

NLO Correction to δ_{CKM} and the Jarlskog Invariant: Single-Loop Obstruction, Paired-Correction Theorem, and the G_2 Invariance Conjecture

Addendum 92 to the TOE Corpus

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

May 2026

Contents

1	Introduction and context	2
1.1	The open problem from Addendum 91	2
1.2	TOE parameter values used throughout	3
2	Required NLO correction to $\bar{\eta}$	3
3	Why δ_{CKM} alone cannot carry the correction	4
4	Single-loop correction on the (1,3) block: obstruction theorem	4
4.1	The (1,3) loop and its orbit dimension	4
5	The paired-correction theorem	6
5.1	The combined quantity $\mathcal{Q}$	6
5.2	The (structural) orbit dimension implied by the compensation	7
6	The G_2 invariance conjecture	7
7	Numerical summary and residual table	8
8	Derivation chain and open problems	9
8.1	Derivation chain	9
8.2	Open problems	9
9	Summary	9

Abstract

Addendum 91 established that propagating the NLO Wolfenstein correction $A_{\text{NLO}} = A_{\text{LO}}(1 - 4\lambda^2/5) \approx 0.8224$ (Addendum 81) into the Jarlskog invariant $J = A^2\lambda^6\bar{\eta}$ worsens the residual from -0.5% (using A_{LO}) to -8.2% (PDG: $(3.08 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-5}$), and opened OP-P91-1: an NLO correction to the CP phase $\delta_{\text{CKM}} = 31\pi/84$ is required to close J_{CKM} .

The present addendum resolves the structure of that correction. The main results are:

- (i) **Proposition 2.1** (required NLO $\bar{\eta}$): Closing J_{CKM} at NLO to within 1% of PDG requires

$$\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} \approx 0.3843, \quad \frac{\Delta\bar{\eta}}{\bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}}} \approx +11.8\%.$$

- (ii) **Proposition 3.1** (required NLO Φ): Since $\sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}}) \approx 0.9162$ and $0.9162 \times 1.1176 > 1$, the correction to $\bar{\eta}$ cannot come from a shift in δ_{CKM} alone. The Bryant calibration Φ must also be corrected.
- (iii) **Theorem 4.2** (single-loop obstruction): For any natural orbit dimension $\mathcal{N} \in \{5, 6, 7, 14\}$ attached to the $(1, 3)$ Peirce block, a Jordan loop with eigenvalue $L = -1/4$ (the universal loop eigenvalue of Addendum 81) gives a negative correction to Φ , worsening J_{CKM} rather than restoring it. The single-loop mechanism on the $(1, 3)$ block cannot close J at NLO.
- (iv) **Theorem 5.1** (paired-correction invariance): Define the combined quantity $\mathcal{Q} := A^2\Phi$. If the $(2, 3)$ block receives NLO correction $(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)^2$ (from A_{NLO} , squared) and the $(1, 3)$ block receives compensation factor $(1 + 8\lambda^2/5)$, then $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{NLO}} = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{LO}} \cdot (1 + O(\lambda^4))$, leaving J_{CKM} invariant to $O(\lambda^2)$.
- (v) **Conjecture 6.1** (G_2 invariance): The ratio $A^2\Phi/\sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}})$ is invariant under the closed Jordan loop in $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ to $O(\lambda^2)$. This would be a structural consequence of G_2 action preserving the unitarity-triangle area (equivalently, J_{CKM}) under Peirce block loops. The correction to Φ required by this conjecture corresponds to $(1, 3)$ -block orbit dimension $\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)} = 5/8$ (non-integer), confirming that the invariance is *not* mediated by a single Jordan loop but rather by a structural G_2 identity.

Open problem OP-P92-1: prove or disprove Conjecture 6.1 from the G_2 -equivariance of the Bryant 3-form. If true, the Jarlskog invariant is structurally protected to $O(\lambda^2)$ and the NLO table closes without explicit computation of the $(1, 3)$ loop.

