An Open Letter to the Astrophysical-Kinetics, Magnetic-Confinement-Fusion, and Planetary-Dynamics Communities: Weighted Villani Hypocoercivity, Stochastic-Modulus Photon Propagation, Cohomological MHD, and Observational Bounds on Solar Companions

Peter De Ceuster*

*Astrophysics, Kinetics & Fusion Working Note: Symmetrized Hypocoercive Closures, Toroidal Transport Geometry, and Celestial Mechanics,
(peterdeceuster5@gmail.com)

November 19, 2026

Abstract

This document is written as an open letter to researchers in astrophysical kinetic theory, magnetic-confinement fusion, laser–plasma physics, and planetary dynamics. Across eight prior preprints [1–8], we explored stochastic-modulus photon dispersion in cosmic media, Villani hypocoercivity for cosmic and fusion plasmas, cohomological and moduli-space approaches to tokamak/stellarator confinement, and wide-companion kinematics of the Sun. A rigorous audit reveals critical analytical and observational defects across those formulations: an unweighted L^2 instability in the kinetic Langevin closure, an inverted hypocoercive weight ordering, a dimensionless photon self-energy with an eleven-order-of-magnitude Fisher-forecast error, a conflation of zero-Lyapunov flat translation surfaces with hyperbolic geodesic chaos on toroidal reactors, and a 320× period error alongside Milky Way tidal-radius and WISE/Gaia exclusions in solar-companion models.

Here we establish the corrected mathematical and empirical foundations for all four subfields. First, we derive the dimensionally consistent Schwinger–Keldysh photon self-energy $\mathrm{Re}\,\Sigma \sim g^2 m_\phi^2 \sigma_\phi^2$ and Stratonovich-to-Itô Faraday–axion polarization transport, contrasting localized FRB dispersion bounds against MICROSCOPE and Chandra. Second, we prove the exact Gaussian-weighted symmetrized hypocoercive closure on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ under $H^1_x L^2_v$ forcing, fixing the weight hierarchy $1 \gg a \gg b \gg c > 0$ and restricting bosonic Uehling–Uhlenbeck decay strictly to $T > T_c$. Third, we replace extra-dimensional cohomological leakage and genus-3 vessel proposals with three-dimensional de Rham/Hodge–Helmholtz helicity, symplectic cantori turnstile minimization, and broadband two-plasmon-decay scaling. Fourth, we correct Kepler's third law, compute the 1.7–2.1 pc Galactic Jacobi radius refuting bound HD 186302 models, and specify LSST/NEO Surveyor and Gaia chemical-tagging protocols.

What follows is a technical formulation of the corrected kinetic, fusion-transport, and celestial-mechanics equations, together with quantitative observational bounds. The discussion is organized in six points.

(1) Stochastic-modulus photon propagation and multi-messenger FRB/WEP bounds. In [2], the self-energy $\Sigma(\omega) \simeq g^2\sigma_\phi^2 m_\phi^2/\omega^2$ was dimensionless ($[M]^0$ instead of $[M]^2$), the group index omitted $\omega\Sigma'(\omega)$, Eqs. (14)–(15) mismatched the $\omega^{-\alpha}$ versus $\omega^{-(\alpha+2)}$ scaling, Eq. (6) possessed a non-integrable Lorentzian double pole $(k^2 - m_\phi^2)^{-2}$, the Stokes SDE omitted a factor of two and Itô–Stratonovich drift, and the stationary endpoint phase shift $\Delta\psi = \frac{\tilde{g}}{2}[\phi(\text{Earth}) - \phi(\text{Source})]$ was mistakenly treated as a $\sqrt{L/L_c}$ random walk. Carrying out the exact Schwinger–Keldysh forward-scattering integral over a damped spectrum $[(k_0^2 - \mathbf{k}^2 - m_\phi^2)^2 + \gamma^2 k_0^2]^{-1}$ restores exact mass dimension $[M]^2$ and Stratonovich polarization transport:

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\Sigma(p) \simeq \frac{1}{4} g^2 \langle (\partial_\mu \phi)(\partial^\mu \phi) \rangle \sim g^2 m_\phi^2 \sigma_\phi^2 \equiv m^2_{\gamma,\mathrm{eff}}, \qquad n_g(\omega) = 1 + \frac{\omega\Sigma'(\omega) - \Sigma(\omega)}{2\omega^2}, \tag{1}$$

$$d\mathbf{S} = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{S}) \circ d\phi \implies \frac{d}{d\lambda}\langle Q \rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\tilde{g}^2 \Gamma_\phi \langle Q \rangle, \qquad \langle \Delta\psi^2 \rangle_{\mathrm{stat}} = \frac{\tilde{g}^2}{2}\sigma_\phi^2 \ \ (L \gg L_c), \tag{2}$$

Crucially, stationary ϕ produces a distance-independent birefringence variance; genuine distance growth requires Faraday–axion mode mixing in magnetized plasma. Moreover, updating the Fisher matrix of [2] with current localized fast-radio-burst bounds ($m_\gamma \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-15}\,\mathrm{eV}$) and cosmic mean density $\rho_\phi \leq \rho_{\mathrm{DM}} \approx 1.3\,\mathrm{keV/cm^3}$ limits cosmic dilaton couplings only to $g \lesssim 0.4\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$ (or $10^{-3}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$ in galactic halos)—eleven orders of magnitude weaker than the $10^{-14}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$ forecast in [2], while MICROSCOPE equivalence-principle bounds already exclude $g \gtrsim 10^{-22}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$ for $m_\phi \lesssim 10^{-14}\,\mathrm{eV}$ and Chandra NGC 1275 limits $\tilde{g} \lesssim 10^{-12}\,\mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$. Separating plasma dispersion from $m^2_{\gamma,\mathrm{eff}}$ relies on the distinct $(1+z)^{-1}$ versus $(1+z)^{-2}$ redshift scaling in Eq. (5). Simultaneously, in [3], we correct the gravitational redshift ISW formula by restoring $1/c^2$ ($\frac{\Delta\nu}{\nu} = \frac{2}{c^3}\int \partial_t \Phi\, dl$), enforce $\partial_\nu \Xi^\nu_{\mathrm{stoch}} = 0$ via an antisymmetric stochastic magnetization $\Xi^\nu_{\mathrm{stoch}} = \partial_\mu M^{\mu\nu}_{\mathrm{stoch}}$, flip the attractive Jeans sign to $1 - \frac{k_J^2}{k^2}W = 0$, note that Wasserstein space $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is contractible ($H^k(\mathcal{P}_2, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$), and remove the claim of repulsive negative effective mass in [3] that directly contradicted [2] written two days earlier.

(2) Symmetrized Gaussian-weighted Villani hypocoercivity for astrophysical and fusion kinetics. Both [1] and [6] formulated hypocoercive decay in *unweighted* $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Because $\langle f, \nabla_v \cdot (\nabla_v f + v f) \rangle_{L^2} = -\|\nabla_v f\|^2 + \frac{d}{2}\|f\|^2$, unweighted L^2 admits exponentially growing algebraic tails, breaks Hermite diagonality, omits the confining $\frac{1}{4}\|vf\|^2$ moment in Proposition 3.1 of [6], and fails to close under $L^2_{x,v}$ stochastic forcing η because no Δ_x dissipation exists to absorb $2c\langle \nabla_x f, \nabla_x \eta \rangle$. Likewise, [3] inverted Villani's weight hierarchy as $c \gg b \gg a$, flipped the commutator sign $[v \cdot \nabla_x - \nabla V \cdot \nabla_v, -\partial_{x_i}] = -(\partial^2_{x_i x_j} V)\partial_{v_j}$, misapplied Mouhot–Villani homogeneous plasma damping to inhomogeneous attractive Jeans halos (where Dobrushin's W_1 bound also fails for singular $1/|x|$ forces), and conflated $k \neq 0$ shear-enhanced dissipation ($\lambda_H \sim \nu^{1/3}$) with the global confining Fokker–Planck spectral gap ($\lambda \sim \nu$).

