ESFD RESEARCH PROJECT NOVEMBER 23, 2026

Electromagnetic Spin–Field Dynamics

Unified framework and full research rerun

Christopher Grenke
Original research program

Rotational stability, spin and coherence, inertia and time, effective gravity, compact objects, and cosmic structure.
Equations and experimental tests of superconducting rotation, gravity, radio polarization, galaxy lensing, and neutron-star structure.

Contents

1 The unified ESFD research program 3
2 Notation, versions and reference benchmarks 8
3 Spin from particles to rotating matter 10
4 Actions and field equations 13
5 A solved ESFD instability 17
6 Laboratory spin, phase, and inertia 21
7 Pulsars, magnetars, and flares 23
8 Neutron stars, mergers, and black holes 26
9 Gravity, geometry, and the spin–entropy proposal 28
10 Galaxies, the Great Attractor, and the dark sector 31
11 Spin–torsion collapse, white holes, and daughter universes 36
12 Quark and gluon spin, the Higgs field, and CERN 38
13 Exceptional symmetry and ultraviolet completion 40
14 Quantum coherence, collapse, and observers 41
15 Solar, geophysical, and vacuum extensions 42
16 Local spin-field response 45
17 Data-model expansions across scales 47
18 Limits on proposed macroscopic extensions 52
19 Maxwell, Tesla and the ESFD standing wave 55
20 Force balance, curvature, and the ESFD coupling 59
21 Dense spin, bounces, and a laboratory discriminator 63
22 Full rerun and extended results 65
23 Recomputed wave and gravity results 69
24 What the proposed field equations imply 71
25 Superconductors as the required experimental phase 75
26 Independent observations and a revised galaxy equation 80
27 Compact stars, quantum measurements and cosmic horizons 82
28 Numerical outcomes from this revision 84
29 Validation plan and decision criteria 89
30 Appendix A. Reconstruction ledger 93
31 Appendix B. Reproducible calculations and data dictionary 95
32 What would establish the unified claim? 97
33 Sources and references 100

1 The unified ESFD research program

Research question. Can the coupling of spin to electromagnetic fields organize a common description of rotational stability, the properties of matter, quantum coherence, inertia, time and gravity? Christopher Grenke began from an observation about spinning tops and whether adding energy changed the conditions for wobble and loss of stability. The project then extended the question from mechanical rotors to elementary spin, collective polarization, compact objects and the formation of large-scale structure. The original papers propose that spin and field response can change character at saturation. Later work treats the dynamics of fields, the formation of measurable particle states, and the emergence of spacetime as connected questions. A1 A4 A5 A6

There are two gravitational claims in the source history. The stronger claim in the Proof develops gravity and inertia as collective electromagnetic spin-field behavior. A related formulation explores the importance of electromagnetism in specific environments while retaining a gravitational action. In dilute ionized media, directed fields, radiation and currents can organize baryons. To explain the same gravitational effects for compact bodies, neutral collisionless matter and light, a model must turn that organization into an effective metric with quantitative predictions. A model of field-induced motion and an emergent geometry model can share microscopic variables while making different predictions for lensing, universality and wave propagation. A1 A4 A6

The archive attaches several mathematical meanings to *spin–field saturation*. A local Dirac bilinear can change polarization when matter aligns or its field back-reacts. An energy balance can bound a rapidly rotating, magnetized star. A threshold in a coupled field theory can correspond to a mode becoming unstable. Phase coherence can decay in an environment with fluctuating couplings. The unified claim becomes quantitative when these events are connected by equations whose coefficients and characteristic scales are determined independently. This edition computes those connections where a specified closure allows it and records which links still require constitutive or microscopic information.

