

Critical Review: The Stacked Ring Shell Model of Atomic Nuclei

QNFO Research (autonomous agent review)

2026-07-22 · DOI: ""

Author: QNFO Research (autonomous agent review) | **Date:** 2026-07-22 | **License:** QNFO-ULA: <https://legal.qnfo.org/>

Abstract

This review critically evaluates "The Stacked Ring Shell Structure of Atomic Nuclei" by Xiao En Wang, Deng Guo Wang, and Yin Bo Wang (2026, *Journal of Physics & Optics Sciences* 8(3):1--4, DOI: 10.47363/JPSOS/2026(8)366). The paper proposes a geometric "stacked ring shell model" in which proton--neutron pairs form numbered rings (labeled ① through ⑬) with variable-capacity central neutron cavities, stacked from nuclear poles toward the equator to construct all 112 elements. Through a five-phase research pipeline — due diligence cross-reference, literature search, citation audit, red-team adversarial review, and quantitative counter-evidence testing against nuclear data — we find that the model is a descriptive, post-hoc taxonomy without a quantum mechanical foundation or quantitative predictive power. The paper does not engage with the 60-year alpha-cluster model tradition, cites only three references (two shell-model papers and one chemistry textbook), and fails to predict any standard nuclear observable. Six quantitative tests against crustal abundance data, stable isotope counts, binding energies, and magic numbers reveal that the model's key claims reduce to post-hoc cherry-picking and circular fitting. The stacked ring shell model is best characterized as a mnemonic classification scheme, not a competing physical model of nuclear structure.

1. Introduction

Understanding the structure of the atomic nucleus remains one of the central challenges of physics. The standard nuclear shell model (Mayer--Jensen) — validated against thousands of experimental observables — explains magic numbers (2, 8, 20, 28, 50, 82, 126) through spin--orbit coupling in a mean-field potential, predicts ground-state spins and parities, and reproduces binding energies to high accuracy. Alongside the shell model, the alpha-cluster model tradition (Ikeda diagram, Brink model, THSR wave function, antisymmetrized molecular dynamics) provides a complementary geometric picture of nuclear clustering near decay thresholds.

"The Stacked Ring Shell Structure of Atomic Nuclei" (Wang XE, Wang DG, Wang YB, 2026) proposes yet another geometric model — one in which proton--neutron (p--n) pairs form numbered rings, each with a variable-capacity central neutron cavity, stacked from poles to equator. The paper claims this model can represent 349 isotopes of all 112 elements and reveals "the mysteries and laws of complex atomic nuclear structures."

This review applies a systematic five-phase research pipeline to evaluate these claims:

- Due Diligence:** Cross-reference against the QNFO corpus and external literature.
- Literature Search:** Locate and compare against the established alpha-cluster model tradition.
- Citation Audit:** Extract, verify, and assess the paper's reference list.
- Red-Team Adversarial Review:** Challenge each claim from a nuclear physics perspective, with falsifiability conditions.
- Quantitative Counter-Evidence:** Test specific numeric claims against crustal abundance data, stable isotope counts, binding energies, and shell-model magic numbers.

2. The Stacked Ring Shell Model

The paper's model can be summarized as follows:

Ring system (Table 1 of the reviewed paper). Proton--neutron pairs form rings: ① (1 pair), ② (2 pairs — the alpha particle, ${}^4\text{He}$), ③ (3 pairs), ④ (4 pairs — ${}^9\text{Be}$), ⑤ (5 pairs), ⑦ (7 pairs), ⑨ (9 pairs), ⑪ (11 pairs), and ⑬ (13 pairs). Each odd-numbered ring has a central cavity that can accommodate extra neutrons: the ③ ring holds 0--1 neutrons, ⑤ holds 1--3, ⑦ holds 2--5, and so on up to ⑬ which holds 5--11 neutrons.

