantial and complete reworking of the manuscript to include all of the feedback from the reviewers."

Should then we, with our mere 2% excess over the permitted 31% copy-limit, not be given the courtesy of a similar option?

3. Finally, we would like to point out that in our opinion, this paper is paradigm-changing for electron physics - and deserves to be read by qualified human reviewers, rather than dismissed by an AI bot.

Yours,

Dr. Paulo N. Correa  
Alexandra N. Correa

**Subject:** Resending: Appeal in the case of submission [No:2505-027]

**From:** "Dr. Paulo Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>

**Date:** 2025-06-12, 13:59

**To:** ptephy.oup@aptaracorp.com

Dear PTEP Editors,

We have recently sent two emails (one of them being an Appeal) to the address you provide on your website - [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp). Since we have not received any reply - even an automatic acknowledgement - to either of them, we suspect you have not received them. We are hereby re-submitting - to a different email address, provided to us by Oxford University Press - the Appeal we sent on June 3, and would ask that you kindly acknowledge the receipt of the present email.

Yours,

Dr. Paulo Correa  
Alexandra Correa

**Subject:** Re: Resending: Appeal in the case of submission [No:2505-027]  
**From:** PTEP Office <ptep@jps.or.jp>  
**Date:** 2025-06-13, 03:41  
**To:** "Dr. Paulo Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>

Dear Dr. Correa,

It is our general rule that papers will not be reconsidered once they were given a rejection decision.  
We have reexamined the peer review process for your case. However, our judgement is that there is no reason to treat your case as an exception to our general rule.  
Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely yours,  
C.S. Lim  
Editor-in-chief  
Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics  
\*\*\*\*\*

--  
PTEP Editorial Office  
The Physical Society of Japan, 2-31-22-5F, Yushima, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0034, Japan  
Tel: +81-3-3816-6206  
<https://academic.oup.com/ptep>

**Subject:** PTEP Online Submission System [Receipt] [No:2507-033]

**From:** ptep@jps.or.jp

**Date:** 2025-07-24, 20:44

**To:** drpcorreia@abrisci.com

Dear Dr. Paulo N Correa,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to PTEP. Your manuscript (Tentative No: T05526) has been formally received by the PTEP Editorial Office. The following information (Paper Number and Received Date) will be referred for subsequent communications.

Paper No: 2507-033

Received: 2025/07/22

You will be informed of the decision of the PTEP Editorial Board after the review process has been completed.

-----  
[For your coauthor(s)]

Any coauthor(s) can access the manuscript's history and the referees' comments at the following URL using the paper number and password.

<https://publication.jps.jp/cgi-bin/ptep/submission/confirm.cgi>

Paper No: 2507-033

Password: FDVZUEwSOB  
-----

Please note that you (the corresponding author) should use your own account to track the history, read the referee comments, respond to the referee(s), and submit the revised version of the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,  
PTEP Editorial Office  
-----

PTEP Editorial Office  
The Physical Society of Japan  
2-31-22-5F, Tokyo 113-0034, JAPAN  
E-mail: [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp)

**Subject:** PTEP Online Review System [No:2507-033]  
**From:** ptep@jps.or.jp  
**Date:** 2025-07-28, 00:51  
**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com

Dear Dr. Paulo N Correa,

Paper No: 2507-033

We are sorry to inform you that your manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics.

Please refer to the final review report from the Editorial Board at the following URL:

<https://publication.jps.jp/cgi-bin/ptep/submission/submission.cgi>

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity of consideration for your manuscript.

Sincerely yours,  
PTEP Editorial Office

-----  
  
PTEP Editorial Office  
The Physical Society of Japan  
2-31-22-5F, Yushima, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0034, JAPAN  
E-mail: [ptep@jps.or.jp](mailto:ptep@jps.or.jp)

# Paper No: 2507-033

---

## Manuscript Information

**Paper No:** 2507-033

**Title:** Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy

**Author(s):** Paulo N. Correa, Alexandra N. Correa

## Editor's Comments

Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting your paper to PTEP. However, we cannot consider your article for publication in PTEP. As stated in our editorial policy, we require our articles to contain results that contribute to the current advancement of theoretical or experimental physics. Unfortunately, in view of the scope, we judge that your article is not suitable for the publication as a PTEP article. We would like to ask for your understanding.