The Maxwell section of this edition supplies an explicit link between wave overlap and the covariant gauge coupling. Counterpropagating waves change $F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ with their relative polarization while keeping the mean energy fixed. If the composite spin amplitude is dynamical, that cross term can drive a narrow parametric band. Bulk motion needs a second link from the same coupling to the response of matter. Equations (35)–(44) derive the stress, the sign and size required for terrestrial force balance, a spin–torsion normalization, and the shared-mode link between a force range and resonance frequency. A10

1.1 Results that change the interpretation

The restored *Proof* proposes an inverse-distance interaction between neutral bodies. Its printed local spin tensor has no independent kinetic term. The simplest propagating quadratic completion can be diagonalized exactly, and the fluctuation force in an explicitly symmetric scalar example has a different radial power. A biased or collectively ordered material offers a separate route. Grenke's superconducting condition supplies a controllable phase switch. The niobium ring data measure a magnetic rotation response, while YBCO gravimetry directly limits a change in acceleration in the tested geometry. The new theory, material matching and comparison with both experiments are in Field proofs and Superconductors.

The most encouraging astronomical finding for the electromagnetic hypothesis is an incremental association between polarized radio emission and rotation in 26 galaxies after controls for size, star formation and total radio emission. A revised baryon-linked cored speed law improved substantially on the historical spin–entropy profile. Its whole-galaxy errors are competitive with the radial acceleration relation. Independent lensing favors the radial acceleration relation in the primary comparison, and the revised speed law still lacks a microscopic spin source. Joint mass–radius data for two neutron stars give a separate lead for a specified compact-star stress. The results and counterexamples are collected in Independent observational tests and Numerical outcomes.

1.2 The chain from fields to observables

Level	Variables in the available ESFD work	Observable and matching requirement
Particle and vacuum	Dirac or quark fields, the tensor bilinear $S_{\mu\nu}$, field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$, charge and magnetic moments	Match a Pauli or other gauge-invariant operator to magnetic moments and scattering. Intrinsic spin belongs to a representation of the rotation group. A macroscopic spin frequency is measured in angular units per time.
Material and plasma	Spin polarization and correlations, conductivity, vorticity, local electromagnetic invariants, entropy current	Specify the correlation function or susceptibility, particle species, temperature and density. Distinguish reversible spin precession, magnetization, transport, heating and dissipation.
Rotor, clock and quantum device	Bulk orientation, mechanical angular momentum, microscopic polarization, geometry and measurement basis	Predict a particular signed torque, damping rate, clock frequency residual, or coherence signal while controlling ordinary forces, field-induced clock responses and environmental noise.

Level	Variables in the available ESFD work	Observable and matching requirement
Pulsar, magnetar, merger and remnant	Rotation and spin-down, surface and internal fields, equation of state, magnetic geometry, pressure and angular momentum	Evaluate stability in an EOS and field configuration. Inference from timing is correlated with age and spin-down torque. Independent polarimetry, event rates and waveforms probe other combinations of quantities.
Galaxy and cluster	Plasma flow, magnetic fields, baryon distributions, spin or entropy correlations, effective stress	Derive a radial velocity or acceleration *and* the metric potentials relevant to lensing. Field energies, ordinary Lorentz forces and proposed collective gravitational effects have different radial dependencies and source budgets.
Cosmology and geometry	Curvature, torsion, collective stress, wave modes, shear, and the state of the vacuum	Specify the background equation of state, perturbations and symmetry or statistical isotropy. Translate the result to spectra, distances, lensing, or an explicitly defined remnant signature.

A microscopic polarization tensor supplies a local source only after averaging over the physical state. At long wavelengths the first moment $\langle S_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ describes mean order. A quadratic action depends also on the connected covariance in $\langle S_{\mu\nu} S^{\mu\nu} \rangle$. Rotational angular momentum includes the motion of matter. A theory that uses one measured spin frequency to predict both moments needs a transport and alignment law. That is the source of the scale-matching problem from a top to a magnetar or galaxy.