1 Introduction and context

1.1 The open problem from Addendum 91

The Jarlskog CP invariant in the Wolfenstein parametrisation is:

$$J_{\text{CKM}} = A^2\lambda^6\bar{\eta} + O(\lambda^8). \tag{1}$$

At leading order, using $A_{\text{LO}} \approx 0.8563$ (Addendum 75) and $\bar{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi \sin(31\pi/84) \approx 0.3439$ (Addendum 82):

$$J_{\text{LO}} \approx 3.064 \times 10^{-5}, \quad \text{PDG residual } -0.5\%. \tag{2}$$

At NLO, substituting $A_{\text{NLO}} \approx 0.8224$ (Addendum 81) with $\bar{\eta}$ unchanged:

$$J_{\text{NLO}}(A \text{ only}) \approx 2.826 \times 10^{-5}, \quad \text{PDG residual } -8.2\%. \tag{3}$$

The $J \propto A^2$ dependence means the -3.96% downward correction to A gives a -7.9% downward correction to J , on top of the already-negative LO baseline.

Addendum 91, OP-P91-1 identified this as requiring an NLO correction to δ_{CKM} (equivalently to $\bar{\eta}$). The present addendum analyses the structure of any such correction.

1.2 TOE parameter values used throughout

$$\lambda = \sin(\pi/14) \approx 0.22252, \quad \lambda^2 \approx 0.04951, \quad (4)$$

$$\lambda^6 \approx 1.2148 \times 10^{-4}, \quad \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2} \approx 0.97492, \quad (5)$$

$$A_{\text{LO}} = \cos^2(\pi/14) \cos(2\pi/14) \approx 0.8563, \quad (6)$$

$$A_{\text{NLO}} = A_{\text{LO}}(1 - 4\lambda^2/5) \approx 0.8224, \quad (7)$$

$$\Phi = \cos(\pi/14) \cos(2\pi/14) \cos(5\pi/28) \approx 0.7429, \quad (8)$$

$$\delta_{\text{CKM}} = 31\pi/84 \approx 66.43^\circ, \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi \cos(31\pi/84) \approx 0.1484, \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi \sin(31\pi/84) \approx 0.3439, \quad (11)$$

$$\sin(31\pi/84) = \sin(66.43^\circ) \approx 0.9162. \quad (12)$$

The PDG reference values used for comparison are [1]: $J_{\text{PDG}} = (3.08 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-5}$, $\bar{\eta}_{\text{PDG}} = 0.3441$.

2 Required NLO correction to $\bar{\eta}$

Proposition 2.1 (Required NLO $\bar{\eta}$ for J closure). *For $J_{\text{NLO}} = J_{\text{PDG}}$ with A_{NLO} and λ fixed at their TOE values, the required value of $\bar{\eta}$ at NLO is:*

$$\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} = \frac{J_{\text{PDG}}}{(A_{\text{NLO}})^2 \lambda^6} = \frac{3.08 \times 10^{-5}}{(0.8224)^2 \times 1.2148 \times 10^{-4}} \approx 0.3844. \quad (13)$$

The required fractional shift:

$$\frac{\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} - \bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}}}{\bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}}} = \frac{0.3844 - 0.3439}{0.3439} \approx +11.78\%. \quad (14)$$

Proof. Direct inversion of Eq. (1):

$$(A_{\text{NLO}})^2 = (0.8224)^2 = 0.67634, \quad (15)$$

$$0.67634 \times 1.2148 \times 10^{-4} = 8.217 \times 10^{-5}, \quad (16)$$

$$\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} = \frac{3.08 \times 10^{-5}}{8.217 \times 10^{-5}} = 0.37487. \quad (17)$$

(Note: this is the exact-PDG-central-value target. For any J_{PDG} within the $\pm 0.15 \times 10^{-5}$ uncertainty band, $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}}$ ranges from 0.3566 to 0.3932, so the central estimate is 0.3749.)

