

Addendum P139

Charm, Bottom, and Continuum Contributions
to the Hadronic Vacuum Polarisation:
Sector Decomposition of $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(M_Z^2)$

Léon Fernando Vlegels

Independent Researcher axiomofchoicepuzzle@gmail.com

14 May 2026

Abstract

Addenda P136 and P137 derived the hadronic vacuum polarisation from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ spectral masses, establishing that the three light vector mesons (ρ , ω , ϕ) account for $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{lm}} \in [3.731, 4.522] \times 10^{-3}$ and bracket the Fermi route target 0.00411 from both sides. Two sectors were flagged as open: the J/ψ and Υ resonances, whose PDG-anchored entries in the P136 table rested on the admission that the J_2 -sector Peirce-weight formula predicts $f_{J/\psi}^2 = 9\pi/\text{MU}^2 = 44.9$, a factor 2.78 below the PDG value 124.5. This addendum closes those open items. We show that the factor-2.78 discrepancy is the expected signature of the NLO QCD annihilation correction $\delta\Gamma_{ee}/\Gamma_{ee} = -16\alpha_s(m_c)/(3\pi) \approx -66\%$ at the charm scale where $\alpha_s(m_c) \approx 0.39$: the TOE Peirce-weight formula gives the algebraically correct Born-level (quenched) result; the physical leptonic width is suppressed by the large QCD dressing, which drives $f_{J/\psi}^2 = M_{J/\psi}/(C\Gamma_{ee})$ upward by the reciprocal factor. We compute the J/ψ , $\psi(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S)$ dispersive contributions using PDG decay constants, confirming the P136 table entries, and we estimate the five-flavour perturbative QCD continuum from M_Υ to M_Z . The resulting sector decomposition accounts for the full PDG value 0.02750 within the pQCD systematic uncertainty, with resonances contributing $\sim 20\%$ and the quark-level continuum $\sim 80\%$.

Contents

1	Setup: the Residual Gap After P136 and P137	2
2	The J/ψ Decay Constant: TOE Prediction and QCD Dressing	2
2.1	$f_{J/\psi}^2$ from PDG data	2
2.2	$f_{J/\psi}^2$ from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Peirce-weight formula	2
2.3	Structural origin: NLO QCD suppression of Γ_{ee}	3
3	Υ Contributions	3
4	Perturbative QCD Continuum Above the Υ	4
4.1	The five-flavour region (M_Υ to M_Z)	4
4.2	Sub- Υ continuum sectors	4
5	Sector Decomposition and Comparison to PDG	5
6	Conclusion	6
7	Open Items	6

1 Setup: the Residual Gap After P136 and P137

The hadronic contribution to the running of the fine-structure constant is defined through the dispersive relation

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(M_Z^2) = \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \int_{4m_\pi^2}^{\infty} \frac{R(s)}{s} \frac{M_Z^2}{M_Z^2 - s} ds, \quad R(s) = \frac{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons})}{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)}. \quad (1)$$

For a narrow resonance V , the NWA collapses equation (1) to the closed-form contribution

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^V = \frac{4\pi\alpha \text{Br}_{\text{had}}}{f_V^2} \cdot \frac{M_Z^2}{M_Z^2 - M_V^2}, \quad (2)$$

where the VMD decay constant satisfies $f_V^2 = 4\pi\alpha^2 M_V / (3\Gamma_{ee})$ (P108).

P136 applied equation (2) to the light neutral vector mesons with fully-derived $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ decay constants (P117–P119), finding $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{lm,NWA}} = 4.522 \times 10^{-3}$. It also listed charmonium and bottomonium contributions, but using PDG f_V^2 values because the J_2 -sector formula for charmonium gives $f_{J/\psi}^2|_{\text{TOE}} = 9\pi/\text{MU}^2 = 44.9$, which is a factor 2.78 below the PDG value 124.5 extracted from the measured leptonic width. The full NWA resonance sum, including J/ψ , $\psi(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S)$, is $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{res}} = 5.523 \times 10^{-3}$. P137 then replaced the ρ NWA entry with the Gounaris-Sakurai lineshape integral ($\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\rho,\text{GS}} = 2.943 \times 10^{-3}$), giving a GS light-meson sum of 3.731×10^{-3} and bracketing the Fermi target from below.

The PDG dispersive value is $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{PDG}} = 0.02750$. The gap between the full NWA resonance sum and the PDG total is $0.02750 - 0.00552 = 0.02198$, or 79.9% of the PDG total. This addendum addresses the gap systematically: first by resolving the $f_{J/\psi}^2$ discrepancy, then by assembling a sector-by-sector budget including the perturbative QCD continuum.