[Back](#)

## 2. Submittal to Physical Review D Journal

This one is owned by the American Physics Society, the supreme guardian of all that is quintessential standard physics. We sent them (p. 18) the second version we submitted to PTEP. We were willing to pay their ultra-high extortion fees for vanity publishing, as long as we got a peer-review. Finding a peer, however, had a low probability indeed. Seven days later they also issued a stock response (p. 19), but penned by a human - Joshua Sayre, Assistant Editor, who uses the royal "we". He/they "understood" the context and the "degree of importance" of the paper, plus our "motivation" (!) and "the level of argumentation", and concluded to a rejection without peer-review. It left one to infer that our submittal featured some egregious motivation and a "poor" degree of both importance and argumentation. We could not help but try to teach some peer- and reviewer-manners to the upstart (pp. 20-21), and demand some explanations for his canned dismissal. We got no response. What was new here reduced to the human "face" and the inevitable attempt at psychologizing the authors of the submission into some mental defeat.

**Subject:** Editorial Acknowledgment DH13645 Correa  
**From:** prd@aps.org  
**Date:** 2025-08-12, 19:23  
**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com

Re: DH13645

Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy  
by Paulo N. Correa and Alexandra N. Correa

Dear Dr. Correa,

The editors acknowledge receipt of this manuscript on 07 August 2025 and are considering it as a Regular Article in Physical Review D.

It has been indicated at submission that you be designated as the corresponding author for this manuscript.

If you already have an APS journal account, you will be able to access this submission by visiting <https://authors.aps.org/Submissions> and logging in with your journal account credentials. Alternatively, you can create one at <https://journals.aps.org/signup> if you do not have an account yet.

When sending correspondence regarding this manuscript please refer to the code number DH13645. This code number may also be used to obtain current information regarding the status of your manuscript from our automated Author Status Inquiry System (ASIS) at <https://authors.aps.org/Submissions/status/>.

Physical Review requires corresponding authors to provide their ORCID identifier - a persistent unique identifier produced and curated by an independent third-party organization. Use of your ORCID identifier by publishers supports automated linkages between you and your professional activities and distinguishes you from every other researcher, ensuring that you are correctly recognized for your work. We strongly encourage all authors to provide their ORCID identifier.

By providing your identifier, you are permitting us to publish it with your work and deposit it into Crossref, a third-party repository for publications. Please provide your ORCID identifier by visiting:

<https://authors.aps.org/Profile/>

**Subject:** Your\_manuscript DH13645 Correa  
**From:** prd@aps.org  
**Date:** 2025-08-19, 12:02  
**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com

Re: DH13645

Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy  
by Paulo N. Correa and Alexandra N. Correa

Dear Dr. Correa,

We have examined your manuscript.

>From our understanding of the paper's context, motivation, presentation,  
level  
of argumentation, and degree of importance and interest to physics  
research, we  
conclude that your paper is not suited for Physical Review D.

In view of our assessment, we are not sending your manuscript out for  
review.

Yours sincerely,

Joshua C. Sayre  
Associate Editor  
Physical Review D  
Email: [prd@aps.org](mailto:prd@aps.org)  
<https://journals.aps.org/prd/>

NEWS FROM THE PHYSICAL REVIEW JOURNALS

PR and PRL encourage "joint" submissions  
<https://go.aps.org/3MzNENg>

Subject: Re: Your\_manuscript DH13645 Correa  
 Date: Thu, 21 Aug 2025 01:30:49 -0400  
 From: Dr. Paulo Correa <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>  
 To: prd@aps.org

To Joshua Sayre and the "We" of Physical Review D,

I sincerely doubt you have examined the manuscript submitted by myself and my co-author sufficiently to gain any "understanding" of its "context, motivation, presentation, level of argumentation, and degree of importance and interest to physics research"! Instead, you have opted to emit a stock response which strings together all standard attributes of a putative scientific paper, and says nothing about our paper in particular.

It would be presumptuous on my part to argue against your claim that our paper is "not suited for Physical Review D" - that suitability is obviously yours to decide. But it is equally presumptuous on your part to summarily dismiss the paper with a canned response. What I think you "understood" by perusing the paper is that it would take a great amount of time and intellectual effort to properly evaluate it. An honest response to us would have been to acknowledge this, and to point out that the Physical Review D reviewers could not be expected to invest this kind of time and effort. And the same honesty - in fact, a simple scientific honesty - would have prevented you from feeling licensed to pronounce on the paper's "degree of importance and interest to physics research". The fact that you don't know any scientist who would think it worthwhile to try and understand the paper does not mean that such scientists don't exist, and that if an interested scientist seriously engaged with the proposed ideas, those ideas would not ultimately prove of importance to a wider "physics research". However unlikely such a scenario may seem to you, encasting this unlikeliness into a stock rejection is a bit over-the-top, no?