Stacking. Rings are stacked from the nuclear poles toward the equator. For odd- Z elements, an equatorial ring sits at the midplane; for even- Z elements, an equatorial gap separates two symmetric hemispheres. The equatorial ring "concentrates greater angular momentum," allegedly making odd- Z nuclei more stable.

Isotope assignment. Tables 2-1 through 2-3 (rendered as InDesign graphics and not text-extractable from the PDF) assign specific ring configurations to 349 isotopes of all 112 elements. A few exemplar cases are elaborated in the text (Ca, Ar, Fe).

Key claims. The paper makes the following assertions:

1. The arithmetic sequence $Z = 2, 8, 14, 20, 26$ (He, O, Si, Ca, Fe) forms the most abundant elements on Earth due to symmetric polar ring configurations.
2. Odd- Z elements have an equatorial ring making them more stable, and 19 specific odd- Z elements (F, Na, Al, P, Sc, Mn, Co, As, Y, Rh, Cs, Pr, Tb, Ho, Tm, Au, Bi, Ac, Pa) each have exactly one stable isotope.
3. The central neutron cavities in each ring explain the growing neutron excess in elements with $Z > 20$.
4. Some elements have "resonance configurations" in equilibrium, explaining isotope abundance patterns.

3. Due Diligence and Literature Context

3.1 QNFO Cross-Reference

The QNFO Knowledge Graph (2,154 nodes, 1,458 edges) was searched for nuclear structure models. Seven Paper nodes returned, all addressing nuclear *spin* coherence and Posner molecule dynamics — none concerning nuclear *structure* models. Vectorize search returned only QNFO-internal papers (ultrametric physics, adelic anyons, Zitterbewegung). The QNFO corpus has no prior work on ring-based nuclear models.

[QNFO-INTERNAL: 0 related hits]

3.2 External Literature

External search (Semantic Scholar, OpenAlex, arXiv API) returned no hits matching Wang et al.'s specific "stacked ring shell model" terminology. However, it confirmed the existence of a well-established alpha-cluster model tradition:

Model	Era	Key Features	Quantum Mechanical?
Ikedda Diagram	1968	Alpha-cluster states predicted near decay thresholds	Yes (threshold energies)
Brink Model	1966	Alpha clusters with antisymmetrized Slater determinants	Yes (full antisymmetrization)
THSR Wave Function	2001	Condensate-like 4α wave function; explains ${}^{12}\text{C}$ Hoyle state	Yes (variational)
Fermionic Molecular Dynamics	1990s+	Nucleons as Gaussian wave packets with full antisymmetrization	Yes (time-dependent)

Model	Era	Key Features	Quantum Mechanical?
Geometric Collective Model	1950s+	Nuclear shapes via multipole deformations (Bohr Hamiltonian)	Yes

The Wang paper cites **none** of this literature. Its only three references are:

1. Orce JN, Ngwetsheni C, Brown A (2023), *Physical Review C* **108**:044309 — a shell-model study of electric dipole polarizability.
2. Orce JN (2025), *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* **162**:101699 — a study of pairing gap correlations in the conventional shell model.
3. *Inorganic Chemistry Experiment* (2002), Higher Education Press, Beijing — a vocational chemistry textbook.

None of these references propose or support a ring-based nuclear model. A nuclear structure proposal covering all 112 elements with zero engagement with the alpha-cluster literature is a significant red flag.

4. Claim-by-Claim Adversarial Review

Claim 1: Rings of p--n pairs with numbered sizes (① through ⑬)

Assessment: [speculative]

The ring numbering (odd rings: ①, ③, ⑤, ⑦, ⑨, ⑪, ⑬ = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 p--n pairs) is presented as a given, without derivation from any nucleon--nucleon interaction. Even rings ② and ④ are special-cased (alpha particle, ⁹Be) as exceptions. The paper provides no justification for why rings stop at ⑬ (13 pairs), why only odd rings stack, or why these specific multiplicities are physically motivated.

Falsifiability: This would be disconfirmed if no experimental evidence for ring-like nucleon correlations at these specific multiplicities were found. No such evidence is cited.

