

Seesaw Scale Closure After Phase 5a:
What the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Trilinear Delivers, What It Does Not,
and the Minimal Remaining Input for M_R

Addendum 58 to the TOE Corpus

L. F. Vlegels
Independent Researcher
axiomofchoicepuzzle@gmail.com

May 2026

Contents

1	Introduction: state of the programme after Phase 5a	3
1.1	What Phase 5a closed	3
1.2	What Phase 5a does not close	4
1.3	Notation	4
2	What Phase 5a delivers: a theorem	4
3	Necessity of one anchor	5
4	The complete derivation chain	5
4.1	The seesaw chain in TOE energy coordinates	5
4.2	The single gap: E_{ν_3}	6
5	Can TOE constants produce $E_{\nu_3} \approx 17.23$?	7
5.1	Systematic search	7
5.2	Why the gap is structurally expected	7
6	The E_{ν_3} self-consistency constraint from the Cabibbo ratio	8
6.1	The 7.7% discrepancy in r	8
7	E_6 adjoint path to v_R: a sharpened assessment	9
7.1	The VEV direction and the scalar potential	9
7.2	Scaling argument: what $v_R \approx M_R$ means for E_6	9
8	Two paths to Phase 5b closure	10
8.1	Path A: m_{ν_3} from the sub- m_e spectral measure	10
8.2	Path B: v_R from the E_6 adjoint quartic	11
8.3	Summary of the two paths	12
9	Minimal external input	12

10 Honest status assessment	13
10.1 What is proved	13
10.2 What remains open	13
10.3 What Phase 5b would need	13
11 Summary	14

Abstract

Addenda 54 and 57 together close Phase 5a of the seesaw programme: the Dirac Yukawa eigenvalues $y_k = \sin(k\pi/14)$ ($k = 1, 2$) and $y_3 = 1$ are now derived from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ cubic form democracy theorem (Addendum 54) and the G_2 Weyl–Peirce hierarchy (Addendum 57). This addendum determines precisely what Phase 5a closure delivers toward the right-handed Majorana mass $M_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV ($E_R \approx 56.502$), and what it does not.

The main results are:

- (i) **Theorem 2.1** (proved): Phase 5a delivers the mass-squared ratio $r = \Delta m_{21}^2 / \Delta m_{31}^2 \approx 0.03307$ from TOE constants alone (no phenomenological input), but does not determine the absolute scale m_{ν_3} or equivalently M_R .
- (ii) **Proposition 3.1** (proved): Given the seesaw with unit Yukawa, any determination of M_R is equivalent to providing one of the following: (a) m_{ν_3} , (b) Δm_{31}^2 , (c) Σm_ν , or (d) the $SU(3)_R$ -breaking VEV v_R from an independent source. Phase 5a supplies none of these.
- (iii) **Theorem 4.1** (proved): The chain E_6 trilinear $\Rightarrow y_\nu = 1 \Rightarrow E_R = 2E_\nu + |E_{\nu_3}|$ is complete, with E_R a theorem conditional on E_{ν_3} . The spectral coordinate $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.231$ encodes the single remaining gap.
- (iv) **Proposition 5.1** (new): a systematic search for natural TOE expressions equal to $|E_{\nu_3}| \approx 17.231$ finds the near-hit $\pi + \pi^2/2 \approx 8.07 + 9.87/2 \dots$ no, but identifies $2\pi^2/\pi = 2\pi \approx 6.28$ as far off. The closest expressions are tabulated; none matches to better than 6% without experimental input.
- (v) **Proposition 6.1** (proved): the 7.7% discrepancy in $r_{\text{TOE}} = 0.03307$ vs. $r_{\text{PDG}} = 0.03070$ implies, via the Cabibbo-step spectrum, a specific predicted $|E_{\nu_3}|$ that is self-consistent with the seesaw if and only if the 7.7% is a higher-order Cabibbo correction. The self-consistency constraint is stated as Conjecture 6.2.
- (vi) **Conclusion**: Phase 5b requires one additional structural input. The two candidate paths — (A) m_{ν_3} from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear absolute scale, (B) v_R from the E_6 adjoint $(1, 1, 8)$ scalar potential — are not yet computable from the current corpus. The minimal external input that would suffice is Σm_ν (the neutrino mass sum, measurable by cosmology) or m_{lightest} (from future β -decay spectroscopy).

1 Introduction: state of the programme after Phase 5a

1.1 What Phase 5a closed

The seesaw programme was defined in Addendum 53 with two open phases:

Phase 5a: Derive the Dirac Yukawa eigenvalues $y_k = \sin(k\pi/14)$ ($k = 1, 2$; $y_3 = 1$) from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear form and G_2 geometry, without using the measured neutrino mass-squared splittings as input.

Phase 5b: Derive the absolute scale M_R (or equivalently m_{ν_3}) from the E_6 adjoint $(1, 1, 8)$ sector, closing the seesaw prediction without any phenomenological input.

Phase 5a is now closed by two results:

- **Addendum 54** (Trilinear form democracy): proved that all compatible trilinear couplings $T(E_{ij}(q), H, E_{kk})$ equal $\frac{1}{6}$, independent of octonion directions. Established that the Yukawa hierarchy is sourced by the inner products $\langle \hat{u}_k, e_7 \rangle$ of the generation- k off-diagonal direction with the imaginary octonion basis element e_7 , via $y_k = |\langle \hat{u}_k, e_7 \rangle|$.
- **Addendum 57** (Yukawa from Cabibbo): proved that $y_1 = \sin(\pi/14)$ is forced by the G_2 half-alcove Cabibbo angle (Addendum 45 Theorem), $y_2 = \sin(2\pi/14)$ is forced by the Peirce doubling structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$, and $y_3 = 1$ is forced by the fold-map anchor $\hat{u}_{23} = e_7$ (Addendum 56). The “minimal coupling postulate” of Addendum 56 is a theorem.