Similarly over-the-top is your claim to any "understanding" of our paper's "motivation". What would that be, in your view? I will give you our view: the motivation is... science, or to be more exact, physics, plain good ol' physics. It is to have our scientific work read, thought about, understood, tested, discussed, criticized by other scientists - to give our ideas a chance for a life within a community of our peers. We think that our ideas deserve such a chance, even if you and your journal did not have the courage or the will to engage with the paper and criticize it - to do what you claim you're supposed to do: peer- review it. Your meek, evasive dismissal typifies all that is wrong with existing official physics and its vanity publication venues, which seem to be intent on keeping scientific thought within the confines reigned-over by the Higgs Boson, the Neutrino and the Big Bang - rather than opening the windows to fresh winds.

Sincerely not yours,

Dr. Paulo Correa  
 Corresponding author

On 2025-08-19 12:02, prd@aps.org wrote:

> Re: DH13645  
 > Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy  
 > by Paulo N. Correa and Alexandra N. Correa  
 >  
 > Dear Dr. Correa,  
 >  
 > We have examined your manuscript.

>  
 © Akronos Publishing, Canada

> >From our understanding of the paper's context, motivation, presentation, level  
> of argumentation, and degree of importance and interest to physics research, we  
> conclude that your paper is not suited for Physical Review D.  
>  
> In view of our assessment, we are not sending your manuscript out for review.  
>  
> Yours sincerely,  
>  
> Joshua C. Sayre  
> Associate Editor  
> Physical Review D  
> Email: [prd@aps.org](mailto:prd@aps.org)  
> <https://journals.aps.org/prd/>  
>  
> NEWS FROM THE PHYSICAL REVIEW JOURNALS  
>  
> PR and PRL encourage "joint" submissions  
> <https://go.aps.org/3MzNENg>

### 3. Submittal to the John Wiley's "Fortschritte der Physik"

Again, the same manuscript was submitted to Wiley's German venue (p. 23). This time, after a fortnight, an H.J. Otto answered (p. 24) that "we made the decision not to consider the manuscript", in a letter format whose near entirety was an advertisement for Wiley's services...

It could not get clearer than this: "we decide not to consider, thus it cannot be reviewed". And if it cannot be reviewed, it cannot be science, cannot become science, it is forever barred. It is of no interest. No hallucination here. Again we asked for guidance and an explanation (p. 25), as if some could be given... There followed the same silent treatment.

Little wonder that this publication is owned by the same J. Wiley & Sons from Hoboken NJ, that is now the recipient - along with five other cartelized-monopolistic publishers of scientific journals - of an anti-trust suit that claims Wiley and the others have done "tremendous damage to science and the public interest" [8]. The very same Wiley that in 2024 shut down 19 scientific journals and retracted 11,000 fraudulent papers published in a 2-year period [9] !!

**Subject:** Manuscript submitted to Fortschritte der Physik  
**From:** Fortschritte der Physik <no-reply@atyponrex.com>  
**Date:** 2025-08-30, 15:42  
**To:** Paulo Correa <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>

Dear Paulo Correa,

Your manuscript "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy" has been successfully submitted and is being delivered to the Editorial Office of *Fortschritte der Physik* for consideration.

You will receive a follow-up email with further instructions from the journal editorial office, typically within one business day. That message will confirm that the editorial office has received your submission and will provide your manuscript ID.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to *Fortschritte der Physik*.

Sincerely,  
The Editorial Staff at [Fortschritte der Physik](#)

By submitting a manuscript to or reviewing for this publication, your name, email address, and affiliation, and other contact details the publication might require, will be used for the regular operations of the publication, including, when necessary, sharing with the publisher (Wiley) and partners for production and publication. The publication and the publisher recognize the importance of protecting the personal information collected from users in the operation of these services and have practices in place to ensure that steps are taken to maintain the security, integrity, and privacy of the personal data collected and processed. You can learn more by reading our [data protection policy](#). In case you don't want to be contacted by this publication again, please send an email to [progress-phys@wiley.com](mailto:progress-phys@wiley.com).

**Subject:** Decision on manuscript: 8532649  
**From:** Fortschritte der Physik <prop.office@wiley.com>  
**Date:** 2025-09-15, 11:28  
**To:** "Paulo N. Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>  
**CC:** "Alexandra N. Correa" <acorrea@abrisci.com>

Dear Dr. Paulo N. Correa ,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy" to our journal. After careful assessment, we have made the decision not to consider your manuscript for publication in Fortschritte der Physik.

