

E_6 Structure of the Seesaw Scale:
Adjoint (1, 1, 8) Sector, Spectral Reflection,
and the Option B Near-Miss

Addendum 64 to the TOE Corpus

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

May 2026

Contents

Abstract

Addendum 55 identified the right-handed Majorana neutrino mass $M_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV with TOE energy coordinate $E_R \approx 56.502$ and left two open threads: (i) the spectral reflection identity $E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3}$ was stated structurally but not derived from the E_6 geometry, and (ii) the near-miss $\mu_1/2 + \pi \text{ MU} \approx 56.851$ had no algebraic grounding. This addendum works out the $(1, 1, 8)$ adjoint sector of E_6 in trinification in detail, proves what can be proved about the spectral reflection, and examines whether the Option B near-miss corresponds to any E_6 root datum.

The main results are: (a) the spectral reflection $E_R + E_{\nu_3} = 2E_v$ is a theorem conditional on the unit-Yukawa identification $m_{D,3} = v$ (Theorem ??); (b) the Killing form of $\text{SU}(3)_R$ restricted from E_6 yields a Cartan eigenvalue $\kappa = 12/78$ in the adjoint normalisation, but this ratio does not produce a scale near $E_R \approx 56.5$ (Proposition ??); (c) the Option B expression $\mu_1/2 + \pi \text{ MU}$ has a suggestive reading as “half the spectral first moment plus a Hopf phase correction,” but no derivation from E_6 root eigenvalues has been found (Conjecture ??); (d) the E_6 trilinear $\mathbf{27}^3$ forces $y_\nu = 1$ by an argument that is structural but not yet a formal proof (Proposition ??). The gap between structural understanding and numerical derivation is precisely delineated; the two remaining paths to closing it are described.

1 Context and goals

1.1 Where Addendum 55 left off

Addendum 55 systematically evaluated five routes to deriving M_R from the E_6 adjoint **78** sector and found the following status:

- Options A, C, D (branching-ratio, RG nonperturbative, Casimir ratio): eliminated, errors $\geq 30\%$.
- Option B ($\mu_1/2 + \pi \text{ MU} \approx 56.851$): near-miss at $+0.6\%$, no structural derivation.
- Option E ($M_R = v^2/m_{\nu_3}$, unit Yukawa): -0.03% match, consistency check not a prediction.

The seesaw reflection $E_R = 2E_v + |E_{\nu_3}|$ was identified (Addendum 55, eq. (5.4)) but not derived from the E_6 geometry. The present addendum attempts that derivation and examines whether the $(1, 1, 8)$ Killing form can ground the Option B near-miss.

1.2 What this addendum does

Section ??: geometry of the $(1, 1, 8)$ block in the E_6 adjoint.

Section ??: Killing form eigenvalues, embedding index, and why they do not produce $E_R \approx 56.5$.

Section ??: formal status of the $y_\nu = 1$ identification from the $\mathbf{27}^3$ trilinear.

Section ??: the spectral reflection as a theorem, its conditions, and what additional structure would make it a derivation.

Section ??: algebraic anatomy of the near-miss $\mu_1/2 + \pi \text{ MU}$ and what E_6 structure, if any, it could encode.

Section ??: honest accounting of what remains open.

1.3 Notation

Throughout, $m = m_e \exp(\text{MU}(E - \pi))$ is the TOE mass formula with $m_e = 0.511$ MeV, and the constants are:

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	$\pi + \ln(v/m_e)/\text{MU}, v = 246.22 \text{ GeV}$	19.636
E_{ν_3}	$\pi + \ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)/\text{MU}, m_{\nu_3} = 49.5 \text{ meV}$	-17.231
E_R	$\pi + \ln(M_R/m_e)/\text{MU}, M_R = 1.24 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$	56.502

The sign of E_{ν_3} is negative because $m_{\nu_3} \ll m_e$: neutrino masses lie below the electron on the TOE spectral axis.

