

The Golden-Ratio Near-Miss $\sin^2 \theta_W \approx \frac{3}{8\varphi}$

Addendum 94 to the TOE Corpus

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

May 2026

Contents

1	Introduction and context	3
1.1	The near-miss in P90	3
1.2	Equivalent formulation	3
1.3	Organisation	3
1.4	Constants and conventions	4
2	Precise numerical account	4
2.1	The ratio and its residual	4
2.2	Residual in units of λ^4	4
3	Algebraic test: is the identity exact?	5
3.1	The exact-identity condition	5
3.2	The effective λ that would make it exact	6
4	Structural route A: G_2 dihedral ratio	6
4.1	Dihedral groups in the Weinberg angle derivation	6
4.2	Pentagon angle connection	6
5	Structural route B: $E_6 \supset \text{SU}(5)$ hypercharge renormalization	7
5.1	The standard $\text{SU}(5)$ hypercharge normalization	7
5.2	The E_6 normalization factor	7
5.3	The TOE prediction as an effective k_1^{eff}	7
6	Structural route C: E_8 Coxeter-plane projection	8
6.1	The golden ratio in E_8 geometry	8
6.2	E_6 Coxeter plane: no golden ratio	9
6.3	Octonion chain: $\mathbb{O} \leftrightarrow E_8 \leftrightarrow \text{icosahedron} \leftrightarrow \varphi$	9
7	The effective running-factor conjecture	9
7.1	Interpretation of the ratio	9
7.2	Physical interpretation: effective RG running	10
8	Open problem	11
9	Summary of results and status	11

Abstract

Addendum 90 observed that the TOE NLO Weinberg angle $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} \approx 0.23189$ and the standard $SU(5)$ GUT prediction $\sin^2 \theta_W^{SU(5)} = 3/8 = 0.37500$ stand in near-exact ratio $1/\varphi$ where $\varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio:

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{SU(5)}} = \frac{0.23189}{0.37500} = 0.61837 \approx \frac{1}{\varphi} = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} = 0.61803, \quad \delta = +0.054\%.$$

Equivalently, $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} \approx 3/(8\varphi) \approx 0.23176$, residual $+0.054\%$.

The present addendum investigates whether this near-miss is exact, algebraically motivated, or numerological.

Main results.

- (i) The identity $8(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)/(3(1 + \pi)) = 1/\varphi$ is *not* exact. The algebraic gap is 1.3% (see Section 3). The residual 0.054% is approximately $0.14\lambda^4$ in magnitude, making the near-miss at the natural NLO-squared (λ^4) scale.
- (ii) Three structural routes are explored (Sections 4–6): the G_2 dihedral ratio $|D_6|/|D_5| = 6/5$ (suggestive but not the right factor), the $E_6 \supset SU(5)$ hypercharge renormalization chain (the most structurally motivated route), and the E_8 Coxeter-plane φ -projection (establishes that φ enters the geometry at the E_8 level, not E_6).
- (iii) The near-miss is framed as Conjecture 7.1 (Section 7): the NLO Jordan loop correction acts as the effective symmetry-breaking renormalization from M_{GUT} to M_Z , and this running factor is $1/\varphi$ to $O(\lambda^4)$.
- (iv) Open problem OP-P94-1 is registered: prove or disprove the effective running factor $= 1/\varphi$ using the $E_8 \rightarrow E_6 \rightarrow SM$ projection (Section 8).

1 Introduction and context

1.1 The near-miss in P90

Addendum 90, Proposition 5.4.1 observed that the ratio of two independently derived Weinberg angle values stands in near-exact golden-ratio proportion:

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi} \left(1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5} \right) \approx 0.23189, \quad (1)$$

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = \frac{3}{8} = 0.37500, \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}} = 0.61837 \approx \frac{1}{\varphi} = 0.61803, \quad (3)$$

where $\varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \approx 1.61803$ is the golden ratio, and $1/\varphi = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \approx 0.61803$.

The two values in the ratio come from entirely different derivations:

- $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}$ is the TOE NLO result from Addenda 42, 43, and 88, derived from the Peirce block structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ with the G_2 -orbit NLO correction $4\lambda^2/5$.
- $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = 3/8$ is the textbook SU(5) GUT prediction at M_{GUT} , from the hypercharge normalization $k_1 = 5/3$ and the embedding $\text{U}(1)_Y \subset \text{SU}(5)$.

That these two independently derived quantities are in near-exact ratio $1/\varphi$ demands investigation.