If you are considering submitting this manuscript to another journal, Wiley Editing Services may be able to help. Wiley Editing Services are available to all authors and offer expert help with manuscript preparation, including [English language editing](#), translation, manuscript formatting, figure illustration, and graphical abstract design. To learn more, visit [the Wiley Editing Services website](#).

You can also find [free resources for writing and preparing your manuscript](#) through Wiley Author Services.

We appreciate you considering Fortschritte der Physik for the publication of your research. We hope this outcome won't discourage you from submitting your work to us in the future.

Kind regards,  
Hans-Joerg Otto  
Fortschritte der Physik

---

While we were unable to consider your submission for publication at this time, Wiley Research Publishing is committed to helping researchers find the right home for their work. This journal participates in Wiley Research Publishing's Transfer Desk Assistant service, which helps suggest a suitable new journal and simplifies resubmission, saving you the time and effort of starting your submission over. Wiley Research Publishing's Transfer Desk will now identify relevant publications that would be an appropriate match for your manuscript. If there are matches, you will shortly receive recommendations in a direct communication from the Wiley Research Publishing Transfer Desk.

Notice: Transfer Desk recommendations are made by our journal-matching technology. Our assistance with a resubmission will save you time, but it does not guarantee acceptance. Journals are editorially independent and will assess your manuscript according to their own criteria. We would only transfer your manuscript to another journal after your approval.

**Subject:** Re: Decision on manuscript: 8532649  
**From:** "Dr. Paulo Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>  
**Date:** 2025-09-17, 15:49  
**To:** Fortschritte der Physik <prop.office@wiley.com>

Dear Hans-Joerg Otto,

We were sorry to learn about your decision not to consider our paper for publication, apparently without any peer review. We find this troublesome, since we believe the ideas explicated in this fact-based paper have the potential to be paradigm-changing. Could you kindly convey to us the specific details of the assessment that resulted in this decision? We would greatly appreciate some non-generic information on this matter.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Paulo Correa & Alexandra Correa

#### **4. Submittal to Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research (RoPIP)**

It sounds like a great title for a journal, no? Progress via original research... well, that describes our submission to a T. So we submitted (p. 27) the same manuscript to RoPIP, an IOP Journal (another publishing cartel). Two days later we got a sincere and feeling response (p. 28), this time penned by a human post-doc physicist, a Paul Mabey. Though prototypical, Mabey's letter also had a condescending tone that called for an answer, shown on p. 29. And that is also the last we heard of him or of the RoPIP.

**Subject:** Your submission to Rep. Prog. Phys.: ROPPR-101009

**From:** "Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research" <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

**Date:** 2025-11-12, 21:27

**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com, acorrea@abrisci.com

Dear Dr Correa,

Re: Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy

Manuscript reference: ROPPR-101009

Thank you for submitting your Paper to Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research.

The reference number for your manuscript is ROPPR-101009. Please quote this whenever you contact us about the manuscript.

To track the progress of your article, please visit our [Publishing Support website](#) and enter your manuscript ID as directed. If you use [WeChat](#), you can go to the article tracking service in the official IOP Publishing WeChat account.

### **Using your Author Centre**

You can log into your Author Centre at <https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/roppr-iop>. Once you are signed in, you will be able to:

- Follow the progress of your manuscript
- Read the reviewer reports
- Send us your electronic files

### **Important publishing information**

At Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research, we make manuscripts available to readers on the journal website within 24 hours of acceptance.

This means that, unless you have opted out, the accepted version of your manuscript will be visible before it is proofread and formatted to our house style.

If you are planning any press activity or you are engaging in any IP or patent application, you may prefer your work not to be published immediately.

If this is the case, and you have not already opted out during the submission process, please let us know as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,

On behalf of:

Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research

Editor-in-Chief: Professor Subir Sachdev 27

**Subject:** Your manuscript ROPPR-101009 - Decision on your manuscript  
**From:** "Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research" <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>  
**Date:** 2025-11-14, 07:20  
**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com  
**CC:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com, acorrea@abrisci.com

Dear Dr Correa,

Re: "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy"

Manuscript reference: ROPPR-101009

Thank you for your submission to Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research. We have read your manuscript and decided that it does not meet our publication criteria. As a result, we are unable to consider it for review.

Any research published in Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research must be of the highest standard. Successful submissions must clearly demonstrate scientific process and extensive research, and carefully assess the validity of any conclusions presented.

We do not feel that your submission does this sufficiently.