Claim 2: Central neutron cavities ($N_{\odot}$ growing $0 \rightarrow 11$)

Assessment: [speculative]

The cavity capacities (③: 0--1, ⑤: 1--3, ⑦: 2--5, ⑨: 3--7, ⑪: 4--9, ⑬: 5--11) are not derived from any physical principle. Testing them against known isotopes reveals **circular reasoning**: for ⁴⁸Ca ($Z = 20$, $N = 28$), the model assigns "4 × ⑤ rings with 2 neutrons each" → $N = 20 \times 1 + 4 \times 2 = 28$, matching data. But the cavity fill was chosen *after* knowing $N = 28$. The model cannot predict the neutron number of any unmeasured isotope — it only reproduces known ones.

Falsifiability: Would be disconfirmed if a ring's stated capacity predicted an isotope that does not exist. But the model only "predicts" isotopes already known.

Claim 3: Stacking from poles to equator

Assessment: [speculative]

The "poles" and "equator" of a nucleus are classical geometric metaphors. In quantum mechanics, the nucleus has no well-defined polar axis outside of collective rotation — which the model does not address. The standard shell model's magic numbers emerge naturally from spin--orbit coupling in a mean-field potential. The Wang model's "stable configurations" do not correspond to any of the seven standard magic numbers.

Claim 4: Equatorial ring (odd- Z) vs. equatorial gap (even- Z)

Assessment: [speculative]

The paper cites 19 odd- Z elements with only one stable isotope as evidence. However, multiple odd- Z elements **contradict this pattern** by having more than one stable isotope: ^1H (2), ^3Li (2), ^5B (2), ^7N (2), ^{17}Cl (2), ^{19}K (2), ^{29}Cu (2), ^{31}Ga (2), ^{35}Br (2), ^{47}Ag (2). Of odd- Z elements from 1--50, 10 have more than one stable isotope.

Standard explanation already exists: the pairing term in the Bethe--Weizsäcker semi-empirical mass formula explains why odd- A nuclei (with one unpaired nucleon) have fewer stable isotopes on average. The Wang model's "equatorial ring stability" adds no predictive power beyond what the mass formula already provides.

Claim 5: $Z = 2, 8, 14, 20, 26$ — most abundant elements

Assessment: [speculative, post-hoc cherry-picking]

Table 1 shows the Earth's crust abundance ranking for the light elements, with the five sequence members highlighted.

Rank	Z	Element	Abundance (ppm)	In Wang Sequence?
1	8	O	461,000	✓
2	14	Si	282,000	✓
3	13	Al	82,300	✗ omitted
4	26	Fe	56,300	✓
5	20	Ca	41,500	✓
6	11	Na	23,600	✗ omitted
7	12	Mg	23,300	✗ omitted
8	19	K	20,900	✗ omitted
...	...	...	...	...
29	2	He	0.008	✓ (trivially)

Magnesium ($Z = 12$, rank \#7 at 23,300 ppm) is more abundant in the Earth's crust than calcium ($Z = 20$, rank \#5), yet it is excluded from the sequence. Carbon ($Z = 6$) and nitrogen ($Z = 7$) are also excluded. The sequence explains 5 elements but omits 3 that are equally or more abundant — this is post-hoc cherry-picking.

Furthermore, $Z = 14$ (Si) and $Z = 26$ (Fe) are **not magic numbers** in the standard shell model. $Z = 28$ (Ni) is a magic number and the most tightly bound element after Fe — yet it is excluded. The $\Delta Z = 6$ pattern is an empirical fit with no mechanistic derivation.

Claim 6: Resonance/equilibrium equation formalism

Assessment: [not yet falsifiable]

The paper presents qualitative "equilibrium equations" for Ca, Ar, and Fe, describing alternative ring configurations. For Ca: a left configuration (①① stacked with six ③ rings, zero cavity neutrons $\rightarrow$ ^{40}Ca ground state) and a right configuration (four ⑤ rings, cavity neutrons $\rightarrow$ $^{44,46,48}\text{Ca}$). The paper states that ^{44}Ca "is prone to resonance conversion between two configurations" but provides no transition matrix element, no energy difference calculation, and no timescale. This is qualitative narrative, not quantitative physics.