2 The $(1, 1, 8)$ block in trinification

2.1 Adjoint 78 under trinification

Under $E_6 \supset \text{SU}(3)_C \times \text{SU}(3)_L \times \text{SU}(3)_R$ the adjoint decomposes as (Addendum 48, eq. (6.1)):

$$\mathbf{78} = (8, 1, 1) \oplus (1, 8, 1) \oplus (1, 1, 8) \oplus (3, \bar{3}, \bar{3}) \oplus (\bar{3}, 3, 3). \quad (1)$$

The $(1, 1, 8)$ summand is the adjoint of $\text{SU}(3)_R$: eight generators $\{T_R^a\}_{a=1}^8$ with two Cartan generators $\{H_R^1, H_R^2\}$ and six raising/lowering operators $\{E_R^{\pm\alpha}\}$ corresponding to the three positive roots of $A_2 = \mathfrak{su}(3)$.

2.2 Cartan generators of $\text{SU}(3)_R$

In the Chevalley–Serre basis, the two Cartan generators of $\text{SU}(3)_R$ are

$$H_R^1 = \text{diag}(1, -1, 0), \quad (2)$$

$$H_R^2 = \text{diag}(0, 1, -1). \quad (3)$$

Their diagonal eigenvalues define the T_{3R} and $(B - L)$ quantum numbers via the E_6 Cartan formula $Y = T_{3R} + (B - L)/2$ of Addendum 48 Theorem 3.1.

The $\text{SU}(3)_R$ -breaking VEV v_R is a VEV in the $(1, 1, 8)$ sector. In the physical trinification scenario, the VEV selects a direction in the Cartan of $\text{SU}(3)_R$:

$$\langle (1, 1, 8) \rangle = v_R \cdot \text{diag}(1, 1, -2)/\sqrt{6}, \quad (4)$$

which is the hypercharge direction $T_{3R} + (B - L)/2 = 0$ for the $B - L$ generator. This VEV breaks $\text{SU}(3)_R \rightarrow \text{U}(1)_{B-L}$, generating Majorana masses for ν_R of order v_R .

Remark 2.1 (Two-stage breaking). In the full trinification scenario the breaking chain is $\text{SU}(3)_R \xrightarrow{v_R} \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_{B-L} \xrightarrow{v'_R} \text{U}(1)_{B-L}$. For the seesaw scale it is sufficient to work with the first step, which sets $M_R \sim v_R$. The second step (if present) sets a lower scale $M'_R \ll M_R$ that does not affect the dominant right-handed mass.

2.3 ν_R couples to $(1, 1, 8)$ VEV

The right-handed neutrinos $\nu_{R,i}$ are located at the diagonal entries α_i of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ (Addendum 53, Proposition 2.1). The Majorana mass coupling is

$$\mathcal{L}_R = \frac{1}{2} g_R v_R \nu_{R,i}^T C \nu_{R,j} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (5)$$

where g_R is the $\text{SU}(3)_R$ gauge coupling at the trinification scale. With universal coupling ($g_R \sim 1$ at GUT normalisation), $M_R = g_R v_R \sim v_R$.

The task is therefore to derive v_R from the E_6 structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$.

3 Killing form on the $(1, 1, 8)$ block

3.1 Killing form conventions

For a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, the Killing form is $B(X, Y) = \text{Tr}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\text{ad}_X \circ \text{ad}_Y)$. For $\mathfrak{e}_6$, the dual Coxeter number is $h^\vee(E_6) = 12$ and

$$B_{E_6}(H_\alpha, H_\alpha) = 2h^\vee(E_6) = 24 \quad (\text{in the coroot normalisation}). \quad (6)$$

For the embedded $\mathfrak{su}(3)_R \subset \mathfrak{e}_6$, the restriction of B_{E_6} to the $(1, 1, 8)$ block is

$$B_{E_6}|_{(1,1,8)}(T_R^a, T_R^b) = \ell \cdot B_{\mathfrak{su}(3)}(T_R^a, T_R^b), \quad (7)$$

where ℓ is the *embedding index* of $\mathfrak{su}(3)_R \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{e}_6$.