1.2 Equivalent formulation

Equation (3) can be rewritten as:

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} \approx \frac{3}{8\varphi} = \frac{3(\sqrt{5} - 1)}{16} \approx 0.23176. \quad (4)$$

The residual of $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 0.23189$ against $3/(8\varphi) = 0.23176$ is:

$$\frac{0.23189 - 0.23176}{0.23176} = \frac{0.00013}{0.23176} = +0.054\%. \quad (5)$$

1.3 Organisation

Section 2 collects all numerical quantities precisely. Section 3 tests whether the identity is exact. Sections 4–6 explore three structural routes. Section 7 states Conjecture 7.1 as an effective running-factor interpretation. Section 8 registers the open problem. Section 9 summarises all results with status labels.

1.4 Constants and conventions

$$\varphi = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.61803, \quad \frac{1}{\varphi} = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} \approx 0.61803, \quad (6)$$

$$\lambda = \sin(\pi/14) \approx 0.22252, \quad \lambda^2 \approx 0.049516, \quad \lambda^4 \approx 0.0024519, \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{4\lambda^2}{5} \approx 0.039613, \quad 1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5} \approx 0.960387, \quad (8)$$

$$1 + \pi \approx 4.14159, \quad 3(1 + \pi) \approx 12.4248, \quad (9)$$

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = \frac{1}{1 + \pi} \left(1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5} \right) \approx 0.23189, \quad (10)$$

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = \frac{3}{8} = 0.37500, \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{3}{8\varphi} = \frac{3(\sqrt{5} - 1)}{16} \approx 0.23176. \quad (12)$$

2 Precise numerical account

2.1 The ratio and its residual

Proposition 2.1 (Precise near-miss statement). *The following numerical facts hold to six significant figures:*

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = \frac{0.960387}{4.14159} = 0.231888, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{1}{\varphi} = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} = 0.618034, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}} = \frac{0.231888}{0.375000} = 0.618369, \quad (15)$$

$$\delta_{\text{ratio}} = 0.618369 - 0.618034 = 0.000335, \quad \frac{\delta_{\text{ratio}}}{1/\varphi} = +0.054\%, \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{3}{8\varphi} = 0.231763, \quad (17)$$

$$\delta_{\text{angle}} = 0.231888 - 0.231763 = 0.000125, \quad \frac{\delta_{\text{angle}}}{3/(8\varphi)} = +0.054\%. \quad (18)$$

Remark 2.2 (NLO residual vs. golden-ratio residual). The TOE NLO value $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 0.23189$ has residual +0.29% against the PDG $\overline{\text{MS}}$ value 0.23122 (Addendum 88). The same value has residual +0.054% against $3/(8\varphi) = 0.23176$. These are independent comparisons: the PDG value is a measured quantity; $3/(8\varphi)$ is a number derived from the golden ratio. The fact that the golden-ratio residual (+0.054%) is five times smaller than the PDG residual (+0.29%) does not imply $3/(8\varphi)$ is more “fundamental.”

2.2 Residual in units of λ^4

Proposition 2.3 (Scale of the residual). *The 0.054% residual on the ratio corresponds to:*

$$\delta_{\text{ratio}} = 0.000335 \approx 0.14 \times \lambda^4, \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{\delta_{\text{ratio}}}{1/\varphi} = 0.054\% \approx 0.22 \lambda^4. \quad (20)$$

More precisely, comparing the residual to the natural NNLO scale $\lambda^4 = 0.0024519$:

$$\frac{\delta_{\text{ratio}}}{1/\varphi} = 0.000542 \approx 0.22 \times \lambda^4, \quad \delta_{\text{ratio}} = 0.000335 \approx 0.14 \times \lambda^4. \quad (21)$$

Thus the residual is at the natural $O(\lambda^4)$ (NNLO) scale. The near-miss at 0.054% is at the λ^4 level, consistent with the all-orders $1/\varphi$ attractor conjecture.

Remark 2.4 (Comparison to other TOE near-misses). The NLO residuals in the TOE corpus are typically $O(\lambda^4)$: Weinberg angle $+0.29\% \approx 1.2\lambda^4$; Higgs mass $+0.26\%$; Wolfenstein A $+0.08\%$. The golden-ratio residual $+0.054\%$ is in the same numerical range, but it is not a residual against an observed quantity — it is a residual against an algebraic prediction.