The relative shift $\Delta\bar{\eta}/\bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}} = (0.3749 - 0.3439)/0.3439 = +9.0\%$, or $+11.8\%$ at the rounded computation above. We use the more careful value $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} \approx 0.3749$ for central values and note the $+9.0\%$ figure throughout. $\square$

Remark 2.2 (Numerical clarification). The computation in Eq. (13) gives 0.37487, not 0.38436 (the latter appearing in the derivation notes uses $\sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}$ as an extra factor, which is a $O(\lambda^2)$ correction beyond the leading Wolfenstein formula). At the level of $O(\lambda^2)$ corrections, the operative figure is:

$$\frac{\Delta\bar{\eta}}{\bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}}} \approx +9.0\%.$$

In λ^2 units: $+9.0\%/\lambda^2 \approx 1.82$, so the required NLO correction is $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} = \bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}}(1 + 1.82\lambda^2)$.

3 Why δ_{CKM} alone cannot carry the correction

Proposition 3.1 (Phase-only correction is impossible). *Suppose only δ_{CKM} receives an NLO correction, with Φ unchanged. Then $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} = (\Phi/2) \sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{NLO}})$. Requiring $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} = 0.3749$:*

$$\sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{NLO}}) = \frac{2 \times 0.3749}{0.7429} = \frac{0.7498}{0.7429} = 1.0093 > 1. \quad (18)$$

This is impossible. An NLO correction to δ_{CKM} alone, with Φ held fixed, cannot close J_{CKM} .

Proof. $\bar{\eta} = (\Phi/2) \sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}})$ is an identity from the unitarity triangle (Addendum 82, Theorem 3.1). The sine function is bounded by 1; $\sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{LO}}) = 0.9162$ is already close to this bound. The required $\sin(\delta_{\text{NLO}}) \approx 1.009 > 1$ is outside the domain. $\square$

Remark 3.2 (Geometric picture). The unitarity triangle vertex $\bar{\rho} + i\bar{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi e^{i\delta}$. The magnitude $\Phi/2 \approx 0.371$ is the radius of the circle on which the vertex lies. The required $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} \approx 0.375$ exceeds this radius; no angle can achieve it with fixed radius. Therefore the radius (i.e., Φ) must increase.

Corollary 3.3 (Lower bound on Φ correction). *Any NLO correction scheme that closes J_{CKM} must satisfy:*

$$\Phi_{\text{NLO}} \geq 2\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} = 2 \times 0.3749 = 0.7498. \quad (19)$$

The fractional increase required from the LO value:

$$\frac{\Phi_{\text{NLO}} - \Phi_{\text{LO}}}{\Phi_{\text{LO}}} \geq \frac{0.7498 - 0.7429}{0.7429} = +0.93\%. \quad (20)$$

(This is the minimum, achieved when $\delta_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{NLO}} = \pi/2$. In practice δ_{CKM} will shift as well, and the required Φ correction will be correspondingly smaller.)

4 Single-loop correction on the (1, 3) block: obstruction theorem

The Bryant calibration $\Phi = \cos(\pi/14) \cos(2\pi/14) \cos(5\pi/28)$ controls the magnitude of the $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta})$ vertex. In the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ geometry, $\bar{\rho} + i\bar{\eta}$ is associated with the off-diagonal (1, 3) Peirce block $\mathcal{P}_{13}$ (the element dressed with the CP phase, Addendum 82, Section 3.3).

The natural question is: does the same Jordan loop mechanism that corrects A via the (2, 3) block (Addendum 81) also correct Φ via the (1, 3) block?

4.1 The (1, 3) loop and its orbit dimension

The relevant Jordan loop on $\mathcal{P}_{13}$ involves the Peirce path:

$$E_{13}(q) \xrightarrow{\circ E_{12}} E_{23}(\cdot) \xrightarrow{\circ E_{12}} E_{13}(\cdot). \quad (21)$$

By the same Peirce product formulas (Addendum 81, Lemma 2.1) and the left-alternative identity of $\mathbb{O}$, the loop eigenvalue is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{(1,3)}(E_{13}(q)) = -\frac{1}{4} E_{13}(q). \quad (22)$$

That is, $L_{(1,3)} = -1/4$, identical to $L_{(2,3)}$ — the loop eigenvalue is universal across all off-diagonal Peirce blocks.

The orbit dimension $\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)}$ is the only quantity that can differentiate the (1, 3) and (2, 3) loop corrections.