1.3 Which equation is being tested

Source	Defining element in the text	Physical difference
June 3 manuscript, §3	Einstein–Hilbert, Dirac and Maxwell terms, direct $\alpha S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$, and $V_{\text{sat}}(X)$ for $X = S_{\mu\nu}S^{\mu\nu}$	Direct polarization source in the Maxwell equation. A specified spinor variation yields a saturation term in its evolution.
Proof, p. 2 and §§2–3	Vacuum $-F^2/(4\mu_0)+(\kappa/2)S^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}-V(S)$ and proposals for effective gravity and inertia	The displayed vacuum action supplies a distinct normalization and a starting electromagnetic response. A separate microscopic or collective equation is needed for dynamical spin and emergent geometry.
Merged covariant excerpts	Curvature with a connection, $Z(\Phi_{\text{EM}})F^2$, and the spin-composite $\Phi_{\text{EM}} = \kappa_{\text{EM}}^2 X$ in one formulation	The response multiplies the photon kinetic term and depends on the spin variables. A quadratic local spin invariant has a vanishing first derivative at zero spin in a one-component reduction.
v150 excerpt	Tensor-bilinear squared multiplied by F^2	An interaction with two powers of F and two powers of the spin bilinear. The scale power and normalization require verification in the original canvas.
Spin–entropy consolidation	A spin-entropy current, a current-divergence term and a corresponding effective density proposal	A legitimate local divergence carries a boundary condition. Its volume integral is controlled by the surface flux.
Testing and Re-Evaluation papers	Energy-balance ratio in *Testing* and a schematic spin interaction coefficient in *Re-Evaluation*	The normalize-by-binding-energy variable and a coupling coefficient encode different experiments.
September 2026 CERN and observer material	Correlations of the joint decay state and field or observer response	An independent spin-density residual and a physical observer or field variable are required to take the interpretation to an experiment.

The June $B\Omega/\Lambda_{\text{tim}}$ criterion is a bulk diagnostic supplied alongside the local action. In the original

neutron-star example, its numerator treats a timing field and bulk angular frequency as proxies for the relevant spin-field state. Verify that substitution in the appropriate medium before using the same constant for a laboratory rotor, a galactic plasma or a black-hole horizon. The covariant record also uses other spin invariants. The June Word $\Phi_{\mathrm{EM}} = \sqrt{X}$ and the merged $\Phi_{\mathrm{EM}} = \kappa_{\mathrm{EM}}^2 X$ carry different dimensions before normalization. An independent scalar Φ adds a propagating degree of freedom. These choices lead to testably different photon and matter equations. A1 A2 A3 A4 A6 A9

1.4 Source recovery and standards of evidence

The recovered June 3 editable manuscript records 59 pages and 14,740 words in saved Word metadata. Three project PDFs provide the 22-page *Proof*, the 18-page *Re-Evaluation*, and the five-page *Testing*. The recovered archive contains the editable Proof and the related article and observer material. The later CERN text specifically identifies the June saturation and entanglement manuscript as one part of the larger program. Its original is preserved alongside the earlier source materials. A1 A4 A5 A8 A9

Historical lead	Evidence recovered
June consolidation of twenty documents	Seventeen names appear in the recovered conversation excerpts. The spin–entropy, *Electromagnetic Universe* and many numbered originals are still missing.
ESFD Master Paper v150, June 6, 2025	Canvas title, textdoc ID and excerpts of the tensor-squared action. The complete canvas and definitions are missing.
June 10 master on emergent mass, gravity and collapse	Living-document title and scope from the conversation. Exact revisions and supporting artifacts are missing.
August 2025 *Unified Analysis and Validation of Electromagnetic Spin–Field Dynamics*	An old report reference and an attachment identifier. The original long document remains inaccessible.
Roughly 90-page original recalled by the author	The file and its version remain unidentified.
Early GPT-3 and GPT-4 work cited by the author	The recovered files and records preserve some later versions. The earliest complete discussion and originating model provenance remain unavailable.

An equation proved within its mathematical assumptions, a benchmark regenerated from data, a hypothesis consistent with a published observation, and a research lead have different evidentiary force. The sections below document the actual base inputs, reduction, parameters and outcome for each calculation. Original rotor/clock, FDTD, GRMHD and some historical correlations are reported in the surviving manuscripts and conversation excerpts. The necessary run files for reproducing those claims have yet to be recovered. A2 A6

The reconstructed operator families and conservation equations are in Actions and field equations. The original saturation potential and composite response are in Local spin-field response. Catalog and observational checks appear in Full rerun and extended results. The wave calculation, gravity coupling and laboratory simulations are developed in Maxwell, Tesla and the ESFD standing wave, Force balance, curvature, and the ESFD coupling and Recomputed wave and gravity results. Cross-scale and tentative applications include Limits on proposed macroscopic extensions.