Conjugating $g = M^{-1/2} f$ on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ restores exact Hermite diagonality $A^* A h_m = |m| h_m$ and the exact Hermite-cascade norm Eq. (3). Requiring trace-class forcing $\tilde{\eta} = M^{-1/2}\eta \in H^1_x L^2_v$ ($\mathrm{Tr}((1 + A^*A + C^*C)Q) < \infty$) and the strict Villani ordering $1 \gg a \gg b \gg c > 0$ with $b^2 < ac$ yields the valid forced Itô inequality Eq. (4) (replacing the false equality in Eq. 10 of [6]), directly controlling the Hermite spectrum benchmarked against Kanekar et al. [9]. For bosonic cosmic gases [1], the Uehling–Uhlenbeck operator (Nordheim 1928) requires weighted $L^2([f_{\mathrm{BE}}(1 + f_{\mathrm{BE}})]^{-1})$ strictly in the non-degenerate regime $T > T_c$ ($\mu < 0$); at or below T_c, $f^{\mathrm{crit}}_{\mathrm{BE}} \notin L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}$ and Escobedo–Velázquez finite-time condensation blow-up invalidates Theorem 5.1 of [1]. Neutron-star superfluids consist of fermionic ${}^1S_0$ /${}^3P_2$ Cooper pairs ($\kappa = h/(2m_n)$), resolving the internal contradiction between Def. 5.4 and Remark 5.8 of [1]) governed by two-fluid

HVBK mutual friction rather than 1D Bose–Hubbard Mott expansions (where bipartite parity $J \mapsto -J$ forbids odd powers in $\mathrm{Var}(\hat{n})$ and $\rho_s \equiv 0$ inside the Mott phase).

$$g = M^{-1/2} f, \qquad A = \nabla_v + \frac{1}{2} v, \quad B = v \cdot \nabla_x, \quad C = [A, B] = \nabla_x, \qquad \|Ag\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_m |m| \, \|g_m\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)}^2, \tag{3}$$

$$E(g) = \|g\|^2 + a\|Ag\|^2 + 2b\langle Ag, Cg\rangle + c\|Cg\|^2 \;\; (1 \gg a \gg b \gg c > 0,\; b^2 < ac), \qquad \frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}[E(g)] + \lambda \mathbb{E}[E(g)] \le \sigma^2 \, \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{M} Q), \tag{4}$$

(3) Rigorous cohomological MHD, field-line transport geometry, and broadband ICF photonics. Three corrections realign the fusion papers [4–7] with plasma physics and dynamical systems:

- **3D de Rham cohomological MHD vs. extra-dimensional leakage [5]:** Tokamaks do not suffer a "10-second barrier"—WEST (1,337 s), EAST (1,066 s steady H-mode), and W7-X (480 s) exceed it by two orders of magnitude—while [5] paired an exact 2-form shift $d(\star F + \Sigma_{\text{bulk}}) = J_{\text{plasma}}$ (zero cohomology class) with a vanishing 5-form integral $J \wedge \star F \equiv 0$, dimensionally broken ν_{DC}, and omitted alpha-heating power. Genuine cohomological MHD operates strictly on 3D toroidal domains Ω via relative de Rham cohomology $H^1_{\text{dR}}(\Omega), H^2_{\text{dR}}(\Omega, \partial\Omega)$, Hodge–Helmholtz Beltrami equilibria $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mu \mathbf{B}$, and Berger–Field relative magnetic helicity $H_R = \int (\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}_p) \cdot (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_p) \, d^3x$ [10].
- **Toroidal cantori turnstiles vs. genus-3 hyperbolic geodesics [7]:** In [7], flat translation surfaces from interval-exchange maps have zero Lyapunov exponent (Katok 1980), Eskin–Mirzakhani–Mohammadi orbit closures live in moduli space $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$ rather than physical reactor space (Kerckhoff–Masur–Smillie guarantees hitting absorbing walls), a genus-3 vessel forces magnetic nulls ($\chi = -4$) driving loss-cone and plasmoid reconnection losses, primitive geodesics on T^2 grow quadratically ($\propto L^2$, not L^0), Eq. (14) inverted survival and escape probabilities, the toy map Eq. (47) was non-symplectic ($\det J \neq 1$), and REBCO engineering current density is $J_e \approx 1\text{–}2 \times 10^3 \, \mathrm{A/mm^2}$ (not $> 10^5 \, \mathrm{A/mm^2}$). Transport suppression in 3D fusion devices is rigorously governed by **symplectic cantori turnstile flux minimization** (MacKay–Meiss–Percival) on T^2 flux surfaces and quasi-isodynamic stellarator optimization (DESC/SIMSOPT).
- **Broadband ICF two-plasmon decay and synchrotron wall design [4]:** Ignition requires $P_\alpha = \frac{1}{5} P_{\text{fus}} > P_{\text{loss}}$ (80% neutron escape). Because no dielectric photonic bandgap exists at 1–20 keV bremsstrahlung X-rays, viable photonic fusion engineering targets (a) broadband laser suppression of two-plasmon decay with $\gamma_{\text{eff}} \sim \gamma_0^2 / \Delta\omega$ ($\Delta\omega/\omega_0 \gtrsim 1$–2%, fixing the dimensionally invalid $I(\omega)/I_{\text{th}}$ in Eq. 6 of [4]), and (b) adjoint Maxwell sensitivity $\delta Q / \delta \epsilon = 2 \, \mathrm{Re}(\mathbf{E}_{\text{adj}} \cdot \mathbf{E})$ for 100–1000 GHz synchrotron metallic reflectors.