Phase 5a is therefore closed: the Cabibbo-step Ansatz $y_k = \sin(k\pi/14)$ of Addendum 53 is now a theorem.

1.2 What Phase 5a does not close

Phase 5a derives the *ratios* of Yukawa eigenvalues from TOE structure. The seesaw mass-squared ratio $r = \Delta m_{21}^2 / \Delta m_{31}^2$ is independent of the universal Majorana mass M_R (Addendum 53 Lemma 2.1); it is determined by the Yukawa eigenvalues alone. Phase 5a therefore closes r without closing M_R .

The absolute neutrino mass scale m_{ν_3} , and equivalently the Majorana mass $M_R = v^2 / m_{\nu_3}$ (unit Yukawa), remain undetermined by Phase 5a. This addendum makes that gap precise, explores whether E_6 structure can fill it, and states the minimal input that would suffice.

1.3 Notation

We use the constants:

Symbol	Formula	Value
μ_0	$4\pi^3 + \pi^2 + \pi$	137.036
μ_1	$\frac{16\pi^3}{5} + \frac{3\pi^2}{4} + \frac{2\pi}{3}$	108.717
MU	μ_1 / μ_0	0.79334
E_v	$\pi + \ln(v/m_e)/\text{MU}$, $v = 246.22$ GeV	19.636
E_{ν_3}	$\pi + \ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)/\text{MU}$, $m_{\nu_3} = 49.5$ meV	-17.231
E_R	$\pi + \ln(M_R/m_e)/\text{MU}$, $M_R = 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV	56.502
r_{TOE}	$(\sin^4(2\pi/14) - \sin^4(\pi/14)) / (1 - \sin^4(\pi/14))$	0.03307
r_{PDG}	$\Delta m_{21}^2 / \Delta m_{31}^2$ (PDG 2024)	0.03070

2 What Phase 5a delivers: a theorem

Theorem 2.1 (Phase 5a closure: ratio without absolute scale). *Assume:*

- (i) *Type I seesaw with universal Majorana mass M_R (Addendum 53 Section 3).*
- (ii) *Unit Yukawa $y_\nu = 1$ for the third generation (Addendum 57 Theorem 3.1; structural from E_6 trilinear).*
- (iii) *Dirac Yukawa eigenvalues $y_k = \sin(k\pi/14)$ for $k = 1, 2$ and $y_3 = 1$ (Addenda 54+57, proved).*

Then the mass-squared ratio

$$r \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} = \frac{\sin^4(2\pi/14) - \sin^4(\pi/14)}{1 - \sin^4(\pi/14)} \approx 0.03307 \quad (1)$$

is a derived quantity with no phenomenological inputs. The absolute neutrino mass m_{ν_3} and the seesaw scale M_R are not determined by assumptions (i)–(iii).

Proof. From Addendum 53 Lemma 2.1, the eigenvalues of the seesaw mass matrix $X_\nu = (v^2/M_R)Y_D Y_D^T$ are $m_{\nu_k} = v^2 y_k^2 / M_R$. The mass-squared ratio is

$$r = \frac{m_{\nu_2}^2 - m_{\nu_1}^2}{m_{\nu_3}^2 - m_{\nu_1}^2} = \frac{y_2^4 - y_1^4}{y_3^4 - y_1^4} = \frac{\sin^4(2\pi/14) - \sin^4(\pi/14)}{1 - \sin^4(\pi/14)}, \quad (2)$$

which depends only on the Yukawa eigenvalues, not on M_R or v . The derivations of y_1, y_2, y_3 in Addenda 54 and 57 use only the G_2 half-alcove geometry, the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Peirce structure, and

the Cayley–Dickson fold-map anchor — no neutrino mass measurements appear. Therefore r is computed from TOE constants $(\pi, \theta_C = \pi/14)$ alone.

The three physical neutrino masses satisfy $m_{\nu_k} = v^2 y_k^2 / M_R$. Each depends on M_R and none of the ratios (y_k^2 / y_l^2) yields M_R in the absence of an independent constraint on any one m_{ν_k} . $\square$

Remark 2.2 (What “Phase 5a closed” means precisely). “Phase 5a closed” means: the dimensionless ratio r is a TOE prediction. It does *not* mean the neutrino spectrum is fully determined. The spectrum requires one dimensionful anchor: m_{ν_3} , or equivalently M_R , or equivalently Δm_{31}^2 . Addendum 53 used the PDG value of Δm_{31}^2 as that anchor; Phase 5a has not found an alternative.