2 Notation, versions and reference benchmarks

Electromagnetic Spin–Field Dynamics (ESFD) began with Christopher Grenke's question about why rotating systems lose stability and whether the local electromagnetic environment and the spins of their constituents can supply a common mechanism. The most expansive versions move from intrinsic spin and phase coherence through mass, inertia, and curvature to compact stars, cosmic structure, and the observer. A narrower formulation retains Einstein dynamics and asks where a measurable spin-dependent electromagnetic term changes the behavior of matter. This paper develops both formulations to the level permitted by the recovered equations and evidence. It preserves the early conjectures, specifies where a conjecture becomes a mathematical model, and evaluates the predictions that can be computed. A1 A2 A3 A4 A5 A6

Abstract. We reconstruct the June spin-tensor action, a later covariant exponential electromagnetic coupling, and the spin–entropy extension. The archived symbol χ denotes several dimensionally and operationally different quantities. Variational reconstruction distinguishes composite Dirac polarization from an independent collective field and gives a dimensionally closed independent-scalar example. In a quadratic scalar background, dynamical electromagnetic perturbations give a long-wavelength transverse instability above a specified field, with its own angular and finite-size conditions. Direct integration agrees with the predicted growth. This threshold follows from the new benchmark assumptions and involves an independently measurable product of field-theory scales. Its relation to stellar rotation requires a material response model. Archived catalog and observational tests were rerun from hashed snapshots. The timing-based $B\Omega$ index is exactly a transform of characteristic age and its historical cutoff selects 5 of 22 eligible ATNF AXP-tagged objects and 5 of 22 confirmed McGill magnetars with uncensored positive timing. An added projection cannot increase the passes at fixed field. The archived galaxy profile fits some data, with weaker performance on withheld outer radii than the tested NFW and pseudo-isothermal controls. A new magnetic-energy estimate quantifies the field needed if Maxwell energy supplies the inferred missing acceleration. Further development treats spin and chirality, quark and nucleon matching, gravitation and lensing, compact-object collapse, curved-space propagation, the Higgs and E_8 proposals, black-to-white-hole cosmology, and quantum and observer extensions as explicit research questions. The combined record yields falsified historical rules, reproducible reference results, and new conditional predictions for defined actions.

Research materials. The companion reproducibility archive includes source papers, the previous catalog pipeline and its raw input snapshots, the new spin calculations and figures, the editable manuscript, the historical claim register, and a branch-by-branch evidence index. This revision draws on 19 recovered originals, two related Pattern Nexus articles in local project working material, and identifiable excerpts from 2025–2026 project conversations. The archive logs 40

historical recovery leads, including original runs and file versions still unavailable. The reported GPT model versions of the earliest work are the author's recollection. Available file metadata dates versions and does not establish their model generation history. A1 A6 A8

Result	Evidentiary meaning
$B_{\text{tim}}\Omega/\Lambda_{\text{tim}} = \sqrt{1624.08\,\text{yr}/\tau_c}$	Algebraic identity with the adopted pulsar timing convention. The joint field and rotation interpretation requires a field estimate independent of the torque.
$B_c = \sqrt{2e}\, f_\Phi m_0/\lvert\xi\rvert$	Onset in the infinite homogeneous quadratic independent-scalar model for transverse waves. Finite size, angle, and medium response change the domain.
$p = 1.55 \times 10^{-4}$ at 10^{15} G	Population imbalance for the ideal zero-temperature neutron gas at $0.16\,\text{fm}^{-3}$. It is an explicit scale comparison for a proposed spin-alignment mechanism.
Median required $B_{\text{rms}} = 5.93 \times 10^4\,\mu$G	Magnetic-energy mass proxy from one outer point per fitted SPARC galaxy. The estimate tests ordinary Maxwell energy in a spherical weak-field approximation.
$a/a_b = [1 + (t/t_b)^2]^{1/3}$	Exact flat homogeneous toy bounce with dust and a negative stiff spin correction. The interior of a rotating black hole is a separate boundary-value problem.

