Dr. Dragoi Andrei-Lucian <dr.dragoi@yahoo.com>

To: Charles Greathouse

Jul 2 at 2:06 PM

Dear Mr. Charles Greathouse,

I would like to request a moderation (and a second opinion) concerning the unprofessional review, the offending, discriminative and unethical attitude and rejection of the sequence A316297 (which is now allocated to another sequence than mine) by the following moderators/reviewers: Mr. Heinz and Mr. Arndt.

Here is the history of the review (with pages listed in chronological order):
https://oeis.org/history?seq=A316297&start=20
https://oeis.org/history?seq=A316297&start=10

I base my request of moderation on the following arguments listed below:

1. Even if the sequence I have proposed is apparently "too short" for OEIS (the even numbers 2, 4 and 6 [0 being a trivial even number in the sequence and not included for this reason]), to verify it, I had to test the entire interval of even positive integers from 6 to 10^{10} which was not an easy work (as it also necessitated a special software built in Visual C++): the two reviewers didn't even observe this essential fact (superficiality?) or they've seen it but they didn't considered it (bad intention?).

2. VBGC(1,0) is much more elegant than the binary Goldbach conjecture (**BGC**) as it offers the same number of even exceptions but a significantly smaller number of Goldbach partitions.

3. The rule that "Generally, the sequence proposed on OEIS must have at least 4 terms" shouldn't be applied mechanically and rigidly, as "generally" doesn't mean "always". I asked for an exception for the initial A316297 of VBGC(1,0) has true mathematical beauty and elegance and that its elegance actually stands in its almost minimal number of exceptions.

4. It is very disappointing the Mr. Heinz has seen this case from such a narrow angle of view.

5. Mr. Arndt was even unethical and indirectly offended me with the formula "terminally confused", just because I

have used vixrapedia.org to create a page in which to present VBGC very synthetically

(https://www.vixrapedia.org/wiki/VBGC). In a shameful matter, Mr. Arndt also attacked my peer reviewed article on

VBGC (without reading it!), JUST because it was published in JAMCS (http://www.sciencedomain.org/abstract/21625) which he considers a junk journal, despite the fact that the editor of JAMCS has a very good reputation and a very high index of citations on Google Scholars (Francisco Welington de Sousa Lima, Professor, Dietrich Stauffer Laboratory for Computational Physics, Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Piaui, Teresina, Brazil: https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=A4a7rhoAAAAJ&hl=en). I publish in JAMCS because of their open peer review system (as also OEIS has), because I like full transparency in reviews, so that to prevent abuses (like the abuses of Mr. Heinz and Mr. Arndt also).I have reminded Mr. Arndt that he (an other moderators) also verified A282251 in 2017 and confirmed it was true just based on my working paper published on RG in 2016-2017.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313038562_VBGC_15e_-_the_conjecture_only_-_23022017_-_21_pages_The_Vertical_generalization_of_the_Binary_Goldbach's_Conjecture_VBGC_as_applied_on_iterative_primes_with_recursive_prime_indexes_i-primeths

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312653619_VBGC_-_preprint_-_full_version_15e_-_23022017_-_32_pages_The_Vertical_generalization_of_the_Binary_Goldbach's_Conjecture_VBGC_as_applied_on_iterative_primes_with_recursive_prime_indexes_i-primeths

Rhetorical question.
Was it really necessary to have added the value "0" in the sequence of positive evens (corresponding to the exceptions of VBGC [1,0]) so that to have "4 terms" and please the rigid reviewers? How is this narrow an unethical view/approach possible on such a prestigious site as OEIS is? I am waiting for a minimal feedback, opinion and moderator from your part in this case.

Thank you in advance!
Best regards from Romania!
dr. Andrei-Lucian Dragoi
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrei_Lucian_Dragoi2

Charles Greathouse <charles.greathouse@case.edu>
To: Andrei L
Cc: N. J. A. Sloane
Jul 2 at 5:59 PM
Dr. Dragoi, I have received your email and will review your complaint this week.

Charles Greathouse
Case Western Reserve University

Dr. Dragoi Andrei-Lucian <dr.dragoi@yahoo.com>
To: Charles Greathouse
Jul 2 at 6:02 PM
Thank you for your prompt feedback and openness!