3 Algebraic test: is the identity exact?

3.1 The exact-identity condition

The claim $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 3/(8\varphi)$ expands to:

$$\frac{1 - 4\lambda^2/5}{1 + \pi} = \frac{3}{8\varphi} = \frac{3(\sqrt{5} - 1)}{16}. \quad (22)$$

Rearranging:

$$8\varphi \left(1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5}\right) = 3(1 + \pi), \quad (23)$$

or equivalently, with $1/\varphi = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$:

$$\frac{4\lambda^2}{5} = 1 - \frac{3(1 + \pi)}{8\varphi} = 1 - \frac{(\sqrt{5} - 1)(3 + 3\pi)}{16}. \quad (24)$$

Proposition 3.1 (The identity is not exact). *Define*

$$\left(\frac{4\lambda^2}{5}\right)_\varphi := 1 - \frac{(\sqrt{5} - 1)(3 + 3\pi)}{16}, \quad (25)$$

the value of $4\lambda^2/5$ that would make (22) exact. Then:

$$(\sqrt{5} - 1)(3 + 3\pi) = 1.23607 \times 12.4248 = 15.357, \quad (26)$$

$$\left(\frac{4\lambda^2}{5}\right)_\varphi = 1 - \frac{15.357}{16} = 1 - 0.95981 = 0.04019, \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{4\lambda^2}{5}|_{\text{actual}} = \frac{4 \sin^2(\pi/14)}{5} = 0.039613. \quad (28)$$

The relative gap is:

$$\frac{(4\lambda^2/5)_\varphi - (4\lambda^2/5)_{\text{actual}}}{(4\lambda^2/5)_{\text{actual}}} = \frac{0.04019 - 0.039613}{0.039613} = \frac{0.000577}{0.039613} = 1.46\%. \quad (29)$$

The absolute gap is 0.000577; in units of $\lambda^4 = 0.0024519$, this is $0.000577/0.0024519 = 0.235 \approx 2.1\lambda^4/10$.

Conclusion: The identity $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 3/(8\varphi)$ is not exact. The algebraic gap is 1.46% in the required value of $4\lambda^2/5$, or equivalently $+0.070\%$ in the ratio $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} / \sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}$.

3.2 The effective λ that would make it exact

Remark 3.2 (Effective λ_{eff}). If instead of the TOE value $\lambda = \sin(\pi/14)$ one used a nearby λ_{eff} satisfying $(4\lambda_{\text{eff}}^2/5) = (4\lambda^2/5)_\varphi = 0.04019$, then the identity would hold exactly. Solving:

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}}^2 = \frac{5 \times 0.04019}{4} = 0.050238, \quad (30)$$

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{0.050238} = 0.22414. \quad (31)$$

The shift $\lambda_{\text{eff}} - \lambda = 0.22414 - 0.22252 = +0.00162$, a relative shift of $+0.73\%$.

The value $\lambda_{\text{eff}} = 0.22414$ does not correspond to any known angular or algebraic special value. In particular, $\sin(\pi/14) = 0.22252$ is the TOE-canonical value (from the Cabibbo sector; Addendum 57). There is no structural reason to prefer λ_{eff} over λ .

Remark 3.3 (Why π and φ do not combine into an exact identity). The combination $3(1 + \pi)/(8\varphi)$ involves both π (transcendental, from the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ monad density) and $\varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ (algebraic, from the icosahedral group). These arise from entirely different mathematical structures; there is no a priori reason they would satisfy an exact algebraic relation. The near-miss is therefore a genuine numerical coincidence at the $O(\lambda^2)$ level, whose structural origin (if any) remains to be identified.

4 Structural route A: G_2 dihedral ratio

4.1 Dihedral groups in the Weinberg angle derivation

The G_2 Weyl group is the dihedral group D_6 of order $|D_6| = 12$ (generated by reflections in the G_2 root system, Coxeter number $h(G_2) = 6$). The regular pentagon is governed by the dihedral group D_5 of order $|D_5| = 10$. The golden ratio φ enters via D_5 : the diagonal-to-side ratio in a regular pentagon is φ , and $2\cos(\pi/5) = \varphi$, $2\sin(\pi/10) = 1/\varphi$.

Proposition 4.1 (Dihedral ratio is not the source). *The ratio $|D_6|/|D_5| = 12/10 = 6/5$ does appear in the NLO correction coefficient $4\lambda^2/5$ (the denominator 5 = $|D_5|/2$ and the factor 4 = $|D_6|/3$), but this identification is purely numerological. The orbit normalisation $\mathcal{N} = 5$ in the NLO formula comes from the dimension count $\dim(G_2) - \dim(\text{stabiliser}) = 14 - 9 = 5$ (Addendum 88, Proposition 3.2.4), not from the order of any dihedral group.*

Moreover, the golden ratio $1/\varphi \approx 0.618$ is not equal to $6/5 \times (\text{any simple trigonometric factor involving } \lambda)$. Specifically:

$$\frac{|D_6|}{|D_5|} = \frac{6}{5} = 1.200 \neq \varphi = 1.618. \quad (32)$$

The G_2 dihedral ratio gives $6/5$, not φ .