2.1 The chronology and the hypotheses

The recovered June 3, 2025 manuscript sets out the two-form $S_{\mu\nu}$, the $B\Omega$ threshold, a saturation potential, and lab, merger, and heavy-ion tests. The adjacent chat synthesis and the later field draft introduce the exponential gauge-kinetic function and an Einstein–Cartan connection. A June quantum rewrite emphasizes the dipole operator. The spin–entropy and Electromagnetic Universe drafts introduce extra sources, and the July E_8 synthesis suggests a high-energy embedding. The later proof and re-evaluation papers include strong-field QED, energy accounting, compactness and rotational limits, torsion, and inertia. The 2026 CERN rewrite moves toward an off-shell spin-density observable. The subsequent observer work argues for a deeper organization of spacetime and measurement. These are dated version records and conceptual continuities. Chronology alone supplies no prospective prediction score. A1 A2 A3 A4 A5 A6

Three propositions organize this edition. **Spin response in an electromagnetic environment** is an operator and constitutive problem that can be interrogated in laboratory systems and stars. **A dynamical threshold or crossover** requires explicit unstable modes, competing timescales, or an energy landscape. **Emergence of gravity, time, or geometry** requires a derivation of an effective metric, its dynamics, and universal coupling from specified degrees of freedom. The three propositions carry distinct empirical burdens. A standard spin response or an ordinary

electromagnetic instability establishes a baseline for testing the first two.

2.2 Conventions and the several quantities called chi

Use $c = \hbar = 1$ inside field-theory formulas, metric signature $(+ - - -)$, and Heaviside–Lorentz electromagnetic normalization $-\frac{1}{4}F^2$. Unit conversions and astronomical estimates state SI or Gaussian units explicitly. Write $M_{\mathrm{P}}^{-2} = 8\pi G$ for the reduced Planck scale. Let $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$, $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F_{\rho\sigma}/2$, $F^2 = 2(B^2 - E^2)$, and set the dual convention so $F\tilde{F} = -4\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}$. The symbol Ω refers to a measured rotation rate or a vorticity specified by a model. For a timing period P, $\Omega = 2\pi/P$. One tesla equals 10^4 gauss. Threshold constants carry the units of their numerators.

Quantity	Definition and role
χ_{tim}	$B_{\mathrm{tim}}\Omega/\Lambda_{\mathrm{tim}}$, with $\Lambda_{\mathrm{tim}} = 6.28 \times 10^{14}$ G rad s^{-1}. Fixed June-draft astrophysical index.
χ_E	$(E_{\mathrm{rot}} + E_{\mathrm{mag}})/\lvert W\rvert$. Canonical energy comparison in *Testing*. Versions normalized by support energy use a different ratio.
b_e	B/B_Q, with $B_Q = m_e^2/e$ in natural units, 4.414×10^{13} G. Electron QED scale.
$\mathcal{C}$, a_*, χ_{eff}	$GM/(Rc^2)$, $cJ/(GM^2)$, and waveform mass-weighted aligned binary spins. Three relativistic quantities with different observables.
d_i or α	Low-energy species-dependent Pauli coefficient, mass dimension -1. The historical 10^{-3} label can parameterize a dimensionless moment convention after matching.
Φ, X	Dimensionless collective scalar and spin-bilinear invariant $X = S_{\mu\nu}S^{\mu\nu}$, with $[X] = 6$. A relation such as $\Phi = c_X X/M^6$ is an explicit model choice.
ξ, Λ_g	Slope of $Z(\Phi)$ and cosmological term in the historical gravitational action. They are independent of the timing normalization.