(4) Celestial mechanics and observational exclusion of distant solar companions. In [8], Kepler's third law omitted the cube on a, misidentified relative $a = a_1 + a_2$ as barycentric a_s, miscalculated the orbital period at $a = 3.0 \times 10^4$ AU ($m_s = 0.1 \, M_\odot$) as 1.6×10^9 yr instead of $P = 4.95 \times 10^6$ yr (a 320× error), and claimed HD 186302 ($184 \, \mathrm{ly} = 56.4 \, \mathrm{pc} = 1.16 \times 10^7$ AU) could remain gravitationally bound to the Sun. Applying Eq. (6), the Milky Way Jacobi tidal radius at the solar circle is $r_J \approx 1.7$–$2.1 \, \mathrm{pc}$: Galactic tides overwhelm Sun–HD 186302 gravity by $(56.4/1.9)^3 \approx 26{,}000\times$, and Gaia DR3 kinematics ($v_{\text{rel}} \approx 50 \, \mathrm{km/s}$ vs. $v_{\text{esc}} \approx 17 \, \mathrm{m/s}$) confirm HD 186302 is an *unbound solar sibling* from a dissolved birth cluster [11], not a binary companion. Furthermore, WISE [12] and Gaia DR3 exclude 100% of the $[0.01, 0.5] \, M_\odot \times [10^4, 10^5]$ AU grid simulated in [8]. Viable studies split cleanly into Gaia DR3 6D orbital traceback plus chemical tagging for unbound siblings, and REBOUND/IAS15 + LSST/NEO Surveyor searches for sub-Saturn or super-Earth outer-solar-system perturbers.

$$\Delta t(\nu, z) = K_{\text{DM}} \left[\mathrm{DM}_{\text{MW}} + \frac{\mathrm{DM}_{\text{host}}}{1+z} + \mathrm{DM}_{\text{IGM}}(z) \right] \nu^{-2} + \frac{m_{\gamma,\text{eff}}^2}{2\hbar^2 (2\pi\nu)^2} \int_0^z \frac{c \, dz'}{H(z')(1+z')^2}, \tag{5}$$

$$a^3 = \frac{G(M_\odot + m_s)}{4\pi^2} P^2, \qquad r_J = \left[\frac{G(M_\odot + m_s)}{4A(A-B)} \right]^{1/3} \approx 1.7\text{–}2.1 \, \mathrm{pc}, \qquad \frac{E_{\text{kin}}}{|E_{\text{grav}}|} \sim 8 \times 10^6 \;\; (\text{HD } 186302). \tag{6}$$

(5) Quantitative synthesis across astrophysical, fusion, and planetary domains. Table 1 summarizes the repaired equations and empirical constraints across [1–8].

Table 1. Corrected mathematical models and empirical constraints across cosmic gas kinetics, fusion confinement, and solar-companion dynamics.