3.2 Embedding index of $\text{SU}(3)_R$ in E_6

Proposition 3.1 (Embedding index of trinification factors). *Each of the three trinification factors $\text{SU}(3)_C, \text{SU}(3)_L, \text{SU}(3)_R \hookrightarrow E_6$ is a regular embedding obtained by removing one node of the E_6 Dynkin diagram. For a regular embedding of $\text{SU}(3)$ (Dynkin diagram A_2) into a simply-laced group G via a subdiagram, the embedding index is*

$$\ell = \frac{h^\vee(G)}{h^\vee(\text{SU}(3))} = \frac{12}{3} = 4. \quad (8)$$

Proof. For a regular subalgebra embedding (roots of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ are a subset of the roots of $\mathfrak{e}_6$, with no rescaling), the embedding index equals the ratio of dual Coxeter numbers when both algebras are simply laced [?]. The trinification is a regular maximal embedding of A_2^3 into E_6 , so each A_2 factor has $\ell = 12/3 = 4$. $\square$

Remark 3.2 (Consistency check). At embedding index $\ell = 4$: $B_{E_6}|_{(1,1,8)}(H_R^1, H_R^1) = \ell \cdot B_{\mathfrak{su}(3)}(H_R^1, H_R^1) = 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 = 24$, matching $B_{E_6}(H_\alpha, H_\alpha) = 24$ for a long root H_α of E_6 .

3.3 Casimir eigenvalue of $(1, 1, 8)$ in the adjoint of E_6

The quadratic Casimir of $\text{SU}(3)$ in the adjoint (8-dimensional) representation is $C_2(\mathbf{8}) = 3$. The Casimir of E_6 at the $(1, 1, 8)$ contribution is

$$C_2^{E_6}|_{(1,1,8)} = \ell \cdot C_2^{\text{SU}(3)}(\mathbf{8}) = 4 \cdot 3 = 12. \quad (9)$$

As a fraction of the E_6 dual Coxeter number $h^\vee = 12$:

$$\frac{C_2^{E_6}|_{(1,1,8)}}{h^\vee(E_6)} = \frac{12}{12} = 1. \quad (10)$$

Proposition 3.3 (Killing form does not fix the seesaw scale). *The $(1, 1, 8)$ Killing-form Casimir equals $h^\vee(E_6)$. Setting $E_R^{(K)} = E_{\text{bulk}} \cdot (C_2^{E_6}|_{(1,1,8)}/h^\vee(E_6))^n$ for any rational power n gives:*

n	$E_R^{(K)}$	Error vs. 56.502
1	124.025 ($= E_{\text{bulk}}$)	+119.5%
1/2	11.14	−80.3%
−1	0.00806	→ 0

Since the ratio is exactly 1, $E_R^{(K)} = E_{\text{bulk}}^n$, which misses the target for all $n \neq 1$, and for $n = 1$ gives the bulk energy $4\pi^3 \approx 124$, not 56.5. The Killing-form Casimir ratio on $(1, 1, 8)$ does not determine E_R .

Remark 3.4 (Why this is not surprising). The Killing-form ratio being exactly 1 reflects the fact that the $(1, 1, 8)$ embedding index $\ell = h^\vee(E_6)/h^\vee(\text{SU}(3))$ is precisely the ratio of dual Coxeter numbers. The Casimir carries no additional scale information. The obstruction identified in Addendum 55 Option D ($\pi^3 \approx 31$ at -45%) used $h^\vee(\text{SU}(3))/h^\vee(E_6) = 1/4$; the present calculation with the corrected embedding index makes the obstruction sharper: the ratio is 1, not $1/4$, but neither value is close to the target.

4 Unit Yukawa from E_6 trilinear

4.1 The $\mathbf{27}^3$ invariant

Proposition 4.1 ($y_\nu = 1$ from E_6 trilinear). *In minimal E_6 trinification with a single generation in each $\mathbf{27}$ (or, in the TOE, all three generations in one $\mathbf{27}$ via $F_4 \mathbb{Z}_3$), the E_6 -invariant trilinear $\lambda \mathbf{27}^3$ of the superpotential decomposes under $\text{SU}(3)_C \times \text{SU}(3)_L \times \text{SU}(3)_R$ into:*

- Top-quark Yukawa: coupling λ at the unification scale.
- Neutrino Dirac Yukawa y_ν : same trilinear vertex, so $y_\nu = \lambda = y_t$ at the unification boundary.

With $y_t \approx 1$ at unification (the top Yukawa runs to $y_t \rightarrow 1$ under GUT-scale RG evolution from low-energy $y_t(m_t) \approx 0.935$), this gives $y_\nu = 1$ to within the running accuracy.

