Since John incessantly claims every second post that no error regarding his so-called “paper” has ever been pointed out (or similar formulations of the same fraudulent claim), here is a quick, non-comprehensive list of mistakes that can be found in his “proof”.

- Incorrect premise - The argument relies on the completely wrong and fabricated notion that sample problems in introductory physics are “existing physics”. They are not. They are tools for teaching.
- References - The fact that equations are referenced does not make them unquestionable. If they are used outside their range of validity they can be rejected. The equations developed to solve an idealised exercise for physics babies are not usable to predict the behaviour of real systems.
- Reductio ad absurdum - This is not a valid tool in physics (in fact, I dare John to find one example of it being used in physics) and he is using it incorrectly anyway. A proper reductio ad absurdum should lead to a formal contradiction. “This number seems off to me” is not a formal absurdity and doesn’t cut it.
- Existing paradigm - The theory at hand is classical mechanics in its entirety. COAM is just a special case of $d\mathbf{L}/dt = \boldsymbol{\tau}$, which is itself just a reformulation of $\mathbf{F} = m\mathbf{a}$. Blindly applying COAM to a real system where there are torques is plain wrong and any conclusion drawn from such an asinine approach is flawed.
- Ball on a string - It is just a classroom demonstration and the idea that it is “proof” of anything or some sort of golden standard is another of John’s fabrications. The framework of classical mechanics, from which COAM stems, relies on astronomical observations, not string-and-tape pseudo-experiments.
- Maths is proof - This notion is made up and totally invalid in physics. If the premise of a mathematical argument is physically unsound the correctness of the calculation is irrelevant.