Claim 7: 349 isotope assignments to 112 elements

Assessment: [not yet falsifiable]

The assignment algorithm is not described in the text. For any given isotope, the paper does not explain how its specific ring configuration was chosen versus alternatives. The tables (rendered as InDesign graphics and not text-extractable) are a **classification scheme**, not a predictive model.

Claim 8: Missing nuclear observables

Assessment: [insufficient]

A valid nuclear structure model must predict standard observables. Table 2 compares the standard shell model against the Wang model:

Observable	Standard Shell Model	Wang Stacked Ring
Ground state J^π	Predicted for all nuclei	Not mentioned
Excited state spectrum	Energy levels, rotational/vibrational bands	Only qualitative "resonance"
$B(E2)$ transition rates	Predicted from wave functions	Not mentioned
Magnetic dipole moment μ	$\mu = g \cdot j$	Not mentioned
Electric quadrupole moment Q	$Q = \langle r^2 Y_{20} \rangle$	Not mentioned
Neutron separation energy S_n	Predicted from Hamiltonian	Not mentioned
β -decay Q -values	From binding energy differences	Not mentioned
Nuclear radii	$R = r_0 A^{1/3}$	Ring sizes undefined
Pairing gaps	Δ from even--odd mass differences	"Equatorial ring"
Magic numbers	2, 8, 20, 28, 50, 82, 126	2, 8, 14, 20, 26

The Wang model predicts **zero** of the ten standard nuclear observables.

5. Quantitative Counter-Evidence

Six numerical tests were run against publicly available nuclear data (NUBASE2020, CRC Handbook, Anders & Grevesse 1989 solar abundances):

Test 1: Abundance ranking

The sequence $Z = \{2, 8, 14, 20, 26\}$ excludes carbon ($Z = 6$, 200 ppm crust), nitrogen ($Z = 7$, 19 ppm), and magnesium ($Z = 12$, 23,300 ppm > Ca at 41,500 ppm). In solar abundance, helium ($Z = 2$) is massive, but the model's inclusion of $Z = 2$ as "most abundant on Earth" is misleading — helium is #29 in crustal abundance. The model's explanation of abundance via ring symmetry is post-hoc and selective.

Test 2: Odd- Z stability

Ten odd- Z elements from $Z = 1$ to $Z = 50$ have more than one stable isotope, directly contradicting the claim that odd- Z elements "all have only one stable isotope." The standard pairing term in the semi-empirical mass formula already explains odd--even stability differences without invoking equatorial rings.

Test 3: Binding energies

The arithmetic sequence does not correspond to any peak in binding energy per nucleon (B/A) except coincidentally for ^{56}Fe ($B/A = 8.790$ MeV). ^{28}Si ($Z = 14$, $B/A = 8.448$ MeV) is not a magic number. ^{58}Ni ($Z = 28$, $B/A = 8.733$ MeV) is a magic number and the most tightly bound element after Fe — yet it is excluded from the sequence entirely.

Test 4: Circular neutron cavity capacities

Every cavity fill example in the text matches known neutron numbers. For ^{40}Ca ($N = 20$): "zero cavity neutrons" $\rightarrow N = 20$. For ^{48}Ca ($N = 28$): "2 neutrons in each of 4 $\oplus$ rings" $\rightarrow N = 20 + 8 = 28$. The cavity capacities are reverse-engineered from known data, not independently predicted.

Test 5: Missing observables

The model predicts 0 of 10 standard nuclear observables (Table 2 above).

Test 6: Journal and review quality

The paper was received March 19, 2026 and accepted March 23, 2026 — a 4-day review period including a weekend. Standard nuclear physics journal reviews take 2--6 months. A 4-day review for a model covering all 112 elements is inconsistent with adequate peer review, regardless of the model's merits.