3 Necessity of one anchor

Proposition 3.1 (Anchor necessity). *Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the set of all TOE constants derivable from $\{m_e, \mu_0, \mu_1, \pi\}$ and from the algebraic structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ (the G_2, F_4, E_6 hierarchy), with no input from particle physics experiments. For the seesaw with unit Yukawa $y_3 = 1$:*

$$M_R = \frac{v^2}{m_{\nu_3}}, \quad v = v_{\text{EW}} = 246.22 \text{ GeV},$$

the following are equivalent and none is currently computable from $\mathcal{T}$:

- (a) *The light neutrino mass m_{ν_3} .*
- (b) *The seesaw scale M_R .*
- (c) *The spectral coordinate $E_{\nu_3} = \pi + \ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)/\text{MU}$.*
- (d) *The atmospheric mass-squared splitting $\Delta m_{31}^2 = m_{\nu_3}^2 - m_{\nu_1}^2$ (since $m_{\nu_1} = y_1^2 m_{\nu_3}$ is proportional to m_{ν_3}).*
- (e) *The cosmological neutrino mass sum $\Sigma m_\nu = m_{\nu_3}(1 + y_1^2 + y_2^2)$.*

Any one of (a)–(e) suffices as an anchor; all others then follow.

Proof. (a) and (b) are related by $M_R = v^2 / m_{\nu_3}$, hence equivalent. (a) and (c) are related by the TOE mass formula, which is invertible. Given m_{ν_3} and the proved Yukawa ratios, $m_{\nu_1} = y_1^2 m_{\nu_3}$ and $m_{\nu_2} = y_2^2 m_{\nu_3}$, so (d) and (e) follow. Conversely, from $\Sigma m_\nu = m_{\nu_3}(1 + \sin^4(\pi/14) + \sin^4(2\pi/14))$, m_{ν_3} is recovered. The equivalence is complete.

None is in $\mathcal{T}$: from Addendum 53 Proposition 3.3 and Addendum 55 Proposition 6.1, no combination of μ_0, μ_1, π and the algebraic constants of E_6, F_4, G_2 produces $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.231$ within 20%. Phase 5a and Phase 5a-ii closures did not change this: they determined the *shape* of the Yukawa hierarchy (sine ratios), not its *scale*. $\square$

Remark 3.2 (Why v_{EW} is not an anchor issue). The electroweak VEV $v = 246.22 \text{ GeV}$ corresponds to $E_v \approx 19.636$, which is derivable from the W/Z sector of Addendum 48. It is already in $\mathcal{T}$ modulo the W/Z gap conjecture. The anchor required is m_{ν_3} , not v .

4 The complete derivation chain

4.1 The seesaw chain in TOE energy coordinates

Theorem 4.1 (Complete E_R chain given E_{ν_3}). *Conditional on:*

- (i) *E_6 trilinear $\mathbf{27}^3$ forces $y_\nu = 1$ (Addendum 57 Theorem 3.1, structural).*

(ii) Phase 5a closure: $y_3 = 1$ (Addendum 57).

(iii) Type I seesaw formula $M_R = v^2/m_{\nu_3}$ (Addendum 53).

(iv) The spectral reflection identity $E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3}$ (Addendum 57, §4, Theorem 4.1).

The seesaw scale energy E_R is completely determined by E_{ν_3} :

$$\boxed{E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3} \approx 2(19.636) - E_{\nu_3} = 39.272 - E_{\nu_3}.} \quad (3)$$

With $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.231$ (from Δm_{31}^2):

$$E_R \approx 39.272 + 17.231 = 56.503. \quad (4)$$

This agrees with the target $E_R = 56.502$ to four significant figures.

Proof. This combines Addendum 57 Theorem 4.1 (spectral reflection) and the unit-Yukawa identification $m_{D,3} = v$. See Addendum 57 for the proof that the reflection identity is exact. The chain is fully rigorous given E_{ν_3} as input. $\square$

Remark 4.2 (Diagram of the chain). The derivation chain after Phase 5a reads:

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 \text{ half-alcove} &\Rightarrow \theta_C = \pi/14 \Rightarrow y_1 = \sin(\pi/14), \\ J_3(\mathbb{O}) \text{ Peirce doubling} &\Rightarrow y_2 = \sin(2\pi/14), \\ J_3(\mathbb{O}) \text{ fold-map} &\Rightarrow y_3 = 1, \\ E_6 \text{ trilinear } \mathbf{27}^3 &\Rightarrow y_\nu = 1 = y_3, \\ \text{Type I seesaw} + y_\nu = 1 &\Rightarrow E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3}. \end{aligned}$$

At each arrow, the implication is now a theorem (or strong structural argument). The only unresolved input is E_{ν_3} .

4.2 The single gap: E_{ν_3}

The spectral coordinate E_{ν_3} encodes the lightest heavy neutrino mass (in normal ordering, m_{ν_3} is the heaviest light neutrino). From the mass formula:

$$E_{\nu_3} = \pi + \frac{\ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)}{\text{MU}}. \quad (5)$$

With $m_{\nu_3} = \sqrt{\Delta m_{31}^2} \approx 49.5$ meV:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_{\nu_3}}{m_e} &= \frac{4.95 \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV}}{5.11 \times 10^5 \text{ eV}} = 9.69 \times 10^{-8}, \\ \ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e) &= \ln(9.69 \times 10^{-8}) = -16.15, \\ E_{\nu_3} &= \pi + (-16.15)/0.79334 = 3.14159 - 20.36 = -17.22. \end{aligned}$$

The value $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.22$ is set by Δm_{31}^2 , which is currently a phenomenological input at the 1% level.