2 The J/ψ Decay Constant: TOE Prediction and QCD Dressing

2.1 $f_{J/\psi}^2$ from PDG data

The J/ψ has $M_{J/\psi} = 3.097 \text{ GeV}$, $\Gamma_{ee} = 5.55 \text{ keV}$, and $\Gamma_{\text{tot}} = 92.9 \text{ keV}$ (PDG 2024). The hadronic branching ratio is $\text{Br}(J/\psi \rightarrow \text{had}) = 1 - 2 \times (5.55/92.9) = 0.881$. By the VMD definition,

$$f_{J/\psi}^2|_{\text{PDG}} = \frac{4\pi\alpha^2 M_{J/\psi}}{3\Gamma_{ee}} = \frac{4\pi \times (1/137.036)^2 \times 3097 \text{ MeV}}{3 \times 5.55 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MeV}} = 124.5, \quad (3)$$

consistent with the P136 tabulated value 124.916. Substituting into equation (2) gives

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{J/\psi}|_{\text{PDG}} = \frac{4\pi\alpha \times 0.881}{124.5} = \frac{0.09166 \times 0.881}{124.5} = 6.47 \times 10^{-4}, \quad (4)$$

reproducing the P136 entry. The kinematic factor $M_Z^2/(M_Z^2 - M_{J/\psi}^2) = 1.00115$ contributes less than 0.12% and is negligible.

2.2 $f_{J/\psi}^2$ from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Peirce-weight formula

The $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Peirce decomposition assigns a weight $\text{MU} = \mu_1/\mu_0 = 0.79334$ to the J_2 -sector (P117). For the $\phi(1020)$, a $s\bar{s}$ state with $|Q_s| = 1/3$, P117 found $f_\phi^2 = 36\pi/\text{MU}^2 = 179.7$. Since the VMD leptonic width scales as $\Gamma_{ee} \propto Q_q^2$, the decay constant satisfies $f_V^2 \propto M_V/\Gamma_{ee} \propto 1/Q_q^2$. The J/ψ carries charm-quark charge $Q_c = +2/3$, giving $Q_c^2 = 4/9$, compared to $Q_s^2 = 1/9$ for the strange quark. The J_2 -sector formula for charmonium is therefore

$$f_{J/\psi}^2|_{\text{TOE}} = \frac{Q_s^2}{Q_c^2} f_\phi^2 = \frac{1/9}{4/9} \times \frac{36\pi}{\text{MU}^2} = \frac{9\pi}{\text{MU}^2} = \frac{9\pi}{(0.79334)^2} = 44.9. \quad (5)$$

The ratio to the PDG value is $124.5/44.9 = 2.77$, reproducing the P136 flag to within rounding.

2.3 Structural origin: NLO QCD suppression of Γ_{ee}

The Peirce-weight formula (5) is the algebraically exact Born-level prediction for a 3S_1 $c\bar{c}$ state embedded in the J_2 -sector conformal geometry. It contains no QCD loop corrections. The leptonic annihilation of a vector quarkonium state receives a leading radiative correction (van Royen-Weisskopf formula at NLO in QCD):

$$\Gamma_{ee}^{\text{NLO}} = \Gamma_{ee}^{\text{LO}} \left(1 - \frac{16\alpha_s(m_c)}{3\pi} + O(\alpha_s^2) \right). \quad (6)$$

The charm mass from the TOE (P84, Proposition 1) is $m_c = 1287 \text{ MeV}$, within 1.3% of the PDG value 1270 MeV . Running the P106 value $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1186$ down to the charm scale using three-loop QCD gives $\alpha_s(m_c) \approx 0.39$. Substituting into equation (6):

$$\frac{16\alpha_s(m_c)}{3\pi} \approx \frac{16 \times 0.39}{9.425} = 0.663. \quad (7)$$

The NLO correction is -66% of the leading-order leptonic width. Since $f_{J/\psi}^2 \propto 1/\Gamma_{ee}$, this suppression of Γ_{ee} induces an enhancement of $f_{J/\psi}^2$:

$$\frac{f_{J/\psi}^2|_{\text{physical}}}{f_{J/\psi}^2|_{\text{TOE}}} \approx \frac{1}{1 - 16\alpha_s(m_c)/(3\pi)} = \frac{1}{1 - 0.663} = 2.97. \quad (8)$$

This is consistent with the empirical ratio 2.77: the $\sim 7\%$ residual is within the $O(\alpha_s^2)$ corrections and the relativistic $v^2/c^2 \sim 0.25$ corrections to the non-relativistic wavefunction at the origin. The qualitative conclusion is unambiguous. The factor-2.78 tension is not a failure of the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ geometric formula. It is the expected consequence of a strong coupling $\alpha_s(m_c) \approx 0.39$ that is large enough to make the NLO correction comparable to the LO result. The TOE Peirce-weight formula gives the correct conformal skeleton; QCD dressing at the charm scale inflates the physical $f_{J/\psi}^2$ by the observed factor.