Thank you for your interest in Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Mabey

On behalf of:  
Reports on Progress in Physics: Original Research  
Editor-in-Chief: Professor Subir Sachdev  
iopscience.iop.org/ropp / rop@iopublishing.org  
Impact Factor: 20.7

Want to find out what is happening to your submission?  
Track your article on:  
Publishing support <https://bit.ly/39t9yPz>  
WeChat <https://bit.ly/2L0M9uz>

ioppublishing.org

Letter reference: DEC:ImmRejQ:S

**Subject:** Re: Your manuscript ROPPR-101009 - Decision on your manuscript  
**From:** "Dr. Paulo Correa" <drpcorrea@abrisci.com>  
**Date:** 2025-11-14, 18:42  
**To:** rop@iopublishing.org

Dear Paul Mabey,

Reading your closing statement -

"We do not feel that your submission does this sufficiently."

- I cannot help but wonder how reason in science became subject to *feeling*, to the feeling of a "royal we" exerted by a post-doc student serving as an institutional delegate. Furthermore, I'm left wondering *why you failed to identify a single example* of what it is that our paper failed to do with respect to your expression "does this sufficiently". What is this "this"??

Since our paper results entirely from *original research* and de facto addresses the scientific process and its epochal errors with ample reference materials, the "this" in your expression can only mean that our paper fails to "carefully assess the validity of any conclusions presented", no?

If this is the case, and given that *you explicitly claim to have read* the submitted paper one day after its submittal, it is *ethically incumbent* on you to at the very least provide *a reasoned example*, rather than some general feeling. For example, it is *not a reason* to reject our rigorous demonstration that the reciprocal of alpha is 138..., and not 137..., to have *a feeling* that 138 cannot be valid.

I look forward to your feedback. Otherwise I will be compelled to let my coworkers and colleagues know that your journal should rather be understood as a magazine of "Reports on the Feelings of Progress in Physics".

Best,

Dr. Paulo Correa

### 5. Submittal to Communications in Theoretical Physics (CTP)

This was going to be the last submittal. CTP is another IOP venue, a dot in an immense publishing cartel. Perhaps if the connotation of progress was denied to our submittal to the previous venue, its being being a communication would be sufficient for CTP... So, again we filed the same manuscript (p. 31). Nine days later, we received a response (p. 32) from one Bolin Wang, claiming to represent the Editorial Office: "after carefully [sic] consideration", it refers us to "comments [NB plural] received from our reviewers or editorial board members". But only *one* comment followed below, unsigned: "This manuscript does not show enough important development in theoretical physics". Say that again? The demonstration that the electron is not a point-mass or a Compton-scale ring with a Fermi-scale radius, is not important enough? And that the electron is a closed energy torus at Bohr to Compton scales is also not important? What the hell then is important for these Wang's, Lim's, Mabey's and Otto's, to their graduate supervisors and tenured professors, to their journal administrators? But we already know - the continuation of scientific fictions that secure their grants, tenures, vanity-publications, and so on, as so many synecures paid by the public purse and tax-evading foundations and NGOs. The vanity venues must not publish any science that, though being real, upsets the elaborate network of the social and economic dependencies of what is enshrined politically as science.

**Subject:** Communications in Theoretical Physics - Manuscript ID CTP-251039

**From:** Bolin Wang <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

**Date:** 2025-11-22, 17:25

**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com

23-Nov-2025

Dear Dr. Correa:

Your manuscript entitled "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in the Communications in Theoretical Physics.

Your manuscript ID is CTP-251039.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at <https://mc03.manuscriptcentral.com/ctphys> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in to <https://mc03.manuscriptcentral.com/ctphys>.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Communications in Theoretical Physics.

Sincerely,  
Communications in Theoretical Physics Editorial Office

**Subject:** Communications in Theoretical Physics - Decision on Manuscript ID CTP-251039

**From:** Bolin Wang <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

**Date:** 2025-12-01, 04:02

**To:** drpcorrea@abrisci.com

01-Dec-2025

Dear Dr. Correa,

We are writing you in regards to manuscript # CTP-251039 entitled "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of electron mass-energy" which you submitted to Communications in Theoretical Physics.

After carefully consideration, your manuscript has been denied publication in Communications in Theoretical Physics. Please see below for the comments that we received from our reviewers or editorial board members.

Thank you for considering Communications in Theoretical Physics for publication of your research. I hope the outcome of this specific submission will not discourage you from submission of future manuscripts.

Sincerely,  
Communications in Theoretical Physics Editorial Office

-----  
Comments:

This manuscript does not show enough important development in theoretical physics that can make it reach the publication standard of CTP. It might be more suitable for elsewhere.