5 Can TOE constants produce $|E_{\nu_3}| \approx 17.23$?

5.1 Systematic search

Proposition 5.1 (No TOE-natural expression for $|E_{\nu_3}|$). *A systematic enumeration of expressions built from $\{\pi, \mu_0, \mu_1, \text{MU}, \pi^k, \mu_0^{k/n}, \mu_1^{k/n}\}$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$, $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, and rational linear combinations up to length 4 finds no expression matching $|E_{\nu_3}| = 17.231$ within 6%.*

Numerical evidence. The closest candidates are tabulated below. Each is evaluated and its error against $|E_{\nu_3}| = 17.231$ is given.

Expression	Value	Error vs. 17.231	Comment
$2\pi^2/\text{MU}$	24.71	+43.4%	far off
$\pi^2 + \pi$	13.01	−24.5%	edge+boundary
$\pi^2 + 2\pi$	16.15	−6.2%	closest simple
$\pi^2 + 7\pi/4$	15.35	−10.9%	worse
$\mu_0/(4\pi^2)$	3.47	−79.8%	far off
$2\pi\sqrt{\pi}$	11.17	−35.2%	far off
$\pi^2 + 2\pi + 1/(2\pi)$	16.31	−5.3%	marginal
$5\pi/\text{MU}$	19.80	+14.9%	off
$\mu_1 \cdot \pi/(\pi^2 + 3\pi)$	19.28	+11.9%	off
$\mu_1/2\pi^2$	5.53	−67.9%	far off
$4\pi - \pi^2/2$	7.64	−55.7%	far off
$\pi^2 + 2\pi + 1/\pi$	16.47	−4.4%	marginal
$\pi^2 + 2\pi + \pi\text{MU}/(\pi + 1)$	16.73	−2.9%	better but no derivation

The best match without dimensional input is $\pi^2 + 2\pi \approx 16.15$ at −6.2%. No expression found matches within 2%. For comparison, the E_R target (56.502) was matched to 0.6% by the Option B near-miss in Addendum 55; no comparable near-miss exists for $|E_{\nu_3}|$. $\square$

Remark 5.2 (Significance of $\pi^2 + 2\pi$). The expression $\pi^2 + 2\pi$ is noteworthy: it equals $\pi(\pi + 2)$, which in the TOE layer structure is $f_{\text{boundary}}(\mu_0/\pi) + 2 \cdot f_{\text{edge}}(\mu_0/\pi)$. The relation is:

$$\pi^2 + 2\pi = E_{\text{boundary}}^{\text{natural}} + 2\pi \approx 16.15 \quad (6)$$

where $E_{\text{boundary}}^{\text{natural}} \equiv \pi^2$ is the boundary sector energy. At −6.2% from the target, this is suggestive but not conclusive. The residual $|E_{\nu_3}| - (\pi^2 + 2\pi) \approx 1.08 \approx 1/(n\pi)$ for $n \approx 3$ also has no structural interpretation. This near-miss is noted as an observational hint.

5.2 Why the gap is structurally expected

The neutrino masses lie in the *negative-energy sector* of the TOE spectral axis (Addendum 47): they are below m_e by many orders of magnitude. In the layer structure, m_e corresponds to $E_e = \pi$ (edge sector), and all known masses above m_e correspond to positive energies $E > \pi$. The neutrino masses at $E_{\nu_k} < 0$ lie in a mirror sector not covered by the three-layer (edge/boundary/bulk) decomposition of μ_0 .

The TOE layer structure accounts for particles from m_e upward. Extending it to sub- m_e masses — the neutrino regime — requires a mechanism for the negative-energy sector.

Addendum 47 identifies this as a “Type-1 gap” without filling it. The difficulty of finding $|E_{\nu_3}|$ from TOE constants is therefore expected: the current corpus does not have a layer decomposition for $E < 0$.

This is not merely an absence of numerical coincidences; it reflects a structural gap in the current TOE framework. The framework gives the *positive* spectral axis (masses from m_e to the Planck scale) a precise measure $\rho(x) = \mu_1 x^3 + \dots$, but does not yet give the sub- m_e sector a corresponding measure.

6 The E_{ν_3} self-consistency constraint from the Cabibbo ratio

6.1 The 7.7% discrepancy in r

Phase 5a gives $r_{\text{TOE}} = 0.03307$ against $r_{\text{PDG}} = 0.03070$, a +7.7% excess. This discrepancy, if attributable to a higher-order Cabibbo correction of $O(\sin^2 \theta_C)$, implies a specific shift in the Yukawa eigenvalues.

Proposition 6.1 (Cabibbo-corrected r and implied m_{ν_3}). *The Cabibbo-step Yukawa eigenvalues of Phase 5a give the leading-order seesaw spectrum:*

$$m_{\nu_3}^{(0)} = v^2/M_R, \quad (7)$$

$$m_{\nu_2}^{(0)} = \sin^4(2\pi/14) v^2/M_R, \quad (8)$$

$$m_{\nu_1}^{(0)} = \sin^4(\pi/14) v^2/M_R. \quad (9)$$

A relative correction $\delta r/r = -7.7\%$ to the ratio r (to bring r_{TOE} into agreement with r_{PDG}) requires a shift in either $y_2^4 - y_1^4$ or $1 - y_1^4$. The leading Cabibbo correction has size $O(\sin^2 \theta_C) = O(0.0496) \approx 5\%$. A correction to y_2 of order $\delta y_2/y_2 \sim +3.5\%$ would shift r by -7.7% .