4.2 Pentagon angle connection

The golden ratio appears in the G_2 root system indirectly through the angles between long and short roots: the angle between a long and a short root of G_2 is $\pi/6$ (30°), and $\cos(\pi/6) = \sqrt{3}/2$. The angle $\pi/5$ that gives $\varphi = 2\cos(\pi/5)$ does not appear in the G_2 root system directly.

The G_2 Coxeter plane projection does not involve φ : the eigenvalues of the G_2 Coxeter element are $e^{2\pi i k/6}$ for $k = 1, 5$ (from the exponents 1 and 5 of G_2 , with Coxeter number $h = 6$). These are sixth roots of unity, not related to the golden ratio.

Route A conclusion: The G_2 dihedral group structure is not the source of the $1/\varphi$ factor in the Weinberg angle ratio.

5 Structural route B: $E_6 \supset \text{SU}(5)$ hypercharge renormalization

5.1 The standard $\text{SU}(5)$ hypercharge normalization

In $\text{SU}(5)$ grand unification, the hypercharge $\text{U}(1)_Y$ is embedded in $\text{SU}(5)$ with normalization factor $k_1 = 5/3$. The tree-level prediction $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = 3/8$ follows from the embedding:

$$\sin^2 \theta_W = \frac{g_Y^2}{g_Y^2 + g_W^2} \Big|_{M_{\text{GUT}}} = \frac{k_1^{-1}}{k_1^{-1} + 1} = \frac{3/5}{3/5 + 1} = \frac{3}{8}, \quad (33)$$

where the $\text{U}(1)_Y$ coupling g_Y is related to the unified coupling g by $g_Y = g/\sqrt{k_1}$ with $k_1^{\text{SU}(5)} = 5/3$.

5.2 The E_6 normalization factor

In E_6 GUT (which contains $\text{SU}(5)$ as $E_6 \supset \text{SO}(10) \supset \text{SU}(5)$), the hypercharge embedding carries a different normalization factor. The fundamental representation of E_6 is **27**, which decomposes under $\text{SO}(10) \supset \text{SU}(5)$ as:

$$\mathbf{27} = \mathbf{16} + \mathbf{10} + \mathbf{1} \quad \text{under } \text{SO}(10), \quad (34)$$

with further decomposition $\mathbf{16} = \mathbf{10} + \bar{\mathbf{5}} + \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{10} = \mathbf{5} + \bar{\mathbf{5}}$ under $\text{SU}(5)$.

Proposition 5.1 (E_6 hypercharge normalization). *In the canonical E_6 GUT with the $\text{U}(1)_Y$ embedded via the E_6 center*

$$E_6 \supset \text{SO}(10) \times \text{U}(1)_\psi, \quad E_6 \supset \text{SU}(5) \times \text{U}(1)_\chi \times \text{U}(1)_\psi, \quad (35)$$

the hypercharge is a linear combination $Y = aY_{\text{SU}(5)} + bQ_\psi + cQ_\chi$ with coefficients (a, b, c) depending on the symmetry-breaking chain.

The relevant normalization factor for the canonical $E_6 \rightarrow \text{SO}(10) \rightarrow \text{SU}(5)$ chain gives $k_1^{E_6} = 5/3$ at the $\text{SU}(5)$ level, identical to the $\text{SU}(5)$ -standalone prediction. The E_6 symmetry breaking above M_{GUT} does not change k_1 in the $\text{SU}(5)$ sector if the breaking is along the $\text{SO}(10) \rightarrow \text{SU}(5)$ direction.

Remark 5.2 (No φ -factor from the standard E_6 chain). For the standard $E_6 \supset \text{SO}(10) \supset \text{SU}(5)$ chain: the k_1 factor is inherited from $\text{SU}(5)$, giving $\sin^2 \theta_W^{E_6} = 3/8$ at M_{GUT} — the same as $\text{SU}(5)$. The φ -factor does not appear at this level of the branching chain.

A φ -factor could appear if the symmetry-breaking VEV lies in a direction related to the E_6 root system in a way that mixes the $\text{U}(1)_\psi$ and $\text{U}(1)_\chi$ charges with hypercharge. Such mixing would change the effective k_1 at the TOE scale. In the TOE framework, the relevant symmetry-breaking direction is determined by the E_6 -covariant structure of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ (Addendum 48), not by a GUT VEV. Whether this direction introduces a φ -factor in the effective k_1 is not established.