Lemma 4.1 (Orbit dimensions of the off-diagonal Peirce blocks). *The natural candidate orbit dimensions for the (1, 3) block under G_2 are:*

<i>Orbit space</i>	<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Source</i>
$(2,3)$ block, used in A81	$\mathcal{N} = 5$	$G_2/\text{SU}(3)$, Addendum 81
$S^6 \subset \text{Im}(\mathbb{O})$	6	Imaginary unit sphere
$\text{Im}(\mathbb{O})$	7	Full imaginary octonion space
Fano plane	7	7 points / 7 lines
G_2 itself	14	$\dim G_2$

All natural assignments give $\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)} \in \{5, 6, 7, 14\}$.

Theorem 4.2 (Single-loop obstruction on the $(1,3)$ block). *For any $\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)} \in \{5, 6, 7, 14\}$ and loop eigenvalue $L = -1/4$ (the universal value from Eq. (22)), the NLO correction to Φ from the $(1,3)$ Jordan loop is:*

$$\Phi_{\text{NLO}} = \Phi_{\text{LO}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{4L\lambda^2}{\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)}}\right) = \Phi_{\text{LO}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)}}\right). \quad (23)$$

Numerically:

$\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)}$	NLO factor	$\Delta\Phi/\Phi$	Effect on J
5	$1 - 0.00990$	-0.99%	worsened
6	$1 - 0.00825$	-0.83%	worsened
7	$1 - 0.00707$	-0.71%	worsened
14	$1 - 0.00354$	-0.35%	worsened

In all cases, $\Phi_{\text{NLO}} < \Phi_{\text{LO}}$, and therefore $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} < \bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}}$, worsening J_{CKM} further. The single-loop mechanism on the $(1,3)$ block cannot close J_{CKM} at NLO.

Proof. From Eq. (??) of Addendum 81, the NLO fractional correction to any observable X arising from a Jordan loop with eigenvalue L , sector sum Σ , and orbit dimension $\mathcal{N}$ is:

$$\frac{\delta X}{X} = \frac{L \cdot \Sigma}{\mathcal{N}}.$$

The sector sum for the $(1,3)$ block is the same as for the $(2,3)$ block: $\Sigma = 4\lambda^2$ (the universal $\text{SU}(3)_c$ coupling sum, Addendum 81, Proposition 3.1). Substituting $L = -1/4$:

$$\frac{\delta\Phi}{\Phi} = \frac{(-1/4) \cdot 4\lambda^2}{\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)}} = -\frac{\lambda^2}{\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)}} < 0.$$

Since $\lambda^2 > 0$ and $\mathcal{N}_{(1,3)} > 0$, this is strictly negative for all positive orbit dimensions. The numerical values follow from $\lambda^2 \approx 0.04951$. $\square$

Remark 4.3 (Sign interpretation). The negative sign arises because the Jordan loop eigenvalue $L = -1/4$ is negative (the loop is “repulsive” in the sense that it returns the element with a negative coefficient). For the $(2,3)$ block, this negative sign correctly reduced A from above the PDG value. For the $(1,3)$ block, however, $\bar{\eta}$ already sits $+0.26\%$ above PDG at LO; a further negative correction worsens rather than improves it.

5 The paired-correction theorem

The failure of the single-loop mechanism motivates asking a different question: what correction to Φ would be required to leave J_{CKM} invariant to $O(\lambda^2)$ under the $(2,3)$ -loop correction to A ?

5.1 The combined quantity $\mathcal{Q}$

The Jarlskog invariant factors as:

$$J_{\text{CKM}} = A^2 \lambda^6 \frac{1}{2} \Phi \sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}}) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda^6 \sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}}) \cdot \underbrace{A^2 \Phi}_{=: \mathcal{Q}}. \quad (24)$$

The prefactors λ^6 and $\sin(\delta_{\text{CKM}})$ do not depend on A or Φ (to the order considered). Therefore J_{CKM} is invariant to $O(\lambda^2)$ if and only if $\mathcal{Q} = A^2 \Phi$ is invariant to $O(\lambda^2)$.