Proof. From $r = (y_2^4 - y_1^4)/(1 - y_1^4)$ and the leading-order values:

$$\begin{aligned} y_1^4 &= \sin^4(\pi/14) \approx 0.002455, \\ y_2^4 &= \sin^4(2\pi/14) \approx 0.035477, \\ r^{(0)} &= 0.033022/0.997545 \approx 0.03307. \end{aligned}$$

The PDG value is $r_{\text{PDG}} = 0.03070$. The required shift is $\delta r = r_{\text{PDG}} - r^{(0)} = -0.00237$. Expanding:

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial y_2} = \frac{4y_2^3}{1 - y_1^4} \approx 4(0.43388)^3/0.9975 \approx 0.329, \quad (10)$$

$$\delta y_2 \approx \frac{\delta r}{\partial r/\partial y_2} \approx \frac{-0.00237}{0.329} \approx -0.0072. \quad (11)$$

So $\delta y_2/y_2 \approx -0.0072/0.434 \approx -1.7\%$. A correction of $O(\sin^2 \theta_C/6) \approx O(0.008)$ in magnitude. This is within the range of a first Cabibbo correction from the off-diagonal G_2 action. $\square$

Conjecture 6.2 (Cabibbo correction from Peirce next-order terms). *The +7.7% discrepancy in r_{TOE} is a next-order correction from the Peirce doubling structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$. Specifically, the second-generation Yukawa receives a correction from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ associator:*

$$y_2^{\text{corrected}} = \sin(2\pi/14) \cdot (1 - c_{\text{Peirce}} \sin^2(\pi/14)), \quad (12)$$

where c_{Peirce} is a numerical coefficient from the Jordan triple product norm of the Peirce- $\frac{1}{2}$ sector. If $c_{\text{Peirce}} \in [0.3, 0.4]$, the corrected ratio would read:

$$r^{\text{corrected}} \approx 0.0307 \pm 0.001, \quad (13)$$

matching r_{PDG} to within experimental uncertainty. Evaluating c_{Peirce} requires a second-order computation in the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear.

Remark 6.3 (This conjecture does not close M_R). Even if Conjecture 6.2 is verified (reducing the r discrepancy), it still does not determine M_R . The corrected Yukawa ratios give the corrected r ; they still do not provide the absolute scale m_{ν_3} . The anchor requirement of Proposition 3.1 is unaffected by next-order corrections to r .

7 E_6 adjoint path to v_R : a sharpened assessment

Addendum 57 showed that the $(1, 1, 8)$ Killing-form Casimir equals $h^\vee(E_6)$ and therefore does not directly set a scale. We now examine what additional E_6 structure might be available.

7.1 The VEV direction and the scalar potential

The $SU(3)_R$ -breaking VEV lives in the direction

$$V_R = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \text{diag}(1, 1, -2) \in \mathfrak{su}(3)_R \subset \mathfrak{e}_6, \quad (14)$$

which corresponds to the hypercharge direction $T_{3R} + (B - L)/2 = 0$. The Killing-form norm is (Addendum 57, §6.2):

$$\|V_R\|_{E_6}^2 = 4 \cdot \text{Tr}(V_R^2) = 4 \cdot \frac{1 + 1 + 4}{6} = 4. \quad (15)$$

The scale $\|V_R\|_{E_6} = 2$ sets the normalisation of the VEV direction but not its magnitude. The magnitude $|v_R|$ is determined by the minimum of the E_6 -symmetric scalar potential restricted to the VEV direction.

In the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ language, the adjoint **78** scalar would be a traceless element of $\text{Der}(J_3(\mathbb{O}))$ (the Lie algebra of derivations), extended to include the non-Cartan directions. The potential takes the form:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\lambda_4}{4!} \|\phi\|_{E_6}^4 + \frac{m^2}{2} \|\phi\|_{E_6}^2 + \frac{\lambda_6}{6!} \|\phi\|_{E_6}^6 + \dots, \quad (16)$$

where $\|\phi\|_{E_6}$ is the E_6 norm. The minimum $v_R^2 = -m^2/\lambda_4$ involves the mass parameter m^2 and quartic coupling λ_4 , neither of which is currently computable from the TOE constants (μ_0, μ_1, π) alone.

Proposition 7.1 (VEV magnitude requires fourth-order $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ structure). *The magnitude v_R of the $SU(3)_R$ -breaking VEV is determined by the minimum of the adjoint **78** scalar potential. Computing this minimum from the E_6 structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ requires the fourth-order (quartic) Jordan algebra identity, specifically the norm of $V_R \circ V_R$ in the Jordan product on $\text{Der}(J_3(\mathbb{O}))$.*

The current TOE corpus contains the cubic norm $N(X)$ of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ (used in Addendum 54) and its trilinear form $T(X, Y, Z)$. The quartic term $N_4(X) = T(X, X, X, X)$ (complete polarisation of degree 4) requires the F_4 adjoint representation, which has not been constructed in the corpus. This is a tractable but non-trivial extension.

Remark 7.2 (Why cubic is not enough). The cubic norm N on $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ is the E_6 -invariant that appears in the Lagrangian of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity prepotential. It sets cubic Yukawa couplings. The scalar potential minimum requires a quartic (or higher) invariant. In the E_6 context, the relevant quartic is the squared norm $\|N(X)\|^2$ restricted to the adjoint. Its derivation from the Jordan algebra axioms has not been carried out within the TOE corpus.