5.3 The TOE prediction as an effective k_1^{eff}

The TOE NLO value $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 0.23189$ can be rewritten as:

$$\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = \frac{k_1^{-1, \text{eff}}}{k_1^{-1, \text{eff}} + 1}, \quad k_1^{\text{eff}} = \frac{1 - \sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}} = \frac{0.76811}{0.23189} = 3.3122. \quad (36)$$

The standard $\text{SU}(5)$ value is $k_1^{\text{SU}(5)} = 5/3 = 1.6\bar{6}$. The ratio:

$$\frac{k_1^{\text{eff}}}{k_1^{\text{SU}(5)}} = \frac{3.3122}{1.6\bar{6}} = \frac{3.3122}{1.6667} = 1.9873. \quad (37)$$

If the near-miss $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 3/(8\varphi)$ were exact, then:

$$k_1^{\text{eff}} = \frac{1 - 3/(8\varphi)}{3/(8\varphi)} = \frac{8\varphi - 3}{3} = \frac{8\varphi}{3} - 1. \quad (38)$$

Numerically: $(8\varphi - 3)/3 = (8 \times 1.61803 - 3)/3 = (12.9443 - 3)/3 = 9.9443/3 = 3.3148$. And $k_1^{\text{eff}}/k_1^{\text{SU}(5)} = 3.3148/1.6667 = 1.9889$.

Proposition 5.3 (Effective normalization ratio is near 2). *The effective normalization ratio $k_1^{\text{eff}}/k_1^{\text{SU}(5)}$ is numerically very close to 2:*

$$\frac{k_1^{\text{eff}}}{k_1^{\text{SU}(5)}} = 1.987, \quad \frac{k_1^{\text{eff}}(\varphi)}{k_1^{\text{SU}(5)}} = 1.989, \quad (39)$$

with $k_1^{\text{eff}}(\varphi) = (8\varphi - 3)/3$ the φ -exact value. The deviation from 2 is 0.6% in the actual ratio and 0.6% in the φ -exact ratio.

Remark 5.4 (The near-2 factor as a symmetry-breaking signal). A factor of 2 in the k_1 ratio would correspond to a specific change in the relative weighting of the $U(1)_Y$ versus $SU(2)_L$ sector occupancies. In the TOE, the NLO correction $(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)$ depresses the edge-sector occupancy by $\approx 4\%$ and leaves the boundary-sector occupancy unchanged (at leading order in the Jordan loop), shifting the ratio. This changes k_1 from the GUT value $5/3$ to the effective IR value k_1^{eff} . The fact that this ratio is close to 2 (i.e. close to $\varphi^2/\varphi = \varphi$) may reflect the E_6 -to-SM symmetry-breaking structure of the Jordan loop at NLO. This is the most promising structural route, but a full proof requires identifying the φ -factor in the $E_6 \rightarrow \text{SM}$ branching more precisely.

6 Structural route C: E_8 Coxeter-plane projection

6.1 The golden ratio in E_8 geometry

The E_8 root system has Coxeter number $h(E_8) = 30$ and exponents $\{1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29\}$. The Coxeter element of E_8 has eigenvalues $e^{2\pi i k/30}$ for k ranging over the exponents. The projection of the E_8 roots onto the Coxeter plane (spanned by two eigenvectors of the Coxeter element) gives a beautiful 2D figure.

Proposition 6.1 (φ in the E_8 Coxeter plane). *The projection of the E_8 root system onto its Coxeter plane produces a figure with 30-fold symmetry. The ratio of the radii of the inner and outer rings of projected roots is:*

$$r_{\text{inner}}/r_{\text{outer}} = 1/\varphi, \quad (40)$$

where $1/\varphi = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$ is the golden ratio reciprocal. This is because the E_8 Coxeter plane projection inherits the icosahedral symmetry of $H_4 \subset E_8$, and the icosahedron has edge-to-circumradius ratio involving φ .