Regards!
dr. Dragoi

Neil Sloane <njasloane@gmail.com>
To: Charles Greathouse
Cc: Andrei L,N. J. A. Sloane, Susanna Cuyler
Jul 2 at 8:47 PM
Dear Andrei-Lucian Dragoi,
I have read your message dated July 2 2018. The purpose of the OEIS database, which I have maintained since 1964, is to help people identify sequences.

In order to be included, a sequence must pass certain tests, one of which is that the sequence is interesting.
In my opinion, the sequence "2,4,6" is not interesting.

The sequence of even numbers is interesting, of course. But not "2,4,6". I think you do not
understand the way the OEIS is used.

I totally support the decision of the editors.

Please remember that when you submitted that sequence you agreed to the Contributors' License Agreement,
which says among other things that the editors may reject your sequence if ir is not suitable for the OEIS.

In the OEIS Wiki there is a page called Examples of What Not to Submit. One of the examples is "1,2,3 (and no further
terms are known)".

My decision is final.

Best regards
Neil

Neil J. A. Sloane, President, OEIS Foundation.
11 South Adelaide Avenue, Highland Park, NJ 08904, USA.
Also Visiting Scientist, Math. Dept., Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ.

Phone: 732 828 6098; home page: http://NeilSloane.com
Email: njasloane@gmail.com

Dr. Dragoi Andrei-Lucian <dr.dragoi@yahoo.com>
To: Neil Sloane
Cc: Charles Greathouse
Jul 3 at 12:25 AM
Dear Mr. Sloane,

The sequence "2, 4, 6" is OBVIOUSLY "not interesting" per se, but is hugely interesting as it seems to contain the ONLY exceptions of the following conjecture (VBGC[1,0]): "**Every even number 2m >6 can always be written as a sum of two distinct primes P(x) and a prime-index prime P(P(y))**". I have verified this conjecture up to 10^{10} and the only exceptions are: 2,4,6. This sequence transmits a valuable information to all the other authors interested in Goldbach's conjecture as it spares them to verify again this truth. This conjecture is much stronger than the classical (non-trivial) binary Goldbach conjecture [**BGC**] ("**Every even number 2m>6 can always be written as a sum of two distinct primes P(x) and P(y)**)". VBGC(1,0) is much more interesting than BGC (as it has exactly the same exceptions as BGC but has a much narrow graphical comet, containing a significantly smaller number of Goldbach partitions for each **m**) and all the professionist mathematicians I have consulted on this matter agree with me (including the notorious professor Florentin Smarandache which is a big name in mathematics and gave his recommendations on all my articles containing VBGC)
It is sad that you didn't mention anything about the conjecture VBGC(1,0) (which is the "generator" of this sequence): either you don't see/understand its beauty, either you don't recognize it (both possibilities are disappointing).

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Florentin_Smarandache

Conclusion: "2, 4, 6" is not interesting per se, BUT its definition ("the only exceptions of VBGC[1,0]" is very interesting).
My final opinion: it is so sad that OEIS doesn't regard a sequence in its specific definition, context and based on the truth that lies behind it. It is rigid and narrow for OEIS to regard sequences simply as some "islands" isolated/separated from the mathematical truths than defines them.

When a user reads a OEIS article/sequence entry he FIRSTLY reads the title (which is the definition of the sequence, which appears BEFORE the sequence) and then the sequence: believe me, if any user would have read the title of my entry and THEN the sequence he would surely recognize VBGC (together with its "2,4,6" sequence) as both very interesting and elegant property of primes, higher-order primes and their critical density.

Not considering this specific (and spectacular!) definition of "2, 4, 6" is very unfair and shows very rigid and narrow approach. Your way of thinking (which you have also implemented in the rigid system of rules of OEIS) is in opposition with truth and evolution of mathematics.

Rhetorical question: How can you separate a sequence from its definition? The same sequence can have multiple definitions AND any sequence MUST be submitted with its definition, which definition (mentioned from the title and BEFORE the sequence) is more important than the sequence itself and should primarily decide if the sequence is "interesting" or not.

My best (but sad) regards from Romania!
dr. Andrei Dragoi
PS. I shall include your opinion (together with Mr. Heinz's and Mr. Arndt) in the VBGC vixrapedia page so that all my readers, professors and endorsers to witness this profoundly narrow and unfair approach of yours and your team. NOT to mention than you spoke no word about the offenses that Mr. Arndt practices. I understand that you cover the unethical behavior of your collaborators (and that is the other sad part of this sad truth). Without knowing it, you've just made math history: sadly and more specifically, the... dark side of math history.