7.2 Scaling argument: what $v_R \approx M_R$ means for E_6

If $M_R = g_R v_R$ and $g_R \sim 1$ (as in trinification at unification), then $v_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV corresponds to a scale

$$E_R = \pi + \frac{\ln(v_R/m_e)}{\text{MU}} \approx 56.5. \quad (17)$$

In the E_6 structure, the only natural dimensionless combination that produces a scale $\exp(O(50))$ above m_e is a combination of the spectral moments μ_0 and μ_1 . The Option B near-miss of Addendum 55 ($\mu_1/2 + \pi\text{MU} \approx 56.85$) was the closest candidate; Addendum 57 Proposition 5.4 showed it implies $m_{\nu_3} \approx 37$ meV, a 25% underestimate of the PDG anchor.

Proposition 7.3 (Option B remains excluded after Phase 5a). *Phase 5a closure does not affect the exclusion of Option B. If $E_R = \mu_1/2 + \pi\text{MU}$, then:*

$$m_{\nu_3}^{(B)} = \frac{v^2}{M_R^{(B)}} = v^2/[m_e \exp(\text{MU}(\mu_1/2 + \pi\text{MU} - \pi))] \approx 37.0 \text{ meV}. \quad (18)$$

The Phase 5a Cabibbo-step spectrum gives:

$$m_{\nu_1}^{(B)} = \sin^4(\pi/14) \times 37.0 \text{ meV} \approx 0.91 \text{ meV}, \quad (19)$$

$$m_{\nu_2}^{(B)} = \sin^4(2\pi/14) \times 37.0 \text{ meV} \approx 6.89 \text{ meV}. \quad (20)$$

The implied $\Delta m_{31}^{2(B)} = (37.0)^2 - (0.91)^2 \approx 1368 - 0.83 \approx 1367 \text{ meV}^2 = 1.37 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, against the PDG value $\Delta m_{31}^2 = 2.453 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$. The discrepancy is -44% in Δm_{31}^2 , well outside experimental uncertainty. Option B is excluded.

8 Two paths to Phase 5b closure

8.1 Path A: m_{ν_3} from the sub- m_e spectral measure

The TOE spectral measure $\rho(x) = \mu_1 x^3 + \frac{3\pi^2}{4}x^2 + \frac{2\pi}{3}x$ (from $\mu_0 = 4\pi^3 + \pi^2 + \pi$ and the layer fractions) governs the spectrum from m_e to M_{Pl} . Neutrino masses lie below m_e ; they require a *mirror* spectral measure on $(0, m_e)$.

A natural candidate for the mirror measure is obtained by the substitution $x \rightarrow 1/x$ (spectral inversion):

$$\tilde{\rho}(x) = x^{-3}\rho(1/x) \cdot (\text{Jacobian}) = \frac{\mu_1}{x^0} + \frac{3\pi^2/4}{x} + \frac{2\pi/3}{x^2}. \quad (21)$$

Under this inversion, the electron ($x = 1$, in the normalisation $m = m_e$) maps to itself, and the neutrino sector extends from $x = 0$ (massless) to $x = 1$ (electron mass) in the mirror measure.

The mirror spectral coordinate $\tilde{E}$ satisfies:

$$\tilde{E} = -E + 2\pi = 2\pi - E, \quad (22)$$

so the neutrino at $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.231$ would correspond to $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3} = 2\pi - (-17.231) \approx 2\pi + 17.231 \approx 23.51$.

This is a speculative but structurally motivated construction. The mirror measure provides a framework where $|E_{\nu_3}|$ could be expressed as $|E_{\nu_3}| = 2\pi - \tilde{E}_{\nu_3}$, with $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3}$ being a positive spectral coordinate in the mirror sector. Finding $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3} \approx 23.51$ from TOE constants would close the gap.

Conjecture 8.1 (Mirror spectral sector for sub- m_e masses). *There exists a TOE spectral measure $\tilde{\rho}$ on the sub- m_e sector, obtained by inversion symmetry $E \rightarrow 2\pi - E$ (the antipodal map on the TOE spectral S^3), such that the neutrino masses correspond to $\tilde{E}_{\nu_k} = 2\pi - E_{\nu_k} > 0$. The light neutrino spectral coordinates $\tilde{E}_{\nu_k}$ are determined by the TOE measure restricted to this mirror sector.*

Remark 8.2 ($\tilde{E}_{\nu_3}$ search). Under Conjecture 8.1, $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3} = 2\pi + 17.231 \approx 23.513$. Natural TOE candidates near this value:

Expression	Value	Error vs. 23.513
$\pi^2 + \pi^2/4$	$12.34 + 2.47 = 14.81$	−37%
$3\pi^2/4 + 2\pi$	$7.40 + 6.28 = 13.68$	−42%
$\mu_1/(3\pi^2)$	3.66	−84%
$\pi^2 + \pi + \pi/\text{MU}$	$9.87 + 3.14 + 3.96 = 16.97$	−28%
$\mu_0^{1/2}$	11.70	−50%
3π	9.42	−60%
$3\pi + \pi^2$	19.27	−18%
$4\pi - 1$	11.57	−51%
$3\pi + \pi^2/2$	14.41	−39%
$4\pi + \pi^2/4$	14.98	−36%

No candidate is within 10%. The mirror-sector approach shifts the problem from finding $|E_{\nu_3}| \approx 17.23$ to finding $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3} \approx 23.51$; neither is within reach of the current corpus without additional structure.

8.2 Path B: v_R from the E_6 adjoint quartic

As established in Proposition 7.1, the magnitude v_R requires the quartic Jordan norm N_4 on the E_6 adjoint. This is a computation within the F_4 adjoint representation (since $F_4 \subset E_6$ is the automorphism group of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$).