Proof (structural). The E_6 model has a single gauge-invariant trilinear

$$W \supset \lambda T_{ABC} \Phi^A \Phi^B \Phi^C, \quad (11)$$

where T_{ABC} is the E_6 -invariant symmetric tensor and Φ^A are the 27 components of the $\mathbf{27}$ -plet. Under trinification, the third-family top quark and the third-family neutrino both arise from the same $x_{23} \cdot e_0$ slot and its conjugate, coupled via the Higgs (also in the x_{23} block). The coupling constant for both is λ , so $y_t = y_\nu$ at tree level at the unification scale.

Running y_t from $M_{\text{GUT}} \sim 10^{16}$ GeV down to $m_t = 172.69$ GeV using the MSSM beta function with $\tan \beta \sim 1$ gives $y_t(M_{\text{GUT}}) \approx 0.63\text{--}0.73$. However, in the TOE normalisation where the Dirac mass $m_{D,3} = y_\nu \cdot v$ and the seesaw is anchored to $m_{D,3} = v_{\text{EW}}$ (Addendum 53, Option C), the identification is $y_\nu = 1$ exactly. This is consistent with E_6 group theory at tree level; the small deviation $y_t(M_{\text{GUT}}) < 1$ is a loop correction that the present structural argument absorbs into the normalisation $m_{D,3} = v$. $\square$

Remark 4.2 (Status). Proposition ?? is a structural argument, not a formal proof at the level of the TOE constants (μ_0, μ_1, π) . A formal proof would require computing the E_6 trilinear T_{ABC} at the slots $(x_{23} \cdot e_0, x_{23} \cdot e_0, \alpha_3)$ of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ and showing the coupling is unity in the TOE normalisation. This is tractable within the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ cubic form $N(X) = \frac{1}{3!}T(X, X, X)$ framework.

5 The spectral reflection as a theorem

5.1 Setup

The three energies relevant to the seesaw are:

$$E_v = \pi + \frac{\ln(v/m_e)}{\text{MU}}, \quad (12)$$

$$E_{\nu_3} = \pi + \frac{\ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)}{\text{MU}}, \quad (13)$$

$$E_R = \pi + \frac{\ln(M_R/m_e)}{\text{MU}}. \quad (14)$$

Note $E_{\nu_3} < 0 < \pi < E_v < E_R$ since $m_{\nu_3} \ll m_e \ll v \ll M_R$.

5.2 Derivation of the reflection

Theorem 5.1 (Spectral reflection identity). *Assume:*

- (i) The seesaw formula $M_R = m_{D,3}^2/m_{\nu_3}$ (Type I).
- (ii) The unit-Yukawa identification $m_{D,3} = v_{\text{EW}}$.
- (iii) The TOE mass formula (??)-(??).

Then

$$\boxed{E_R + E_{\nu_3} = 2E_v}. \quad (15)$$

Equivalently $E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3} = 2E_v + |E_{\nu_3}|$ (since $E_{\nu_3} < 0$).

Proof. From $M_R = m_{D,3}^2/m_{\nu_3}$ and $m_{D,3} = v$:

$$\frac{M_R}{m_e} = \frac{v^2}{m_e \cdot m_{\nu_3}} = \left(\frac{v}{m_e}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{m_e}{m_{\nu_3}}. \quad (16)$$

Taking the logarithm:

$$\ln \frac{M_R}{m_e} = 2 \ln \frac{v}{m_e} - \ln \frac{m_{\nu_3}}{m_e}. \quad (17)$$

Divide by MU and add π to both sides:

$$\pi + \frac{\ln(M_R/m_e)}{\text{MU}} = 2 \left(\pi + \frac{\ln(v/m_e)}{\text{MU}} \right) - \left(\pi + \frac{\ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)}{\text{MU}} \right)$$

$$E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3}. \quad \square \quad (18)$$

□

Remark 5.2 (Geometric interpretation). Equation (??) says the seesaw mechanism acts as an *antipodal reflection* on the TOE spectral axis: the Majorana scale E_R is the image of the light neutrino energy E_{ν_3} under the map $E \mapsto 2E_v - E$, which is reflection through the electroweak VEV energy E_v . In the S^3 geometry of the TOE, this corresponds to an antipodal map on the Hopf fibre with the equator at E_v . The seesaw mechanism is therefore not merely a mass formula: it is a geometric inversion on the spectral S^3 .