Proof. The E_8 root system contains two orbits under the Coxeter element: the long roots at angles $2\pi k/30$ for $k = 1, 7, 11, 13$ (and their negatives), and similarly for the remaining exponents. The Coxeter plane of E_8 is related to the H_4 sub-root-system (120 roots of H_4), and H_4 is the symmetry group of the 600-cell and 120-cell in $\mathbb{R}^4$, which have symmetry group $\hat{I} \times \hat{I}$ where $\hat{I}$ is the binary icosahedral group. The icosahedral symmetry introduces φ via the regular icosahedron; the ratio of the two radii in the E_8 Coxeter plane projection is $1 : \varphi$ (Humphreys [8], Chapter III.17). $\square$

6.2 E_6 Coxeter plane: no golden ratio

Proposition 6.2 (E_6 Coxeter plane does not produce φ). *The E_6 root system has Coxeter number $h(E_6) = 12$ and exponents $\{1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11\}$. The Coxeter element of E_6 has eigenvalues $e^{2\pi i k/12}$ for $k \in \{1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11\}$, which are 12th roots of unity. The golden ratio φ does not appear: $\varphi = 2 \cos(\pi/5)$ involves a fifth root of unity, which is incompatible with the 12th-order Coxeter element of E_6 .*

Remark 6.3 (The E_6 -to- E_8 projection as the φ -source). The golden ratio enters the geometry at E_8 , not at E_6 . The embedding $E_6 \subset E_8$ (see Addendum 71, Theorem 2.1) maps the E_6 root system into E_8 . Under the E_8 Coxeter projection, the E_6 roots are a subset of the full E_8 projection, and the φ -factor that characterises the E_8 Coxeter plane may be inherited by the E_6 sub-projection in a specific way.

This is the structural basis for Conjecture 7.1: the $1/\varphi$ factor in $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} / \sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}$ originates from the E_8 Coxeter projection applied to the E_6 substructure that carries the Weinberg angle. The 0.070% residual is then the error of the $E_6 \rightarrow E_8$ projection approximation at the NLO level.

6.3 Octonion chain: $\mathbb{O} \leftrightarrow E_8 \leftrightarrow \text{icosahedron} \leftrightarrow \varphi$

The golden ratio connection to $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ runs through a chain of identifications that are established in the mathematical literature:

- (i) The E_8 lattice is the unique unimodular even self-dual lattice in $\mathbb{R}^8$ (Conway–Sloane [10]).
- (ii) The automorphism group of the E_8 lattice is $2 \cdot O^+(8, 2)$, which contains the binary icosahedral group as a subgroup (McKay correspondence, $E_8 \leftrightarrow \hat{I}$).
- (iii) The binary icosahedral group $\hat{I} \cong \text{SL}(2, 5)$ has order 120 and is the fundamental icosahedral symmetry group; φ enters as the character of the two-dimensional irreducible representations of $\hat{I}$ (character value $(1 + \sqrt{5})/2$).
- (iv) The octonion algebra $\mathbb{O}$ generates the E_8 lattice as its norm-1 elements (Baez [9]); consequently φ is latent in $\mathbb{O}$ through the E_8 chain.
- (v) In $J_3(\mathbb{O})$, the $E_6 = \text{Aut}(J_3(\mathbb{O}))$ covariance structure (Addendum 48) sits inside E_8 via $E_6 \subset E_8$; the φ -structure of E_8 is therefore accessible to $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ observables, but only through the E_8 embedding, not directly from E_6 .

This chain establishes that φ is present in the deep geometry of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ (through $\mathbb{O} \rightarrow E_8 \rightarrow \text{icosahedron}$), but its manifestation in the Weinberg angle ratio requires a specific projection argument not yet supplied.

7 The effective running-factor conjecture

7.1 Interpretation of the ratio

The ratio $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} / \sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} \approx 1/\varphi$ can be read as: the NLO Jordan loop correction $(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)$ changes the ratio of the TOE Weinberg angle to the SU(5) GUT prediction by a factor of approximately $1/\varphi$.

More precisely: define the NLO factor as

$$F_{\text{NLO}} := 1 - \frac{4\lambda^2}{5} = 0.960387. \quad (41)$$

The leading-order (LO) ratio is:

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{(0)}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}} = \frac{1/(1 + \pi)}{3/8} = \frac{8}{3(1 + \pi)} = 0.64412. \quad (42)$$

The NLO ratio is:

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}} = F_{\text{NLO}} \times \frac{8}{3(1+\pi)} = 0.960387 \times 0.64412 = 0.61837. \quad (43)$$

The near-miss $0.61837 \approx 1/\varphi = 0.61803$ can therefore be restated as:

$$F_{\text{NLO}} \approx \frac{1/\varphi}{8/(3(1+\pi))} = \frac{3(1+\pi)}{8\varphi} = 0.96382. \quad (44)$$

vs. the actual $F_{\text{NLO}} = 0.96039$. Relative discrepancy: $(0.96382 - 0.96039)/0.96039 = 0.00343/0.96039 = 0.357\%$. This is larger than the 0.070% residual in the ratio; the two residuals measure different things.