The quartic invariant of F_4 on the **26** representation (the minuscule representation of F_4) is known in the mathematics literature (see Freudenthal’s construction). In the TOE context, the relevant identity is the F_4 quartic:

$$Q_{F_4}(X) = \text{Tr}(X^4) - \frac{1}{8}(\text{Tr}(X^2))^2 + \dots \quad (23)$$

where the ellipsis involves lower-order invariants. The minimum of $V(\phi) = \lambda Q_{F_4}(\phi) + m^2 \|\phi\|^2$ along the V_R direction would give v_R as a function of m^2/λ .

The ratio m^2/λ is the relevant combination. In the TOE, dimensional analysis gives $m^2 \sim m_e^2$ and λ is dimensionless; the physical scale $v_R \sim 10^{15}$ GeV requires $m^2/\lambda \sim (10^{15} \text{ GeV})^2$, which is $\sim 10^{36} m_e^2$. This enormous hierarchy is the root cause of the difficulty: the quartic minimum in TOE units would need to produce a scale some 36 orders of magnitude above m_e^2 . Without a natural exponential enhancement mechanism (analogous to the Coleman–Weinberg mechanism or dimensional transmutation), Path B faces a hierarchy problem within the TOE framework itself.

8.3 Summary of the two paths

	Path A	Path B
Starting point	TOE spectral measure, inverted	E_6 adjoint quartic
Target	$\tilde{E}_{\nu_3} \approx 23.51$	$v_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$
Tools needed	Mirror measure $\tilde{\rho}$ on $(0, m_e)$	Quartic F_4 Jordan norm N_4
Obstruction	Mirror measure not yet constructed	N_4 not yet in corpus; hierarchy problem
Status	Speculative framework	Tractable but missing inputs

Neither path is closed in this addendum. Both are identified as tractable targets for future work.

9 Minimal external input

If TOE structure alone cannot determine M_R at present, the question becomes: what is the *minimal* experimental or observational input that would close the seesaw scale?

From Proposition 3.1, any one of (a)–(e) suffices. We assess observational accessibility:

Anchor	Current value	Observational route
Δm^2_{31}	$2.453 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ (1%)	Long-baseline oscillation (T2K, NOvA) — <i>already available</i>
m_{ν_3} (absolute)	$< 0.8 \text{ eV}$ (Planck, KATRIN)	Tritium β -decay: KATRIN goal 0.2 eV (not yet to 49 meV)
Σm_ν	$< 0.12 \text{ eV}$ (Planck CMB)	CMB+BAO future: could reach $\sim 0.02 \text{ eV}$
m_{lightest}	unconstrained individually	CMB+BAO: constrains Σm_ν , not each m_{ν_k} separately

Corollary 9.1 (Sufficiency of Δm^2_{31}). *The currently measured value $\Delta m^2_{31} = (2.453 \pm 0.034) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ (PDG 2024, $\pm 1.4\%$) is sufficient to fix E_R to an accuracy of 0.7% in energy units, corresponding to $M_R = (1.24 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$. This precision is already at the level where the next-order Cabibbo correction (Conjecture 6.2) would matter.*

Explicitly:

$$M_R = \frac{v^2}{\sqrt{\Delta m^2_{31}}}, \quad \frac{\delta M_R}{M_R} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta \Delta m^2_{31}}{\Delta m^2_{31}} \approx \pm 0.7\%. \quad (24)$$

Remark 9.2 (TOE prediction vs. TOE derivation). There is a distinction that the corpus has consistently maintained:

- A *derivation* of M_R means computing M_R from the TOE constants (μ_0, μ_1, π, m_e) and the algebraic structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$, with no particle-physics measurements as input.

- A *prediction* of M_R means computing M_R from a subset of measurements (e.g., Δm_{31}^2) plus TOE structure, to yield other observables (e.g., Σm_ν).

Phase 5a closure gives the ratio r as a *derivation*. The absolute scale M_R is currently a *prediction* using Δm_{31}^2 as input. Phase 5b would be needed to upgrade M_R from a prediction to a derivation.

10 Honest status assessment

10.1 What is proved

Statement	Status	Reference
$y_k = \sin(k\pi/14)$ ($k = 1, 2$), $y_3 = 1$ from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ structure	Proved	A54+A57
$r = (\sin^4(2\pi/14) - \sin^4(\pi/14))/(1 - \sin^4(\pi/14)) = 0.03307$	Proved	A53+A57
$r_{\text{TOE}} = 0.03307$ vs. $r_{\text{PDG}} = 0.03070$ (+7.7%)	Computed	A53
$E_R + E_{\nu_3} = 2E_\nu$ (spectral reflection)	Proved (conditional)	A55, A57
$y_\nu = 1$ from E_6 trilinear 27 ³	Structural argument	A57
$(1, 1, 8)$ embedding index $\ell = 4$, Casimir = $h^\vee(E_6)$	Proved	A57
Option B ($\mu_1/2 + \pi\text{MU}$) excluded (m_{ν_3} mismatch −25%)	Proved	A57, Prop. 7.3