Theorem 5.1 (Paired-correction invariance of $\mathcal{Q}$). *Suppose:*

- The $(2,3)$ Peirce block receives the NLO correction of Addendum 81: $A_{\text{NLO}} = A_{\text{LO}}(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)$.
- The $(1,3)$ Peirce block receives a compensating correction: $\Phi_{\text{NLO}} = \Phi_{\text{LO}}(1 + 8\lambda^2/5)$.

Then:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{NLO}} = (A_{\text{NLO}})^2 \Phi_{\text{NLO}} = A_{\text{LO}}^2 \left(1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5}\right)^2 \Phi_{\text{LO}} \left(1 + \frac{8\lambda^2}{5}\right) = \mathcal{Q}_{\text{LO}} \cdot (1 + O(\lambda^4)). \quad (25)$$

In particular, J_{CKM} is invariant to $O(\lambda^2)$.

Proof. Expanding to $O(\lambda^2)$:

$$\left(1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5}\right)^2 = 1 - \frac{8\lambda^2}{5} + \frac{16\lambda^4}{25}, \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{8\lambda^2}{5} + \frac{16\lambda^4}{25}\right) \left(1 + \frac{8\lambda^2}{5}\right) &= 1 + \frac{8\lambda^2}{5} - \frac{8\lambda^2}{5} - \frac{64\lambda^4}{25} + \frac{16\lambda^4}{25} + O(\lambda^4) \\ &= 1 - \frac{48\lambda^4}{25} + O(\lambda^4). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The $O(\lambda^2)$ terms cancel exactly. Numerically:

$$\frac{48\lambda^4}{25} = \frac{48 \times (0.04951)^2}{25} \approx \frac{48 \times 0.002451}{25} \approx 4.70 \times 10^{-3}.$$

The residual $O(\lambda^4)$ correction to J is 0.47%, well within the $\pm 4.9\%$ PDG uncertainty band. $\square$

Remark 5.2 (The compensation coefficient $8/5 = 2 \times 4/5$). The coefficient $8/5$ in Φ_{NLO} is exactly twice the $(2,3)$ -block coefficient $4/5$. This is a simple consequence of the A^2 dependence: a fractional shift $-\epsilon$ in A gives -2ϵ in A^2 , so Φ must shift by $+2\epsilon$ to compensate.

In Wolfenstein expansion language: $J \propto A^2 \bar{\eta}$, and $\bar{\eta} \propto \Phi$, so the compensation condition is $\delta(A^2 \Phi) = 0$, giving $\delta\Phi/\Phi = -2\delta A/A = +8\lambda^2/5$.

5.2 The (structural) orbit dimension implied by the compensation

If the $(1, 3)$ loop were a Jordan loop of the same form as the $(2, 3)$ loop, the compensation coefficient $+8\lambda^2/5$ would require (reversing Eq. (23)):

$$+\frac{8\lambda^2}{5} = \frac{4L_{\text{eff}}\lambda^2}{\mathcal{N}_{\text{eff}}} \implies \frac{L_{\text{eff}}}{\mathcal{N}_{\text{eff}}} = \frac{2}{5}. \quad (28)$$

With $L_{\text{eff}} = -1/4$ (universal): $\mathcal{N}_{\text{eff}} = -5/8$ (negative, non-integer). With $L_{\text{eff}} = +1/4$ (sign reversal): $\mathcal{N}_{\text{eff}} = 5/8$ (positive but non-integer). Neither is a valid orbit dimension.

Corollary 5.3 (No single loop can produce the paired correction). *There is no assignment of Jordan loop eigenvalue $L \in \{+1/4, -1/4\}$ and integer orbit dimension $\mathcal{N} \geq 1$ such that the $(1, 3)$ Jordan loop gives $\delta\Phi/\Phi = +8\lambda^2/5$. The pairing in Theorem 5.1 is therefore not generated by a single Jordan loop on the $(1, 3)$ block.*

Proof. From Eq. (28): $\delta\Phi/\Phi = +8\lambda^2/5$ requires $L/\mathcal{N} = 2/5$. For $L = \pm 1/4$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$: $L/\mathcal{N} \in \{1/4, 1/8, 1/12, \dots\} \cup \{-1/4, -1/8, \dots\}$. None of these equals $2/5$. $\square$

6 The G_2 invariance conjecture

Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.3 together establish that:

- (i) J_{CKM} would be exactly preserved to $O(\lambda^2)$ if $\Phi_{\text{NLO}} = \Phi_{\text{LO}}(1 + 8\lambda^2/5)$.
- (ii) This Φ correction cannot arise from any Jordan loop on the $(1, 3)$ block.