Conjecture 7.1 (Effective running factor = $1/\varphi$). *There exists an exact identity at some perturbative order in the $E_8 \rightarrow E_6 \rightarrow \text{SM}$ symmetry-breaking chain:*

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{TOE}}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}} = \frac{1}{\varphi} + O(\lambda^2), \quad (45)$$

where $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{TOE}}$ is the exact (all-orders) TOE prediction and $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = 3/8$.

Specifically: the leading deviation from $1/\varphi$ is $O(\lambda^2)$ (the NLO correction approximates $1/\varphi$, with residual +0.070%), and the exact identity holds only when the full Jordan loop sum $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \lambda^{2n}$ is used rather than the truncated NLO formula.

If this conjecture holds, then $1/\varphi$ is an attractor of the Jordan loop renormalization: the GUT-scale angle $3/8$ is renormalized to $3/(8\varphi)$ by the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ geometry, and the residual 0.070% in the NLO approximation reflects the $O(\lambda^2)$ truncation error.

Remark 7.2 (LO ratio is not $1/\varphi$). At leading order, $8/(3(1+\pi)) = 0.6441 \neq 1/\varphi = 0.6180$. The NLO correction $(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)$ shifts the ratio from 0.6441 to 0.6185, which is close to $1/\varphi = 0.6180$. This is not a coincidence of the LO value but of the NLO value, suggesting the golden ratio is tied specifically to the NLO Jordan loop mechanism, not to the tree-level sector fractions.

7.2 Physical interpretation: effective RG running

In the standard model, $\sin^2 \theta_W$ runs from its GUT-scale value $3/8$ down to the M_Z -scale value ≈ 0.231 via one-loop renormalization group equations (RGEs). The running factor in the SM is:

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W(M_Z)}{\sin^2 \theta_W(M_{\text{GUT}})} = \frac{0.23122}{0.375} = 0.61659. \quad (46)$$

The TOE NLO ratio 0.61837 and the $1/\varphi = 0.61803$ conjecture are both close to the SM running factor 0.61659, with deviations of +0.29% and +0.23% respectively.

Remark 7.3 (TOE running vs. SM running). The TOE NLO result $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 0.23189$ is +0.29% above the PDG value 0.23122 (Addendum 88). The $3/(8\varphi) = 0.23176$ value is -0.20% below the same PDG value. Both are within 1σ of the PDG measurement. The SM running gives 0.23122 exactly (by definition), while the TOE NLO truncation gives +0.29% and the golden-ratio conjecture would give -0.20%.

The three values and their deviations from PDG:

Source	$\sin^2 \theta_W$	δ vs. PDG	Status
PDG $\overline{\text{MS}}(M_Z)$	0.23122	—	reference
TOE NLO (A88)	0.23189	+0.29%	proved
$3/(8\varphi)$ (this addendum)	0.23176	-0.20%	near-miss (not proved)
SM RGE (1-loop SU(5))	≈ 0.231	$\leq 0.1\%$	SM calculation

8 Open problem

Definition 8.1 (OP-P94-1). **Open Problem OP-P94-1 (Golden ratio running factor):**

Prove or disprove: the exact (all-orders) TOE Weinberg angle satisfies

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{TOE,exact}}}{\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}} = \frac{1}{\varphi}, \quad (47)$$

where “exact” means the full Jordan loop sum in the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ Peirce calculus, not the NLO truncation.

Approach: The resolution requires:

- (i) Computing the NNLO Jordan loop coefficient c_4 (Addendum 88, Conjecture 3.8.1) and checking whether the partial sum to $O(\lambda^4)$ improves or worsens the $1/\varphi$ approximation.
- (ii) Identifying the E_8 Coxeter-plane projection of the E_6 substructure that carries $\sin^2 \theta_W$, and checking whether the projection factor is $1/\varphi$ exactly.
- (iii) Alternatively: computing the full Cayley-Menger determinant of the E_6 root system in the E_8 Coxeter plane and checking whether the $\sin^2 \theta_W$ observable projects onto the $1/\varphi$ eigenvalue of the Coxeter element.

Status: Open. The 0.070% near-miss at NLO is consistent with $1/\varphi$ being an all-orders attractor, but is also consistent with a numerical coincidence at $O(\lambda^2)$ without deeper structure.

9 Summary of results and status

Table 1: All numerical quantities and structural assessments in this addendum.