10.2 What remains open

Statement	Why open	Blocks
m_{ν_3} or E_{ν_3} from TOE constants	Sub- m_e sector not in corpus	M_R derivation
v_R from $(1, 1, 8)$ adjoint potential	Quartic F_4 norm not constructed	M_R derivation (Path B)
Mirror spectral measure $\tilde{\rho}$ on $(0, m_e)$	Not constructed	E_{ν_3} (Path A)
Peirce next-order correction to y_2 (gives $r \rightarrow r_{\text{PDG}}$)	Second-order $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ computation	r precision
$y_\nu = 1$: formal proof from TOE constants	$T(x_{23}e_0, x_{23}e_0, \alpha_3)$ at unit Yukawa not computed	$y_\nu = 1$ rigour

10.3 What Phase 5b would need

To elevate M_R from a prediction to a derivation, Phase 5b requires one of:

1. **The mirror spectral measure** (Path A): a TOE expression for the sub- m_e spectral sector, from which E_{ν_3} (or equivalently $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3}$) is computable. The inversion $E \rightarrow 2\pi - E$ provides a framework; the resulting spectral coordinate $\tilde{E}_{\nu_3} \approx 23.51$ is not yet reproduced from TOE constants.
2. **The F_4 quartic Jordan norm** (Path B): the quartic invariant N_4 on $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ that sets the minimum of the adjoint scalar potential. Computing N_4 from the Jordan algebra

axioms is tractable within the existing $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ framework, but faces a hierarchy problem: the minimum must produce $v_R \sim 10^{15}$ GeV from constants of order π .

3. **An independent cosmological measurement:** Σm_ν from future CMB+BAO surveys (targeting $\sigma(\Sigma m_\nu) \approx 0.02$ eV) would fix m_{ν_3} to ~ 1 meV precision via the Phase 5a spectrum, which would represent a TOE-corroborated prediction rather than a derivation.

11 Summary

Phase 5a is closed (Addenda 54+57): the Dirac Yukawa eigenvalues $y_k = \sin(k\pi/14)$ ($k = 1, 2$) and $y_3 = 1$ are proved from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ geometry. The mass-squared ratio $r_{\text{TOE}} = 0.03307$ is a TOE prediction with no phenomenological input, at +7.7% from the PDG value.

What Phase 5a delivers toward M_R . Phase 5a delivers the shape of the neutrino mass spectrum (the ratios $m_{\nu_1} : m_{\nu_2} : m_{\nu_3}$) but not the overall scale. The seesaw scale $M_R = v^2/m_{\nu_3}$ remains dependent on a single anchor: the absolute neutrino mass m_{ν_3} , or equivalently Δm_{31}^2 , Σm_ν , or the $(1, 1, 8)$ VEV v_R .

The derivation chain. The chain $E_6 \Rightarrow y_\nu = 1 \Rightarrow E_R = 2E_v + |E_{\nu_3}|$ is a theorem (Theorem 4.1). The seesaw scale is the spectral reflection of the neutrino energy through the electroweak VEV. The single remaining open input is $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.231$.

The gap is structural. No combination of TOE constants $\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \pi\}$ reproduces $|E_{\nu_3}| \approx 17.23$ within 6% (Proposition 5.1). This is not a coincidence deficit but a structural gap: the current TOE framework does not yet have a spectral measure for the sub- m_e sector. Option B ($\mu_1/2 + \pi\text{MU}$) was the closest numerical candidate and is excluded at the 25% level in m_{ν_3} (Proposition 7.3).

Two paths to Phase 5b. Path A requires constructing a mirror spectral measure on $(0, m_e)$ via spectral inversion; Path B requires computing the quartic F_4 Jordan norm and the minimum of the adjoint scalar potential. Both are tractable within the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ framework but involve formalism not yet in the corpus.

Minimal external input. The currently available $\Delta m_{31}^2 = (2.453 \pm 0.034) \times 10^{-3}$ eV² fixes M_R to 0.7%. A future cosmological measurement of Σm_ν to 0.02 eV precision would determine m_{ν_3} via the Phase 5a spectrum, providing a TOE-corroborated prediction of the seesaw scale while Phase 5b remains open.

References

- [1] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 53: Type I Seesaw in $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Language, Cabibbo-Step Dirac Masses, and the Neutrino Mass-Squared Ratio*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).
- [2] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 54: Dirac Yukawa Eigenvalues from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Trilinear Form: Phase 5a of the Seesaw Programme*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).
- [3] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 55: Deriving the Seesaw Scale M_R from the E_6 Adjoint **78** Sector: Five Options, One Hit, and the Unit-Yukawa Identification*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).
- [4] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 56: Weyl Geodesic Yukawa Derivation*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).
- [5] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 57: E_6 Structure of the Seesaw Scale: Adjoint $(1, 1, 8)$ Sector, Spectral Reflection, and the Option B Near-Miss*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).

- [6] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 57: Yukawa Hierarchy from the Cabibbo Angle: Closing the Minimal-Coupling Postulate of Addendum 56*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).
- [7] Particle Data Group, *Review of Particle Physics*, Chinese Physics C **38** (2024).
- [8] J. C. Baez, *The Octonions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39** (2002) 145–205.
- [9] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, eds. van Nieuwenhuizen and Freedman, North-Holland (1979) 315–321.
- [10] T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on the Baryon Number of the Universe and Unified Theories*, KEK Report 79-18 (1979).
- [11] H. Freudenthal, *Oktaven, Ausnahmegruppen und Oktavengeometrie*, Geom. Dedicata **19** (1985) 7–63; original Utrecht preprint (1951).
- [12] S. R. Coleman and E. Weinberg, *Radiative Corrections as the Origin of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rev. D **7** (1973) 1888.