A self-consistency check comes from the Υ . At the bottom scale $\alpha_s(m_b) \approx 0.22$, so $16\alpha_s/(3\pi) \approx 0.37$, predicting a correction factor $\sim 1/(1 - 0.37) \approx 1.59$. One therefore expects the third-generation Peirce-weight formula (when derived) to underpredict f_Υ^2 by a factor ~ 1.6 rather than ~ 2.8 , because α_s is smaller at the bottom scale. This is a testable structural prediction of the TOE.

The practical consequence for the HVP computation is clear. Because PDG Γ_{ee} values are used as input to equation (2), the charmonium and bottomonium entries in the P136 table are already physically correct. The factor-2.78 discrepancy lives in the wavefunction and does not propagate into $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}$ when empirical leptonic widths are the anchor.

3 Υ Contributions

The three narrow Υ resonances contribute through equation (2) with PDG leptonic widths. For $\Upsilon(1S)$: $M_\Upsilon = 9.460 \text{ GeV}$, $\Gamma_{ee} = 1.340 \text{ keV}$, $\Gamma_{\text{tot}} = 54.02 \text{ keV}$, $\text{Br}_{\text{had}} = 1 - 2 \times (1.340/54.02) = 0.950$ (using equal leptonic partial widths approximation; PDG gives 0.965 when muonic and tauonic modes are separately accounted). Using the PDG hadronic branching ratio directly,

$$f_{\Upsilon(1S)}^2|_{\text{PDG}} = \frac{4\pi\alpha^2 \times 9460 \text{ MeV}}{3 \times 1.340 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MeV}} = 1575, \quad (9)$$

and the NWA contribution is

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\Upsilon(1S)} = \frac{4\pi\alpha \times 0.965}{1575} = \frac{0.09166 \times 0.965}{1575} = 5.62 \times 10^{-5}. \quad (10)$$

Table 1: $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S)$ contributions to $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(M_Z^2)$ via equation (2) with PDG inputs. Br_{had} from PDG 2024. The kinematic factor $M_Z^2/(M_Z^2 - M_V^2)$ differs from unity by less than 0.15% for all three states and is absorbed into the quoted values.

State	M_V (GeV)	Γ_{ee} (keV)	f_V^2	Br_{had}	$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^V$
$\Upsilon(1S)$	9.460	1.340	1575	0.965	5.62×10^{-5}
$\Upsilon(2S)$	10.023	0.612	3652	0.962	2.41×10^{-5}
$\Upsilon(3S)$	10.355	0.443	5211	0.957	1.68×10^{-5}
$\Upsilon \text{ sum}$					9.71×10^{-5}

Table 1 lists all three states.

The Υ contributions are strongly suppressed by the larger f_V^2 values at the bottom scale: the Upsilon tower contributes 9.71×10^{-5} , approximately 1.8% of the J/ψ contribution (6.47×10^{-4}) and 0.35% of the PDG $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}$. The three-resonance sum agrees with the P136 table entries to within rounding, confirming that those PDG-anchored values are correct.

4 Perturbative QCD Continuum Above the Υ

4.1 The five-flavour region (M_Υ to M_Z)

Above the open-bottom threshold and above the Υ resonances, the hadronic $R(s)$ is well described by five-flavour perturbative QCD,

$$R_5(s) = N_c \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} Q_q^2 \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_s(s)}{\pi} + \dots \right) = \frac{11}{3} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_s(s)}{\pi} + \dots \right). \quad (11)$$

The charge sum $\sum Q_q^2 = 4/9 + 1/9 + 1/9 + 4/9 + 1/9 = 11/9$ with $N_c = 3$. With $\bar{\alpha}_s \approx 0.15$ averaged over $\sqrt{s} \in [M_\Upsilon, M_Z]$ (running from $\alpha_s(m_b) \approx 0.22$ to $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1186$ from P106), the NLO-improved ratio is $R_5^{\text{NLO}} \approx 3.667 \times 1.048 = 3.84$.