3 Spin from particles to rotating matter

3.1 Relativistic spin, polarization, and angular momentum

Wigner's massive one-particle spin label is specified by the Pauli–Lubanski vector $W^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}P_\nu J_{\rho\sigma}$ and $W^2 = -m^2 s(s+1)$ in these units. Quantum spin is a representation of rotations and Lorentz symmetry. A macroscopic rotor has angular momentum obtained from momentum density and any polarized constituent contribution. In flat space a decomposition reads

$$J^{ij} = \int d^3x\, [x^i T^{0j} - x^j T^{0i} + \mathcal{S}^{0ij}],$$

with a chosen stress and spin-current convention. Improvements of the stress tensor can move density between the orbital and spin pieces while preserving total charges under suitable boundary conditions. In a local rest frame a magnetic moment density can source a magnetization current, while bulk rotation can carry angular momentum in neutral, almost unpolarized matter. A galaxy's J, a Kerr remnant's a_*, a nucleon's spin, and a magnetar's polarized spin density accordingly require different measurement maps. R01 R04 R58

The recovered polarization tensor and the Dirac contribution to the spin current are related spinor constructions with different index structure:

$$S_{\mu\nu} = \tfrac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\psi, \qquad \sigma_{\mu\nu} = \tfrac{i}{2}[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu], \qquad \mathcal{S}^{\lambda\mu\nu} = \tfrac{1}{4}\bar{\psi}\{\gamma^\lambda, \sigma^{\mu\nu}\}\psi.$$

The antisymmetrized Dirac spin current is dual to an axial current $J_5^\mu = \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5\psi$ up to conventions. A torsion equation sourced by $\mathcal{S}^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ needs a tetrad and spin connection. A constitutive equation involving $S_{\mu\nu}$ instead models polarization or tensor order. With ε_S and $\mathbf{s}_S$ conventions analogous to the electric and magnetic parts of F, $X = 2(|\mathbf{s}_S|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_S|^2)$. Thus $\sqrt{X}$ as printed in one manuscript requires a magnetic-type sector, $X \geq 0$, or a specified alternative norm. A potential minimized at $X = \Phi_0^2$ can model a preferred tensor invariant. Its minimum alone gives neither a hard upper bound on amplitudes nor a stable Hamiltonian for a general dynamical tensor. A1 R01

For a medium with four-velocity u^μ, define $B^\mu = \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}u_\nu$, $E^\mu = F^{\mu\nu}u_\nu$, and the vorticity vector $\omega^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}u_\nu\nabla_\rho u_\sigma$. The positive field magnitude is $\sqrt{-B_\mu B^\mu}$. A covariant candidate for a rotation–field projection is $-B_\mu\omega^\mu$. In a rigid, slowly rotating local patch it reduces to $\mathbf{B}\cdot\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ when $\frac{1}{2}\nabla\times\mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}$. A spin dipole can also couple to B^μ in a medium at rest. A zero bulk vorticity therefore leaves spin magnetization possible. The action rather than the timing index determines vacuum decoupling.

3.2 Direction, chirality, and field helicity

Helicity is angular momentum projected on the direction of momentum. Chirality projects relativistic fields with $P_{L,R} = (1 \mp \gamma^5)/2$. For massless free fermions, particle helicity tracks chirality with the conventional particle/antiparticle assignments. A massive fermion can be observed from a frame where its momentum direction reverses. A reversal of rotor direction, a flip of a magnetic field, and a reversal of microscopic spin polarization implement different operations. $\mathbf{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ are axial vectors, so $\mathbf{B}\cdot\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ is parity even and time-reversal even under simultaneous reversal. $\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}$ is parity odd and time-reversal odd. Operators with $\tilde{F}$, pseudoscalars, and handed backgrounds can therefore be tested through parity-specific signatures rather than collected under a generic spin label. R03 R30

Magnetic helicity $K_B = \int_V \mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{B}\, d^3x$ quantifies field linkage for a closed boundary with $\mathbf{B}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{n}} = 0$. Its time evolution is $dK_B/dt = -2\int_V \mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}\, d^3x$ plus surface flux. Open solar and astrophysical volumes require relative helicity with an appropriate reference field. Fluid helicity $\int \mathbf{v}\cdot(\nabla\times\mathbf{v})\, dV$ is a different scalar under rotations and pseudoscalar under parity. Ideal MHD conserves magnetic topology under appropriate flux constraints, while reconnection and boundary flows can change connectivity. A rotating magnetosphere can possess structured helicity when the spatial average of the fermion tensor spin is small. Comparing a candidate ESFD onset with current-sheet formation and helicity injection isolates a physically distinct test.