Domain / Works	Corrected Theoretical Result	Quantitative Benchmark	Observational / Code Probe
Cosmic Gas & Photons [2, 3]	$\mathrm{Re}\,\Sigma \sim g^2 m_\phi^2 \sigma_\phi^2$; Itô factor $1/2$; Jeans $(-)$	FRB $g \lesssim 0.4 \, \mathrm{GeV}^{-1}$; MICROSCOPE 10^{-22}	CHIME/ASKAP Eq. (5) + XRISM
Kinetic Closure [1, 6]	Weighted $g = M^{-1/2} f$; $1 \gg a \gg b \gg c$; $T > T_c$	Hermite cascade $E_m \propto m^{-1/2}$; $\kappa = h/(2m_n)$	Kanekar benchmark / Vela glitch
Fusion MHD & ICF [4, 5, 7]	3D Berger–Field H_R; cantori; $\gamma_{\text{eff}} \sim \gamma_0^2/\Delta\omega$	WEST 1,337 s; EAST 1,066 s; REBCO $J_e \sim 1\text{–}2 \, \mathrm{kA/mm^2}$	DESC/SIMSOPT + LPSE broadband
Solar Companions [8]	$P(3 \times 10^4 \, \mathrm{AU}) = 4.95 \, \mathrm{Myr}$; $r_J \approx 1.9 \, \mathrm{pc}$	WISE rules out $\geq M_{\text{Jup}}$ to 2.6×10^4 AU	Gaia DR3 + Rubin LSST / NEO Surv.

(6) Request to Astrophysics, Fusion, and Planetary Communities, and Conclusion. We ask FRB and X-ray teams to apply the $(1+z)^{-2}$ template (Eq. 5) to localized CHIME/ASKAP bursts and test ICM thermalization times with XRISM; plasma theorists to benchmark the symmetrized closure (Eqs. 3–4) and symplectic cantori turnstiles in stellarator optimization; and outer-solar-system surveys to separate unbound chemical-tagging siblings from Rubin-accessible sub-planetary perturbers. Resolving the unweighted-L^2, dimensional, topological, and orbital discrepancies in [1–8] yields a cohesive, empirically falsifiable program across all three communities.

References

[1] P. De Ceuster, *Applying Villani to understand Cosmic Gas: Kinetics for Classical and Quantum Gas Dynamics: On the Emergence of Quantum Turbulence in Cosmic Media*, Zenodo (2025), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17070538.

[2] P. De Ceuster, *On the riddle of Cosmic Gas: Photon Propagation in a Stochastic Modulus Background: A Testable Effective Field Theory*, Zenodo (2026), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18188599.

[3] P. De Ceuster, *Hypocoercivity and the Cosmic Gas: A study of unobserved law and Cédric Villani's Methods in Astrophysical Kinetics*, Zenodo (2026), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18205954.

[4] P. De Ceuster, *Solutions for Photonic Approaches to Fusion Energy*, Zenodo (2025), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17070091.

[5] P. De Ceuster, *Solving Fusion Energy through Cohomological Magnetohydrodynamics*, Zenodo (2025), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17704390.

[6] P. De Ceuster, *On prolonged fusion energy: Hypocoercive Closure for a Kinetic Langevin Model with Stochastic Forcing*, Zenodo (2025), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17958946.

[7] P. De Ceuster, *Fusion Advances: On the Mirzakhani Manifold and Moduli Space Dynamics as a Geometric Ansatz for Transport Suppression in Magnetic Confinement*, Zenodo (2025), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17971261.

[8] P. De Ceuster, *Kinematics of the Sol–Soror Binary: The Gravitational Bond and the Twin Sister's Cycle*, Zenodo (2025), https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17299800.

[9] A. Kanekar, A. A. Schekochihin, W. Dorland, and N. F. Loureiro, J. Plasma Phys. 81, 305810104 (2015).

[10] M. A. Berger and G. B. Field, J. Fluid Mech. 147, 133–148 (1984); R. S. MacKay, J. D. Meiss, and I. C. Percival, Physica D 13, 55–81 (1984).

[11] V. Adibekyan *et al.*, *The AMBRE project: searching for the closest solar siblings*, Astron. Astrophys. 619, A130 (2018).

[12] K. L. Luhman, *A Search for a Distant Companion to the Sun with the Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer*, Astrophys. J. 781, 4 (2014).