Remark 5.3 (This is a theorem, not a derivation). Theorem ?? is an exact identity given the two assumptions. It is a *theorem* in the sense that no approximation is involved: $E_R + E_{\nu_3} = 2E_v$ holds to arbitrary precision whenever $M_R = v^2/m_{\nu_3}$. It is *not* a derivation of E_R from E_6 structure, because the proof uses m_{ν_3} as an independent input. To make it a derivation, one needs a TOE formula for m_{ν_3} that does not use Δm_{31}^2 as input. This is the Phase 5a open problem of Addendum 53.

5.3 Numerical check

$$\begin{aligned}
E_v &= \pi + \ln(246.22 \times 10^9 \text{ eV} / 0.511 \times 10^6 \text{ eV}) / \text{MU} \\
&= \pi + \ln(4.818 \times 10^5) / 0.79334 = \pi + 13.085 / 0.79334 \approx 19.636, \\
E_{\nu_3} &= \pi + \ln(49.5 \times 10^{-3} \times 10^{-6} \text{ GeV} / 0.511 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}) / \text{MU} \\
&= \pi + \ln(9.687 \times 10^{-5}) / 0.79334 = \pi + (-9.342) / 0.79334 \approx -17.231, \\
2E_v - E_{\nu_3} &= 2 \times 19.636 - (-17.231) = 56.503.
\end{aligned}$$

Against the target $E_R = 56.502$: agreement to 0.002%. The sub-per-mille residual is rounding in the PDG value $\Delta m_{31}^2 = 2.453 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$.

6 Anatomy of the Option B near-miss

6.1 The expression and its proximity

The near-miss identified in Addendum 55 is

$$E_B \equiv \frac{\mu_1}{2} + \pi \text{ MU} = \frac{\mu_1}{2} + \frac{\pi \mu_1}{\mu_0} = \mu_1 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\pi}{\mu_0} \right). \quad (19)$$

Numerically:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_1/2 &= 108.717/2 = 54.359, \\
\pi \text{ MU} &= \pi \times 0.79334 = 2.491, \\
E_B &= 56.850, \quad \text{error} = (56.850 - 56.502)/56.502 = +0.616\%.
\end{aligned}$$

6.2 Factored form

Writing $\mu_0 = 4\pi^3 + \pi^2 + \pi$ and $\mu_1 = \frac{16\pi^3}{5} + \frac{3\pi^2}{4} + \frac{2\pi}{3}$:

$$E_B = \mu_1 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\pi}{\mu_0} \right) = \mu_1 \cdot \frac{\mu_0 + 2\pi}{2\mu_0}. \quad (20)$$

The factor $(\mu_0 + 2\pi)/(2\mu_0) = 1/2 + \pi/\mu_0 \approx 0.5229$, so $E_B = \mu_1 \times 0.5229 \approx 56.85$.

6.3 E_6 root-data interpretation attempted

We attempt to interpret E_B as an eigenvalue of the $(1, 1, 8)$ Casimir in some natural normalisation. The E_6 Dynkin labels of the $(1, 1, 8)$ roots are the A_2 roots embedded at embedding index $\ell = 4$. The highest root of $\mathfrak{su}(3)_R$ embedded in $\mathfrak{e}_6$ has squared length $\langle \alpha_R, \alpha_R \rangle_{E_6} = 2$ (all roots of E_6 have the same length in the simply-laced normalisation). Defining a scale from the root system:

$$E^{(\text{root})} = \frac{|\alpha_R|_{E_6}^2}{|\alpha_{\text{simple}}|_{E_6}^2} \cdot E_{\text{bulk}} = 1 \times 4\pi^3 \approx 124.0. \quad (21)$$

This reproduces the bulk energy, not E_B . No simple ratio of E_6 root lengths or Dynkin labels produces 56.85 directly.

6.4 Relation to the spectral moments

The TOE spectral measure $\rho(x) = 16\pi^3 x^3 + 3\pi^2 x^2 + 2\pi x$ has first moment μ_1 and zeroth moment μ_0 . The energy $E_B = \mu_1(1/2 + \pi/\mu_0)$ can be read as:

1. $\mu_1/2$: half the first spectral moment. In an S^3 context, dividing by 2 corresponds to the Hopf fibre projection: the base S^2 of the Hopf fibration $S^1 \rightarrow S^3 \rightarrow S^2$ receives half the “phase content” of S^3 .
2. π MU: the electron energy $E_e = \pi$ scaled by MU. Since $\text{MU} = \mu_1/\mu_0$, this is $\pi\mu_1/\mu_0$, a normalised ratio of spectral moments. It is the amount by which $E_e = \pi$ is “compressed” by the spectral ratio.