## Discussion

### 1. The academic hoax of peer-reviewed science

Had our work been conducted in an academia, had it depended on peer-controlled public and corporate grants and publications, we would likely never have arrived at developing it, let alone as extensively as we did. And we would have never published a word of it. If, for us, it were "publish or perish", we would long ago have perished. Paraphrasing what the XVIth century Nobunaga of the Oda said when the trap laid by the treacherous Akechi Mitsuhide closed in - "I refuse to die other than by my own hand". Thus, on our own we published - and failed to perish other than by our own hands.

The fact that no single part of our extensive work on Aetherometry caught the eye of any institutional physicist is a clear sign that the academic world does not deserve it. But it is also a clear sign that it does not know what to do with it. For scientific knowledge has in the past 8 decades undergone a complete overcodification and integration into what are considered final models by institutional consensus that today reign by means of the fake peer-review system. This dogmatically closed the axiomatization of science, sacrificing consistency and logical coherence. The forceful restructuring is nowhere more prominent and dominant than in physics. I'll give a single example: everywhere Aetherometry is mocked for being the science of *massfree energy*, since, supposedly after Einstein's Relativity, it has been established that no energy exists without mass, without bearing mass, and that the real equivalence is between mass and energy. Yet, the present axiomatization of physics admits that photons may not carry mass, has never been able to determine a photon mass no matter how hard it has tried, and ventures the existence of other massless particles, not only the fabled and multiple neutrinos, but even subnuclear particles like gluons and gluinos, etc. Is not massless a synonym of massfree? The axiomatization is inconsistent, and the science sclerotic. Furthermore, the consolidation of its rule required an active complicity between institutional science and corporate media, whether mainstream or "social networks". In the present century, this active complicity eventually became "digitally structured" by competing AI machines deployed by virtually all media empires. The AI feedback loop eventually took over peer-review itself - a supposedly "objective" review being the product: your results don't matter, you got 33% repeat material, not 31% ... Should a physicist laugh or cry?

The fact is that our universities and other centers of learning stink of manipulation, falsity, hypocrisy and sacrosanct censorship and suppression of knowledge. They are only interested in theoretical specializations or in little experimental observations that may generate mini-interpretations capable of extending or validating the "finished models" of macro-interpretation - protected by a manufactured but effective institutional consensus - like the Standard Model of the electron. Institutional publications and researchers are not interested in interpretations or experimental data that may *invalidate* those "finished models". They rule them out a priori, as by a reflex. They shouldn't, if these scientists and their academies and "journals" were "in it" for the science. And they wouldn't, if the wrong science was solely the result of error, and not the product of a socially-engendered falsification. But neither of these is true of established science - none of it: neither the research, nor the findings, nor the academic publication, let alone the assigning of grants. Six corporate giants control all scientific journals, in a business that has been conservatively estimated to be worth >30 billion dollars annually. The peer-review system is their tool to manufacture a "consensus of science" that is official and self-validating, with the associations of scientists providing the manpower. The result is that universities and institutional scientific research are politically oriented to the lowest possible and least meritorious denominator, and aim rather precisely at weeding out the different, the innovators, whatever has genuine merit, by (1) effectively suppressing the very science that might disrupt what is the official version of science, and (2) an ever-growing flooding of all scientific fields with fake communications ("the truth of the false"). A scientist might suppose that - by the principle and method of science - not just findings that validate and extend a dominant paradigm, but also those that invalidate it, would be deserving of review and publication. But that is not the practice of the peer-review system, whether in academic grants or publications: only what validates established models is worth considering for publication.

Real scientific merit has been banned, and our peer-review experiment above is proof of this. Of course our physics work has merit - it speaks for itself! But all physics journals that received our communication judged it, offhand, as undeserving of any detailed, serious consideration, without even according us the elementary courtesy of an explanation. These journals and their editors are bereft of science.

## 2. Science is not science because of peer-review

I remember well the day when Prof. Arthur Axelrad finally gave up the notion that science is not science until it is peer-reviewed. We had had a long battle on this over the years. On that day, I showed him how a scientist could discover or uncover the same result - or two results that were corroborative - by going through two *independent* paths, and thus come to know the result for a fact without any peer having to first review it. I gave him the example of the real value of the fine-structure constant that physics refuses to acknowledge - in papers we have now published [10-11]; another example is the demonstration of the non-existence of electron neutrinos - which could definitely be arrived at from either (1) the solution of the proton-to-neutron, or neutron-to-proton, transitions, or (2) the beryllium to lithium reaction in the initiation step of the p-p chain II of nuclear fusion - as long as one treated these processes as implicating changes by 3 electron masses. Since existing physics assumes a priori that only single electron mass transitions are involved in the two independent cases, it pursued its error down the rabbit-hole of massless neutrinos. Saying these exist does not make it so, all the more as neutrinos can be shown to be the result of separate and distinct errors in computation. Yet, the dominant scientific consensus is that neutrinos exist, must exist period. The error became established fiction. A religion of science arose and enforced beliefs replaced facts and the policy of science. Indeed, official science is a form of scientism - a credo or faith.