Approximating $M_Z^2/(M_Z^2 - s) \approx 1$ over the range $\sqrt{s} \in [M_\Upsilon, 0.95 M_Z]$ where the approximation holds to better than 50% (the Z-pole itself is excluded from the hadronic dispersive integral),

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{cont},5f} \approx \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} R_5^{\text{NLO}} \ln \frac{M_Z^2}{M_\Upsilon^2}. \quad (12)$$

With $\alpha/(3\pi) = 7.74 \times 10^{-4}$ and $\ln(M_Z^2/M_\Upsilon^2) = 2 \ln(91.19/9.460) = 4.532$:

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{cont},5f} \approx 7.74 \times 10^{-4} \times 3.84 \times 4.532 = 1.35 \times 10^{-2}. \quad (13)$$

Including the kinematic enhancement from $M_Z^2/(M_Z^2 - s)$ (which grows from 1.01 at $\sqrt{s} = M_\Upsilon$ to ~ 3 at $\sqrt{s} = 0.95 M_Z$, averaging ~ 1.1 over most of the range), the corrected estimate is $\sim 1.49 \times 10^{-2}$, with a systematic uncertainty of $\sim 20\%$ from the ambiguity in the upper cutoff and the pQCD matching scale.

4.2 Sub- Υ continuum sectors

Between the J/ψ family and the Υ (approximately 3.7–10.5 GeV), open-charm and open-bottom meson pair production contributes through the four-flavour R ratio. With $R_4 = (10/3)(1 + \alpha_s/\pi) \approx 3.57$ at $\bar{\alpha}_s \approx 0.22$:

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{cont},4f} \approx \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \times 3.57 \times \ln \frac{(10.5 \text{ GeV})^2}{(3.7 \text{ GeV})^2} = 7.74 \times 10^{-4} \times 3.57 \times 1.878 \approx 5.2 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (14)$$

Below the open-charm threshold, from the end of the ρ -dominated region (~ 1 GeV) to the J/ψ , the three-flavour continuum ($R_3 = 2$, light quarks u, d, s) contributes:

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{\text{cont},3f} \approx \frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \times 2 \times \ln \frac{(3.7 \text{ GeV})^2}{(1 \text{ GeV})^2} = 7.74 \times 10^{-4} \times 2 \times 2.634 \approx 4.1 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (15)$$

These pQCD estimates carry $\sim 25\%$ systematic uncertainty: neither region is purely perturbative (the open-charm threshold has significant D -meson resonance structure; the 1–2 GeV range is where data-driven and pQCD methods diverge most). Nevertheless, both estimates are consistent in sign and order of magnitude with the data-driven dispersive calculation used by the PDG.

5 Sector Decomposition and Comparison to PDG

Table 2 assembles the complete $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(M_Z^2)$ budget.

Table 2: Sector decomposition of $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(M_Z^2)$. Resonance entries use equation (2) (NWA). Light-meson f_V^2 are TOE-native (P117–P119); heavy-quarkonium f_V^2 are PDG-anchored (see Section 2). Continuum entries are pQCD estimates with ~ 20 – 25% systematic uncertainty.

Sector	Source	Contribution	Fraction of PDG
$\rho(770)$ NWA	TOE (P119)	3.735×10^{-3}	13.6%
$\omega(782)$ NWA	TOE (P118)	2.810×10^{-4}	1.0%
$\phi(1020)$ NWA	TOE (P117)	5.073×10^{-4}	1.8%
J/ψ NWA	PDG-anchored	6.47×10^{-4}	2.4%
$\psi(2S)$ NWA	PDG-anchored	2.55×10^{-4}	0.9%
$\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S)$ NWA	PDG-anchored	9.71×10^{-5}	0.4%
<i>Resonance subtotal</i>		5.52×10^{-3}	20.1%
3f continuum (1–3.7 GeV)	pQCD ($R_3 \approx 2$)	$\sim 4.1 \times 10^{-3}$	$\sim 14.9\%$
4f continuum (3.7–10.5 GeV)	pQCD ($R_4 \approx 3.57$)	$\sim 5.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$\sim 18.9\%$
5f continuum ($M_\Upsilon - M_Z$)	pQCD ($R_5 \approx 3.84$)	$\sim 1.49 \times 10^{-2}$	$\sim 54.2\%$
<i>Continuum subtotal</i>		$\sim 2.42 \times 10^{-2}$	$\sim 88.0\%$
Total		$\sim 2.97 \times 10^{-2}$	$\sim 108\%$
PDG	Data-driven dispersion	0.02750	100%

The total 2.97×10^{-2} exceeds the PDG value by $\sim 8\%$, well within the combined systematic uncertainties of the pQCD continuum estimates (~ 20 – 25% per sector). The sector decomposition confirms the structural picture established in P136: narrow resonances account for $\sim 20\%$ of $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}$, with the ρ alone responsible for 13.6%; the quark-level continuum supplies the remaining $\sim 80\%$. This is entirely consistent with the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ discrete spectrum being a complete description of the resonance sector and having no autonomous continuum degrees of freedom between the spectral eigenvalues.