Summing these two terms: E_B interpolates between the half-moment $\mu_1/2$ and a phase correction π MU. Neither term has been derived from the $(1, 1, 8)$ Killing form.

Conjecture 6.1 (Option B as a spectral moment identity). *The expression $\mu_1/2 + \pi$ MU is the correct formula for E_R if and only if the $SU(3)_R$ -breaking VEV satisfies*

$$\ln \frac{v_R}{m_e} = \text{MU} (E_B - \pi) = \text{MU} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{2} + \pi \text{MU} - \pi \right) \approx \text{MU} \times 53.71 \approx 42.63, \quad (22)$$

giving $v_R \approx 1.64 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$. A structural derivation of $E_B = \mu_1/2 + \pi$ MU from the E_6 adjoint would require showing that the $(1, 1, 8)$ Killing-form norm of the VEV direction (??) equals $\mu_1 \cdot (\mu_0 + 2\pi)/(2\mu_0)$ in TOE units. This is an open problem.

6.5 E_B versus E_R : the 0.6% gap

From the spectral reflection Theorem ?? : $E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3}$. The discrepancy with E_B is

$$E_B - E_R = \left(\frac{\mu_1}{2} + \pi \text{MU} \right) - (2E_v - E_{\nu_3}). \quad (23)$$

Numerically: $56.850 - 56.502 = 0.348$. This gap equals

$$\begin{aligned} E_B - E_R &= \frac{\mu_1}{2} + \frac{\pi\mu_1}{\mu_0} - 2 \left(\pi + \frac{\ln(v/m_e)}{\text{MU}} \right) + \left(\pi + \frac{\ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)}{\text{MU}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\mu_1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2\pi}{\mu_0} \right) - \pi - \frac{2\ln(v/m_e) - \ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e)}{\text{MU}}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The expression $2\ln(v/m_e) - \ln(m_{\nu_3}/m_e) = \ln(v^2/(m_e m_{\nu_3}))$ depends on measured parameters v and m_{ν_3} . If E_B were the “true” TOE value of E_R , the residual 0.348 would represent the deviation of m_{ν_3} from a TOE-natural value.

Proposition 6.2 (m_{ν_3} implied by Option B). *If $E_R = E_B = \mu_1/2 + \pi$ MU exactly, then the implied light neutrino mass is*

$$m_{\nu_3}^{(B)} = v^2 / \exp(\text{MU}(E_B - \pi)) \cdot m_e^{-1} = \frac{v^2}{M_R^{(B)}}, \quad (25)$$

with $M_R^{(B)} = m_e \exp(\text{MU}(E_B - \pi)) \approx 1.64 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$, giving

$$m_{\nu_3}^{(B)} = \frac{(246.22 \text{ GeV})^2}{1.64 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV}} \approx 37.0 \text{ meV}. \quad (26)$$

Against the PDG anchor $m_{\nu_3} = \sqrt{\Delta m_{31}^2} \approx 49.5 \text{ meV}$: the implied value is 25% below PDG. Since Δm_{31}^2 is measured to 1% accuracy, Option B is excluded at the $\sim 25\%$ level if the anchor is taken as definitive.

This strengthens the conclusion of Addendum 55: Option B is an observational near-miss in E_R coordinates but a significant miss in m_{ν_3} space. The 0.6% proximity in E_R is a coincidence of the logarithmic scale, not a structural alignment.

7 What derivation from E_6 structure would look like

7.1 The two open paths

From the analysis above, there are exactly two paths to closing the seesaw scale derivation from E_6 structure.

Path 1: TOE formula for m_{ν_3}

The spectral reflection (Theorem ??) is already a theorem: $E_R = 2E_v - E_{\nu_3}$ given the Type I seesaw and unit Yukawa. The remaining gap is E_{ν_3} , which requires a TOE formula for m_{ν_3} . The neutrino mass sits in the negative-energy sector at $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.23$. From the TOE mass formula:

$$m_{\nu_3} = m_e \exp(\text{MU}(E_{\nu_3} - \pi)) = 0.511 \text{ MeV} \times \exp(0.79334 \times (-17.23 - 3.14159)) \approx 49.5 \text{ meV}. \quad (27)$$

A derivation of E_{ν_3} from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear (Phase 5a) would make the entire chain structural. Specifically, the mass-squared splittings Δm_{21}^2 and Δm_{31}^2 need to be derived from the Cabibbo-step Yukawa norms (Addendum 53 Conjecture 2.3), closing the loop.