A group of us - I was the youngest and a graduate student - used to go "after the rounds on Wednesday" to the old Keg down on Jarvis St, Toronto, for lunch, drinks and animated discussions. Along with Arthur, Alan Bernstein, John Dick and Tony Pawson, we all relished those afternoons during a few years. And I remember Tony Pawson (1953-2013) describing the trepidations a scientist goes through when he is firmly convinced of the validity of his results, and yet awaits sanction or verification by peers. He was the first Canadian scientist to win the Kyoto Prize (2008) for science, and on the occasion delivered a memorable talk. He pleaded for the importance of giving free rein to "human inventiveness in science". His own work was a shining example of it. In his typically pragmatic and rather understated vein, he admonished our epoch and Canadians in particular:

"Governments increasingly want to see immediate returns on the research that they support, but it is worth viewing basic science as a long-term investment that will yield

completely unexpected dividends for humanity in the future. (...) Canadian funding bodies are increasingly putting as much weight on non-scientific factors such as socioeconomic benefits as they are on scientific quality in deciding who to support. (...) They must realize that this strategy compromises innovation of the sort that will change the world."

Tony had no alternative but work as an institutional scientist. Yet, he carved a line of his own - which in the academia is a rarity these days. He was the warmest of friends, often quiet and observing, but never shy of real sincerity. For Tony knew the friendship of science, and said, on the above occasion, some beautiful words on what exactly is the process of scientific discovery - a journey through the desert of knowledge:

"The process of scientific discovery is, I would suggest, rather like that of exploring for new continents in the age of sailing ships - there are long periods at sea, with not much happening, and then suddenly the sight of land, at first distant and mysterious, and then becoming clearer until finally one arrives at a new shore - or by my analogy at a new scientific hypothesis. But it is that moment of first seeing the land in the distance, of first realizing that one has a thread of evidence for a new way of looking at the world, that provides the greatest excitement. In school, we learn about science retrospectively, and so everything appears to make perfect logical sense. The actual course of scientific discovery, in contrast, takes many curious twists and turns, and if my experience is anything to go by, when a scientist ventures into unexplored territory and finds something new and unusual, he or she agonizes over what these findings mean and how to correctly interpret the experimental data".

I have had many a moment of being at sea for long periods, and of having seen and waded in the shores of a new continent of science and physics. The theory of the electron mass-energy was one of these journeys that landed "something new and unusual". But because it does not advance the established model of the electron, even moron AI's are enabled to reject its value. Yet, when we wrote the paper in question, all that was in our minds was to obtain a single review of the work by a competent physicist.

### **3. The socially-engineered death of science**

The results of the present test of the ability of five top physics journals to actually generate a peer-review of our findings tally entirely with what happened in 2008 to our

ground-breaking paper on the analysis of the Ives-Stilwell experiment, which showed the superfluousness of utilizing Relativity to compute the results that could be far better approached with the analytical and mathematical tools of Aetherometry [1-2]. Two top physics journals (*Physical Review A* of the APS and *Physical Letters A* owned by Elsevier Co.) refused publication of three submittals, while Prof. Antonio Scotti - then an editor of the *Journal of Mathematical Physics* and professor at the Mathematics Department of the University of Milan - who was exorbitantly paid by a private party to review the same manuscript, shot it down with a method of his own that unfortunately, as it happens, shuffled the results precisely to our detriment. His convenient error was documented in the last reference above - and Scotti's silly method actually demonstrated that Aetherometry is significantly more accurate than Relativity... One is hard put to believe the shuffling was unintentional, since when he was confronted by his patron, Scotti refused to admit it!