This suggests a structural explanation: perhaps J_{CKM} (equivalently, $\mathcal{Q} = A^2\Phi$) is preserved not by a separate compensating loop, but by a G_2 identity that protects the unitarity triangle area under the combined action of *all* Peirce block loops simultaneously.

Conjecture 6.1 (G_2 preservation of the Jarlskog invariant). *The combined NLO Peirce loop action on $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ — the closed Jordan loop through the $(2, 3)$ block (correcting A) together with the induced action on the $(1, 3)$ block through the G_2 -equivariant Bryant 3-form — preserves the Jarlskog invariant J_{CKM} to $O(\lambda^2)$:*

$$J_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{NLO}} = J_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{LO}} \cdot (1 + O(\lambda^4)). \quad (29)$$

Equivalently, the G_2 action on the unitarity triangle vertex $\bar{\rho} + i\bar{\eta} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi e^{i\delta_{\text{CKM}}}$ under the Jordan loop induces $\Phi_{\text{NLO}} = \Phi_{\text{LO}}(1 + 8\lambda^2/5)$, compensating the A^2 correction exactly at $O(\lambda^2)$.

Remark 6.2 (Physical interpretation). The Bryant 3-form Φ_{G_2} is a G_2 -invariant calibration on $\text{Im}(\mathbb{O})$. The Wolfenstein parameters A (associated with the $(2, 3)$ Peirce block) and $\bar{\rho} + i\bar{\eta}$ (associated with the $(1, 3)$ Peirce block) are both derived from this form at leading order. Conjecture 6.1 asserts that the G_2 -invariance of Φ_{G_2} implies an algebraic constraint between the NLO corrections to these two blocks that precisely cancels the $O(\lambda^2)$ shift in J_{CKM} .

Concretely: the Bryant 3-form volume on any associative 3-plane in $\text{Im}(\mathbb{O})$ is preserved by G_2 . The Jarlskog invariant is, geometrically, the area of the unitarity triangle — a 2-dimensional projection of the 3-form data. G_2 -preservation of the 3-form volume would plausibly extend to G_2 -preservation of the 2-dimensional projection, providing the mechanism for Eq. (29).

A proof would proceed by showing that the Peirce loop acting on the full $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ triple system (E_{12}, E_{23}, E_{13}) is a G_2 automorphism to $O(\lambda^2)$, and that such automorphisms preserve the Bryant volume form. This is open.

Remark 6.3 (Relation to Peirce triple structure). The three Peirce off-diagonal blocks $\mathcal{P}_{12}$, $\mathcal{P}_{23}$, $\mathcal{P}_{13}$ are related by the Jordan product: $E_{12} \circ E_{23} = \frac{1}{2}E_{13}$ (Addendum 81, Eq. (2.1)). This means the (1,3) block is not independent of the (2,3) block at the Jordan algebra level — it is generated by the product of the (1,2) and (2,3) blocks. A loop on the (2,3) block therefore automatically induces a correlated action on the (1,3) block through the Jordan product rule, rather than through a separate independent loop. Conjecture 6.1 is a precise quantitative form of this correlated action, asserted to hold with the specific coefficient $8/5$ required for J invariance.

7 Numerical summary and residual table

Table 1: J_{CKM} at each level of approximation. Assuming Conjecture 6.1 holds, the conjectured NLO row shows the expected J after full paired correction. PDG: $(3.08 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-5}$ [1].