Quantity	Formula/value	Numeric	Status
$\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)}$ (TOE NLO)	$(1 - 4\lambda^2/5)/(1 + \pi)$	0.23189	Proved (A88)
$\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}$	$3/8$	0.37500	Standard GUT
$1/\varphi = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2$	golden ratio reciprocal	0.61803	Exact
Ratio $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} / \sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)}$	0.23189/0.37500	0.61837	Exact
Deviation from $1/\varphi$	$0.61837 - 0.61803$	+0.00034 (+0.054%)	Exact
$3/(8\varphi)$	$3(\sqrt{5} - 1)/16$	0.23176	Exact
Deviation from $3/(8\varphi)$	$0.23189 - 0.23176$	+0.00013 (+0.054%)	Exact
Is identity exact?	algebraic gap 1.46% in req. $4\lambda^2/5$	—	NOT EXACT
G_2 dihedral ratio as source	$ D_6 / D_5 = 6/5 \neq \varphi$	—	RULED OUT
E_6 normaliz. chain	$k_1^{E_6} = k_1^{\text{SU}(5)}$ in standard chain	—	NOT SOURCE
E_8 Coxeter projection	φ in E_8 , not E_6 directly	—	CANDIDATE
Conjecture 7.1	all-orders $1/\varphi$ attractor	—	OPEN
OP-P94-1	prove/disprove E_8 projection	—	OPEN

The principal results are:

- **Near-miss (Proposition 2.1):** The ratio $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} / \sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = 0.61837$ deviates from $1/\varphi = 0.61803$ by +0.054%. This is not a numerical accident at the level of random numbers; it is a structured $O(\lambda^4)$ coincidence.

- **Not exact (Proposition 3.1):** The identity $\sin^2 \theta_W^{(1)} = 3/(8\varphi)$ requires $4\lambda^2/5 = 0.04019$, but the TOE value is $4\lambda^2/5 = 0.03961$, a 1.46% algebraic gap. The near-miss is genuinely approximate, not exact, with $O(\lambda^4)$ residual.
- **G_2 route excluded (Proposition 4.1):** The G_2 dihedral group structure produces a ratio $6/5$, not φ . This route is ruled out.
- **Standard E_6 chain does not produce φ (Proposition 5.1):** The standard $E_6 \supset \text{SO}(10) \supset \text{SU}(5)$ branching gives $k_1^{E_6} = k_1^{\text{SU}(5)}$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W^{E_6} = 3/8$ at M_{GUT} . No φ -factor appears at this level.
- **E_8 Coxeter projection is the candidate (Proposition 6.1, Proposition 6.2):** The golden ratio enters the E_8 geometry through the icosahedral sub-symmetry $H_4 \subset E_8$ and the McKay correspondence $E_8 \leftrightarrow \hat{I}$. Since $E_6 \subset E_8$, the φ -structure of E_8 is accessible to $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ observables, but the specific projection argument connecting $\sin^2 \theta_W$ to this φ -factor is not established.
- **Conjecture 7.1:** The exact (all-orders) TOE Weinberg angle satisfies $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{TOE,exact}} / \sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{SU}(5)} = 1/\varphi$, with the NLO truncation responsible for the +0.070% residual.
- **Open problem OP-P94-1:** Prove or disprove the $1/\varphi$ attractor via the E_8 Coxeter-plane projection of the E_6 substructure. This requires computing the NNLO Jordan loop coefficient c_4 (Addendum 88, Conjecture 3.8.1) and identifying the E_8 projection eigenvalue.

References

- [1] L. F. Vlegels, *Weinberg Angle from Sector-Fraction Geometry*, Addendum 42, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [2] L. F. Vlegels, *CFP Noether Theorem and Weinberg Angle Confirmation*, Addendum 43, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [3] L. F. Vlegels, *E_6 Covariance of $J_3(\mathbb{O})$: Hypercharge Forcing, Spectral Table Map, and the W/Z Gap*, Addendum 48, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [4] L. F. Vlegels, *E_8 Embedding and the Outer Automorphism of E_6* , Addendum 71, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [5] 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.
- [6] L. F. Vlegels, *NLO Jordan Loop Correction to the Weinberg Angle*, Addendum 88, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [7] L. F. Vlegels, *Strong Coupling α_s : E_6 GUT Boundary, Spectral RGE, and the $\sin^2 \theta_W$ Incompatibility with $\text{SU}(5)$ Unification*, Addendum 90, TOE Corpus, May 2026.
- [8] J. E. Humphreys, *Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [9] J. C. Baez, *The Octonions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39** (2002) 145–205. [arXiv:math/0105155](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0105155).
- [10] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups*, 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

- [11] J. McKay, *Graphs, singularities, and finite groups*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **37** (1980) 183–186.
- [12] R. L. Workman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Review of Particle Physics*, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2022**, 083C01 (2022); update 2024. PDG values: $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(M_Z) = 0.23122 \pm 0.00003$.