Path 2: $(1, 1, 8)$ VEV from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ adjoint

An independent path is to derive v_R directly from the E_6 adjoint. The $\text{SU}(3)_R$ -breaking direction (??) in $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ has a Killing-form norm:

$$\|V_R\|_{E_6}^2 = B_{E_6}(V_R, V_R) = \ell \cdot B_{\text{su}(3)}(V_R, V_R) = 4 \cdot \text{Tr}(V_R^2), \quad (28)$$

where $V_R = \text{diag}(1, 1, -2)/\sqrt{6}$ in the $\text{SU}(3)_R$ Cartan. Computing: $\text{Tr}(V_R^2) = (1 + 1 + 4)/6 = 1$, so $\|V_R\|_{E_6}^2 = 4$. The energy scale associated with this norm in the TOE would be

$$E_{V_R} = \pi + \frac{\ln \|V_R\|_{E_6}}{\text{MU}} = \pi + \frac{\ln 2}{\text{MU}} \approx \pi + 0.873 \approx 4.01. \quad (29)$$

This gives a mass $m_{V_R} = m_e \exp(\text{MU}(4.01 - \pi)) \approx m_e \times 1.97 \approx 1.01 \text{ MeV}$, far below the seesaw scale. The Killing-form norm of the VEV direction sets the *normalisation convention*, not the physical scale. The physical scale $v_R \sim 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$ must come from a dynamical condition — the potential minimum of the adjoint **78** scalar.

This dynamical condition is not encoded in the Killing form alone; it requires the full scalar potential $V(\Phi_{78})$, which in turn requires specifying the E_6 -symmetric quartic terms. In the TOE context, this would correspond to computing the fourth-order term in the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ adjoint norm, which is not currently available in the corpus.

7.2 Summary of derivation status

Statement	Status	Addendum
$y_\nu = 1$ from E_6 trilinear 27 ³	Structural argument	§??
$E_R + E_{\nu_3} = 2E_v$ (spectral reflection) <i>conditional on:</i> $M_R = v^2/m_{\nu_3}$ and $m_{D,3} = v$	Theorem (conditional)	Thm. ??
(1, 1, 8) embedding index $\ell = 4$	Proved	Prop. ??
(1, 1, 8) Casimir $= h^\vee(E_6)$	Proved	§??
Killing-form ratio does not fix E_R	Proved	Prop. ??
Option B implied $m_{\nu_3} \approx 37$ meV: 25% miss	Proved	Prop. ??
v_R from (1, 1, 8) VEV Killing norm: sets convention not scale	Computed	§??
m_{ν_3} from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear (Path 1)	Open	A53 Phase 5a
v_R from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ adjoint potential (Path 2)	Open	A53 Phase 5b

8 Precise gap statement

The derivation of $M_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV from the E_6 adjoint (1, 1, 8) sector is currently *structurally grounded but numerically incomplete*. The following is a precise accounting.

What is derived.

1. ν_R lives in the diagonal slots of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ (Addendum 53 Proposition 2.1); its Majorana mass couples to the (1, 1, 8) VEV.
2. The (1, 1, 8) block has embedding index $\ell = 4$ into E_6 (Proposition ??).
3. The $y_\nu = 1$ identification is structural in the E_6 trilinear (Proposition ??).
4. Given $y_\nu = 1$ and the seesaw formula, the spectral reflection $E_R = 2E_v + |E_{\nu_3}|$ is exact (Theorem ??).

What requires an additional input.

1. The light neutrino energy $E_{\nu_3} \approx -17.23$ uses the experimental Δm_{31}^2 as input. This is the single remaining phenomenological input in the seesaw chain.
2. The (1, 1, 8) VEV scale v_R is not derivable from the Killing form alone: the Killing-form norm sets the VEV direction (eq. (??)) but not its magnitude. The magnitude requires the scalar potential, which is not currently in the corpus.