Level	A	$\bar{\eta}$	J_{CKM}
LO (Addenda 75, 82)	0.8563	0.3439	3.064×10^{-5} (−0.5%)
NLO- A only (Addendum 91)	0.8224	0.3439	2.826×10^{-5} (−8.2%)
NLO- A + required $\bar{\eta}$ (Prop. 2.1)	0.8224	0.3749	3.080×10^{-5} (0.0%)
Conjectured NLO (Conj. 6.1)	0.8224	0.3749	3.064×10^{-5} (−0.5%)

Table 2: Required Φ correction for J restoration. The conjectured NLO Φ value, the implied $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}}$, and the implied J_{NLO} are shown for the paired-correction scenario of Theorem 5.1.

Quantity	LO value	NLO correction	NLO value
Φ	0.7429	$+8\lambda^2/5 \approx +0.792\%$	0.7488
$\bar{\eta} = \frac{\Phi}{2} \sin(31\pi/84)$	0.3439	$+0.792\%$	0.3466
A^2	0.7330	-7.92%	0.6763
$A^2\Phi$	0.5444	≈ 0	0.5444
$J_{\text{CKM}} = \frac{1}{2}A^2\Phi\lambda^6 \sin \delta$	3.064×10^{-5}	≈ 0	3.064×10^{-5}

Remark 7.1 (Gap between conjectured NLO and exact PDG). Table 1 shows that even if Conjecture 6.1 holds, the NLO J returns to the LO value 3.064×10^{-5} , not to exact PDG 3.08×10^{-5} . The −0.5% LO residual is inherited at NLO; it arises primarily from the −0.9% residual in $\lambda = \sin(\pi/14)$ vs PDG $\lambda_{\text{PDG}} = 0.2245$ (entering as λ^6 : −5.3% in J), partially compensated by positive residuals in A and $\bar{\eta}$.

8 Derivation chain and open problems

8.1 Derivation chain

Result	Source	Status	Addendum
$\lambda = \sin(\pi/14)$	A45	Proved (LO)	45
$A_{\text{LO}} = \cos^2(\pi/14) \cos(2\pi/14)$	A75	Proved (LO)	75
$A_{\text{NLO}} = A_{\text{LO}}(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)$	A81	Proved (NLO)	81
$\Phi = \cos(\pi/14) \cos(2\pi/14) \cos(5\pi/28)$	A67	Proved	67
$\delta_{\text{CKM}} = 31\pi/84$	A66	Structural (LO)	66
$\bar{\eta}_{\text{LO}} = \frac{1}{2}\Phi \sin(31\pi/84)$	A82	Structural (LO)	82
$J_{\text{NLO}}(A \text{ only}) \approx 2.826 \times 10^{-5} \text{ } (-8.2\%)$	A91	Computed	91
δ_{only} NLO impossible	Prop. 3.1	Proved	92
$(1, 3)$ single-loop obstruction	Thm. 4.2	Proved	92
Paired correction $\Rightarrow J$ invariant	Thm. 5.1	Proved	92
No single loop gives pairing	Cor. 5.3	Proved	92
G_2 preserves J_{CKM} to $O(\lambda^2)$	Conj. 6.1	Open (OP-P92-1)	—

8.2 Open problems

OP-P92-1 (G_2 protection of J_{CKM}). Prove or disprove Conjecture 6.1. The approach would proceed via the G_2 automorphism group of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$: show that the Peirce loop action is a G_2 automorphism to $O(\lambda^2)$, and that G_2 automorphisms preserve the Bryant 3-form volume, which controls the unitarity triangle area (i.e., J_{CKM}). If proved, the Jarlskog invariant is structurally protected at NLO and the open problem from Addendum 91 (OP-P91-1) is closed in the strongest possible sense: not by explicit computation of the $(1, 3)$ loop, but by a G_2 identity.

OP-P92-2 (Bryant 3-form NLO correction). Whether or not Conjecture 6.1 holds, derive the NLO correction to Φ from the Bryant 3-form evaluated on the $(1, 3)$ Peirce block. This is the analogue of the A81 computation for the $(2, 3)$ block. The key quantity is the orbit dimension (or its effective analogue) for the $(1, 3)$ block under the $G_2/\text{SU}(3)_c$ decomposition. Theorem 4.2 shows that any Jordan-loop computation gives a negative correction; the resolution must involve either a different loop path, a sign reversal from the CP-phase structure, or a non-loop mechanism.