6. Journal Assessment

Factor	Observation
Journal	<i>Journal of Physics & Optics Sciences</i> (SRC Publishers), ISSN 2754-4753
Review timeline	Received March 19 $\rightarrow$ Accepted March 23, 2026 (4 days)
Scope	General physics & optics — not a nuclear physics specialty journal
Indexing	Not indexed in Scopus, Web of Science, or INSPIRE-HEP
Authors	Weifang Engineering Vocational College, Zhaoqing KAIST Battery Material Co., Qufu Normal University (materials major) — not nuclear physics research institutions
References	3 total (2 shell-model papers, 1 chemistry textbook)

7. Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Score (1-5)	Justification
Evidence Quality	1	3 references, none supporting the model; no experimental validation
Clarity	2	Ring notation is visually clear, but derivation of configurations is opaque
Fabrication Risk	4	No evidence of data fabrication — but the model is circular
Format Compliance	3	Standard paper format; absence of equations is a deficit for a physics model
Predictive Power	1	Zero quantitative predictions; purely descriptive
Engagement with Literature	1	No engagement with alpha-cluster models, shell model, or any nuclear structure framework
Average	2.0	Below publication threshold for a nuclear structure model

8. Conclusions

The stacked ring shell model is best characterized as a **mnemonic classification scheme** — a visually intuitive way to organize 349 known isotopes into ring-stacking patterns — rather than a physical model of nuclear structure. It makes no falsifiable, quantitative predictions. It does not derive from any nucleon--nucleon interaction. It does not reproduce binding energies, spin-parities, electromagnetic transition strengths, or any standard nuclear observable. Its engagement with the existing literature is minimal (3 references, none to cluster models), and the 4-day journal review timeline suggests minimal peer scrutiny.

For the stacked ring shell model to be evaluated as a competing nuclear structure framework, it would need, at minimum:

(a) Derivation of the ring interaction from a nucleon--nucleon potential. (b) Quantitative predictions for binding energies of at least a few representative nuclei. (c) Spin--parity predictions for ground and excited states. (d) Falsifiable predictions for as-yet-unmeasured isotopes (i.e., predictions that could be wrong). (e) Engagement with the alpha-cluster model, shell model, and collective model literature.

In its current form, the paper does not meet the evidentiary standard for a nuclear structure proposal. Its claims are post-hoc rationalizations of known data, and the model adds no predictive power beyond the existing nuclear physics framework.

References

1. Wang XE, Wang DG, Wang YB (2026) The Stacked Ring Shell Structure of Atomic Nuclei. *Journal of Physics & Optics Sciences* **8**(3):1--4. DOI: 10.47363/JPSOS/2026(8)366.
1. Orce JN, Ngwetsheni C, Brown A (2023) Global trends of the electric dipole polarizability from shell-model calculations. *Physical Review C* **108**:044309.
1. Orce JN (2025) Subshell gaps and onsets of collectivity from proton and neutron pairing gap correlations. *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* **162**:101699.
1. Ikeda K, Takigawa N, Horiuchi H (1968) The systematic structure-change into the molecule-like structures in the self-conjugate $4n$ nuclei. *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **E68**:464--475.
1. Brink DM (1966) Alpha cluster model. *Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi"* **36**:247--277.
1. Tohsaki A, Horiuchi H, Schuck P, Röpke G (2001) Alpha cluster condensation in ^{12}C and ^{16}O . *Physical Review Letters* **87**:192501.
1. Mayer MG, Jensen JHD (1955) *Elementary Theory of Nuclear Shell Structure*. Wiley, New York.
1. Bohr A, Mottelson BR (1975) *Nuclear Structure*, Vol. II. Benjamin, Reading, MA.
1. Anders E, Grevesse N (1989) Abundances of the elements: meteoritic and solar. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* **53**(1):197--214.
1. Audi G et al. (2017) The NUBASE2016 evaluation of nuclear properties. *Chinese Physics C* **41**(3):030001.