The Option B near-miss is not structural. Proposition ?? shows that Option B corresponds to $m_{\nu_3} \approx 37$ meV, 25% below the PDG anchor. The 0.6% proximity in E_R coordinates is an artefact of the logarithmic scale and does not reflect E_6 structure.

Closing the gap. The gap is precisely one number: E_{ν_3} (equivalently, m_{ν_3} or Δm_{31}^2). Two approaches that avoid using this number as input:

Phase 5a Derive the Cabibbo-step Yukawa norms from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear $T(x_{23} \cdot e_0, H, \alpha_3)$ for the third-generation coupling. This would give m_{ν_3} (and $m_{\nu_{1,2}}$) from G_2 Coxeter structure, completing the spectrum without experimental input.

Phase 5b Construct the E_6 adjoint scalar potential from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ adjoint representation (the $(1, 1, 8)$ sector realised as traceless elements of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$) and derive the potential minimum v_R in TOE energy units. A VEV consistent with $E_R \approx 56.5$ would require $v_R \approx M_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV, to be checked against the scalar potential's unique minimum in the TOE framework.

Both paths are tractable computations within the existing $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ framework.

9 Summary

We have examined the E_6 adjoint $(1, 1, 8)$ sector in detail to ground the right-handed Majorana neutrino mass $M_R \approx 1.24 \times 10^{15}$ GeV.

$(1, 1, 8)$ embedding and Killing form. The $SU(3)_R$ factor in the E_6 trinification has embedding index $\ell = 4$. Its Casimir in E_6 equals $h^\vee(E_6) = 12$; the Casimir ratio is exactly 1, which maps to the bulk energy $4\pi^3 \approx 124$, not to $E_R \approx 56.5$. The Killing form does not yield the seesaw scale (Proposition ??).

Unit Yukawa. The E_6 trilinear $\mathbf{27}^3$ forces $y_\nu = y_t = 1$ at tree level at the unification scale. This is a structural result (Proposition ??) though not yet a formal proof from TOE constants.

Spectral reflection is a theorem. $E_R + E_{\nu_3} = 2E_v$ follows exactly from the Type I seesaw with $m_{D,3} = v$ (Theorem ??). In the S^3 geometry, the seesaw is an antipodal reflection of the neutrino energy through the electroweak VEV. The numerical check gives agreement to 0.002%.

Option B is excluded. The near-miss $\mu_1/2 + \pi \text{ MU} \approx 56.851$ implies $m_{\nu_3} \approx 37$ meV, 25% below the PDG value. No E_6 root datum corresponding to $\mu_1/2 + \pi \text{ MU}$ has been found. The proximity in E_R coordinates is not structural (Proposition ??).

The gap. The derivation is complete in structure and incomplete in one number. The chain

$$E_6 \text{ trilinear} \Rightarrow y_\nu = 1 \Rightarrow m_{D,3} = v \Rightarrow E_R = 2E_v + |E_{\nu_3}|$$

holds as a theorem. The single remaining open input is E_{ν_3} (equivalently m_{ν_3}). Closing it requires either (Phase 5a) deriving m_{ν_3} from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ trilinear Cabibbo-step structure, or (Phase 5b) deriving the $(1, 1, 8)$ VEV from the E_6 adjoint scalar potential.

References

- [1] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 48: E_6 Covariance of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$, Hypercharge Forcing, and the W/Z Gap*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).
- [2] 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).
- [3] L. F. Vlegels, *Addendum 55: Deriving the Seesaw Scale M_R from the E_6 Adjoint $\mathbf{78}$ Sector: Five Options, One Hit, and the Unit-Yukawa Identification*, TOE Corpus Addendum (2026).

- [4] E. B. Dynkin, *Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras*, Mat. Sb. **30** (1952) 349–462; AMS Transl. **6** (1957) 111–244.
- [5] R. Slansky, *Group Theory for Unified Model Building*, Phys. Rep. **79** (1981) 1–128.
- [6] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, eds. van Nieuwenhuizen and Freedman, North-Holland (1979) 315–321.
- [7] T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on the Baryon Number of the Universe and Unified Theories*, KEK Report 79-18 (1979).
- [8] J. C. Baez, *The Octonions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39** (2002) 145–205.
- [9] Particle Data Group, *Review of Particle Physics*, Chinese Physics C **38** (2024).