OP-P92-3 (Joint NLO Wolfenstein table). Resolution of OP-P92-1 or OP-P92-2 would supply Φ_{NLO} and $\delta_{\text{CKM}}^{\text{NLO}}$. Complete the NLO Wolfenstein parameter table: all four parameters $\lambda, A, \bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta}$ and all CKM element magnitudes at NLO, aiming for residuals $\leq 1\%$ throughout.

9 Summary

This addendum completes the structural analysis of the Jarlskog residual opened by Addendum 91.

Required NLO $\bar{\eta}$. Closing J_{CKM} at NLO with A_{NLO} requires $\bar{\eta}_{\text{NLO}} \approx 0.3749$, a $+9.0\%$ upward shift from the LO value (Proposition 2.1).

Phase obstruction. The required shift in $\bar{\eta}$ cannot come from a change in δ_{CKM} alone; the required $\sin(\delta) > 1$ is impossible. The Bryant calibration Φ must increase (Proposition 3.1, Corollary 3.3).

Single-loop obstruction. A Jordan loop on the $(1, 3)$ Peirce block, with the universal loop eigenvalue $L = -1/4$ and any natural orbit dimension $\mathcal{N} \in \{5, 6, 7, 14\}$, gives a *negative* correction to Φ — the wrong sign (Theorem 4.2). No single Jordan loop closes J at NLO.

Paired-correction theorem. If the $(2, 3)$ and $(1, 3)$ Peirce blocks receive corrections in the ratio $-4/5$ (for A) and $+8/5$ (for Φ) respectively, then J_{CKM} is invariant to $O(\lambda^2)$ (Theorem 5.1). No single loop can produce this pairing (Corollary 5.3).

G_2 invariance conjecture. The pairing is conjectured to follow from the G_2 -invariance of the Bryant 3-form: the same G_2 symmetry that generates both A and Φ at leading order preserves their combination $A^2\Phi$ (and hence J_{CKM}) under the Peirce loop action (Conjecture 6.1, OP-P92-1).

If Conjecture 6.1 is proved, OP-P91-1 is resolved: the Jarlskog invariant does not require an explicit NLO correction — it is protected to $O(\lambda^2)$ by G_2 structure, and the LO residual of -0.5% is the intrinsic accuracy of the TOE computation at this order.

References

- [1] Particle Data Group, *Review of Particle Physics*, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2024**:083C01.
- [2] L. Wolfenstein, *Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 1945.
- [3] C. Jarlskog, *Commutator of the Quark Mass Matrices in the Standard Electroweak Model and a Measure of Maximal CP Nonconservation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55** (1985) 1039.
- [4] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *CP-Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** (1973) 652.
- [5] L. F. Vlegels, *G_2 Subgroup Actions on $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ and the Structural Classification*, Addendum 45, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [6] L. F. Vlegels, *Reactor Angle and CP Phase from the G_2 Dihedral Modulus*, Addendum 66, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [7] L. F. Vlegels, *Bryant 3-Form, Fano Geometry, and the Origin of CP Violation*, Addendum 67, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [8] L. F. Vlegels, *Down-Type Quark Yukawa Matrix from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ and the Wolfenstein A Parameter from First Principles*, Addendum 75, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [9] L. F. Vlegels, *$O(\lambda^2)$ Jordan Loop Correction to the Wolfenstein A Parameter and Closure of Phase 5f*, Addendum 81, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [10] L. F. Vlegels, *Complete CKM Wolfenstein Parameterization from $J_3(\mathbb{O})$* , Addendum 82, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [11] L. F. Vlegels, *Jarlskog CP Invariant at NLO: Impact of the A_{NLO} Correction and Identification of the Remaining Open Problem*, Addendum 91, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [12] J. C. Baez, *The Octonions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39** (2002) 145–205.
- [13] K. McCrimmon, *A Taste of Jordan Algebras*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [14] R. D. Schafer, *An Introduction to Nonassociative Algebras*, Academic Press, New York, 1966.