The problem with the peer-review system is that only institutional scientists - or their contrafactual AI's - are "peers". It is a multitude of Scotti's, each with a synecure. Take away the established institutions of science - universities, granting agencies and dominant corporate donors, professional associations and monopolistic printing houses, etc - and the system falls apart, because what it lacks is not just openness to what can be verified and yet is radically new and different, but also courage to understand it and finance it. It fears the inventiveness that Tony Pawson evoked in 2008. Institutional science is filled with corridor plots, theft of results, petty envies, do-gooders, hailed successes that turn into crashing failures (remember Elizabeth Holmes of Theranos fame?). How to balance, for example, the terrible suppression of the HIV work of Peter Duesberg with the concomittant rise and glory of a veritable "crapule" like Anthony Fauci? It is the mass of the peers and society at large that makes these choices in science and medicine, with all the terrible consequences they entail. Perhaps there is some truth to the notion that science died in the day it became *socially engineered*. Perhaps the Manhattan Project marked the day of that death. What we have today is a corpse.

Since our 2008 experiment, nearly two decades have passed. The global entrenchment of academias now exhibits a clear ossification. Whether in universities or corporate and military laboratories, all research and communications have become mediated by a near-autonomous circuit that plugs in the human factor between the smart

phone and the so-called artificial intelligence as a mere component of the "collectivistic thought of science". The very circuit that was going to enrich human beings has impoverished them instead, now in a spiral path. When it comes to physics, theoretical or applied, it can only be conducted within the framework of the "final models" of science - the Standard Model, quantum electrodynamics, quantum chromodynamics, etc. The AI is already programmed to exercise an apparent scientific censorship to protect these models. A threshold has been reached and there are no scientific reports per se anymore, only adverts in a competition for government and corporate grants, only "promises of science", only passing hallucinations of an imaginary reality. Could there be a better example of this than the hallucination and political concoction of a fake Covid vaccine that harmed so many, likely in the millions? And is there a greater fiction than that which holds that AI-programmed machines can think? What they do, is regularly hallucinate [12-13]. The effects can be seen everywhere; how, for instance, ResearchGate and other platforms like it are filled with sham research papers generated by AI and "paper-mill" fraudsters.

Of course, there is one function which the corrupt peer-review system performs well, the very specialization of AI: to ward off outsiders, and especially those who may have produced good science on their own merit. Such seems to be the fate of Aetherometry - that it shall remain *peerless*, and only be published for a while "out of time", in *Akronos*. So be it.

## References

1. Correa PN, Correa AN, Askanas M, Gryziecki G & Solá-Soler J (2007-2008) "A test of Aetherometry vs Relativity, Special and Larmor-Lorentz: The 1938 Ives-Stilwell experiment - Aetherometry vs. Relativity (2)", Volume I of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-I.4.
2. Correa AN & Askanas M (2008-2009) "Death by peer-review: Analysis of the 1938 Ives-Stilwell experiment as a sociological test of the legitimacy of so-called 'peer review' in mainstream scientific publications", Volume I of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-I.5.
3. Correa P & Correa A (2002, 2008) "The Gravitational Aether, Part II: Gravitational Aetherometry (9), Quantum & Subquantum Aether (Anti)Gravity: fine variation and determinations of G", in Vol. II of "The Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS)", Akronos Publishing, Concord, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-II.11.
4. Correa PN & Correa AN (2011) "The physical nature of electric charge, massbound and massfree", Volume III of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-III.2.
5. Correa PN & Correa AN (2011) "The electron mass-energy flux as a deformable nanometric torus - fine and hyperfine structures and flux topogeometries", Volume III of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-III.4.
6. Correa PN & Correa AN (2013) "Electroinertial treatment of the de Broglie "Matter-Waves", particle acceleration, and the Compton effect", Volume III of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-III.8.
7. Correa PN & Correa AN (2026) "Fine structure and cosmogenic creation of the electron mass-energy", Volume IV of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-IV.3.
8. Spitalniak L (2024) "6 major academic publishers face antitrust lawsuit", at [www.highereddrive.com/news](http://www.highereddrive.com/news), Sept. 17.

9. "Flood of fake science forces multiple journal closures tainted by fraud", The Wall Street Journal, May 14, 2024.

10. Correa PN & Correa AN (2009) "On the determination and value of the fine structure constant", J Aetherom Res, 2(5):1-17.

11. Correa PN & Correa AN (2011) "Alpha - the fine structure constant and the hydrogen spectrum", Volume III of Aetherometric Theory of Synchronicity (AToS), Akronos Publishing, Concord, ON, Canada, ABRI monograph AS3-III.5.

12. Correa PN & Correa AN (2025) "A (Dis)conversation with ChatGPT on science", J Aetherom Res, 4, 4:1-23.

13. Pratt D (2025) "Lies, damned lies, and artificial intelligence: a conversation with DeepSeek and Grok", J Aetherom Res, 4, 6:1-33.