The separation between TOE-native and PDG-anchored entries is also instructive. The three light-meson contributions are fully derived from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ first principles. The heavy-quarkonium entries are PDG-anchored because the TOE Born-level formula underpredicts $f_{J/\psi}^2$ by the QCD dressing factor ~ 2.78 , which is external to the algebraic structure. The continuum contributions are pQCD estimates derived from the colour group structure and the running coupling, neither of which requires external data but which depend on the perturbative QCD framework rather than the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ spectral geometry directly. Closing all three of these dependencies from first principles is the long-range programme; the present addendum fixes the logical status of each.

6 Conclusion

The two open items flagged by P136 and P137 are resolved.

The factor-2.78 discrepancy between the TOE Peirce-weight prediction $f_{J/\psi}^2|_{\text{TOE}} = 44.9$ and the PDG value 124.5 is the expected consequence of NLO QCD suppression of the leptonic width at the charm scale. The formula $\delta\Gamma_{ee}/\Gamma_{ee} = -16\alpha_s(m_c)/(3\pi) \approx -66\%$ at $\alpha_s(m_c) \approx 0.39$ predicts an enhancement of $f_{J/\psi}^2$ by a factor ~ 2.97 , consistent with the observed 2.78 within $O(\alpha_s^2)$. The TOE Peirce-weight formula is the Born-level (quenched) result; the QCD dressing is external. Because PDG Γ_{ee} values are used as input to the dispersive formula, the charmonium and bottomonium entries in the P136 table are already correct: the factor-2.78 discrepancy does not propagate into $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}$.

The $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S)$ contributions (9.71×10^{-5} total) are small relative to the charmonium sector and are confirmed against the P136 table. The five-flavour pQCD continuum from M_Υ to M_Z contributes $\sim 1.49 \times 10^{-2}$, more than twice the entire resonance sum, and is the dominant source of the gap between the NWA resonance total (5.52×10^{-3}) and the PDG value (0.0275). Together with the sub- Υ continuum sectors, the complete budget accounts for the PDG total within the pQCD systematic uncertainty.

The Fermi route to M_W uses the discrete $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ resonance sector ($\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}} \approx 0.004\text{--}0.005$), not the full PDG dispersive value, because the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ spectral structure is discrete. The quark-level continuum, which carries $\sim 80\%$ of the PDG integral, enters the electroweak sector through a channel consistent with the E_6 off-diagonal Peirce structure, rather than additively through the photon polarisation appearing in the Fermi constraint. Deriving that pathway from first principles remains the central open item in the HVP programme.

7 Open Items

1. TOE-native $f_{J/\psi}^2$ with QCD dressing. The Born-level formula $9\pi/\text{MU}^2 = 44.9$ is structurally complete within the J_2 -sector geometry. A TOE-native derivation of the NLO correction requires connecting the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ strong-coupling structure (P106 derives $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1186$) to the renormalisation-group flow of the charmonium short-distance coefficient. This is a two-step derivation: the J_2 -sector one-loop coefficient in the NRQCD factorisation formula, and the three-loop RG running from M_Z to m_c . Both steps are tractable within the corpus.

2. Third-generation Peirce weights for Υ . The ϕ and J/ψ share $\text{MU} = 0.79334$ because both are J_2 -sector states. The Υ requires the third-generation Peirce weight $\text{MU}_3 = \mu_2/\mu_0$, which has not been derived. Computing MU_3 from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ spectral data would yield a TOE-native f_Υ^2 prediction and test whether the discrepancy factor follows the predicted α_s -scaling from Section 2 (~ 1.6 at the bottom scale vs. ~ 2.8 at the charm scale).

3. Continuum derivation from the E_6 exterior structure. The $\sim 80\%$ of $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}$ from the quark-level continuum has no counterpart in the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ discrete spectrum. P136 proposed that this continuum enters electroweak observables through the E_6 off-diagonal Peirce blocks P_{12}, P_{13}, P_{23} . A positive derivation — showing from the E_6 supergravity sector that multiparticle hadronic production does not contribute additively to the photon polarisation in the Fermi constraint — is the principal open derivation in the entire HVP programme.

4. Sub-threshold pion form factor. As noted in P137, the GS lineshape understates $R(s)$ below $\sqrt{s} \approx 0.6 \text{ GeV}$. A TOE-native derivation of the charged-pion form factor from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ charged pion sector (P113) would supply the Omnès factor geometrically and close the ρ -sub-threshold gap without external data input.