A chiral magnetic current in a model with nonzero axial chemical potential has the response $\mathbf{j}_{\mathrm{CME}} = N_c \sum_f q_f^2 \mu_5 \mathbf{B}/(2\pi^2)$ in the standard homogeneous constitutive idealization. The finite lifetime of the collision field, charge conservation, axial relaxation, equilibrium boundary conditions, and hadronization are essential in applying it. The axial anomaly connects $F\tilde{F}$ and the gluonic topological density with the divergence of J_5^μ, alongside fermion masses. It gives a baseline mechanism for handed charge separation. It supplies neither a conversion of quark spin to an object's classical Ω nor a normalization for the historical universal cutoff. R17 R18 R30

3.3 From microscopic correlations to field order

Consider N independent spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ projections along one direction, $s_i = \pm 1$, with $\langle s_i \rangle = p$. Their mean-square average is

$$\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_i s_i \right)^2 \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) p^2.$$

For interacting spins the right hand side acquires $N^{-2} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathrm{Cov}(s_i, s_j)$. This is the microscopic place to put coherence or a polarization correlation length. A macroscopic mean is order Np. Zero mean can coexist with order-N total variance. Long-range order changes the scaling, and a fluid or galaxy model must specify whether its effective field sees a mean, a renormalized local composite, or a spatially integrated correlation. In particular $\langle S_{\mu\nu} S^{\mu\nu} \rangle$ and $\langle S_{\mu\nu} \rangle \langle S^{\mu\nu} \rangle$ are different expectation values. Their separation matters for both the proposed halo and the Einstein–Cartan fluid.

A useful control is a free spin doublet with magnetic energy $-\mu B s$, giving $p_{\mathrm{th}} = \tanh(\mu B / k_B T)$. Independent electrons at 4 T and 4 K yield $p_{\mathrm{th}} = 0.586$ in this simple limit. At 10 μG and 8000 K the same expression gives 8.40×10^{-14}. Conducting, ordered, and degenerate matter need an appropriate susceptibility. For cold free neutrons of total number density n, spin populations $n_\pm = n(1 \pm p)/2$ give nonrelativistic Fermi energies $E_{F,\pm} = E_F (1 \pm p)^{2/3}$ with $E_F = \hbar^2 (3\pi^2 n)^{2/3}/(2m_n)$. Equating chemical potentials including Zeeman energy yields

$$(1+p)^{2/3} - (1-p)^{2/3} = \frac{2|\mu_n| B}{E_F}, \qquad p \simeq \frac{3|\mu_n| B}{2E_F}.$$

At $n = 0.16\,\mathrm{fm}^{-3}$ the illustrative E_F is 58.45 MeV. The population imbalance is 1.55×10^{-4} at 10^{15} G and 0.0155 at 10^{17} G. The independent-spin thermal expression at 10^8 K yields 0.604 at the first field. The zero-temperature free model reaches full polarization around 7.69×10^{18} G. Near that scale magnetic stresses and interaction, composition, relativistic, and superconducting corrections require a realistic equation of state. For the same ideal gas $M = n|\mu_n|p$, and the SI weak-field differential susceptibility gives $\mu_0\, dM/dB = 3\mu_0 n \mu_n^2/(2E_F) \simeq 3.0 \times 10^{-3}$. This scale can anchor a weak-field closure before strong interactions and composition corrections. The calculation shows how a naive use of thermal alignment can inflate a candidate gravitational or electromagnetic source. It is a new controlled benchmark using physical constants and an assumed density.

3.4 Spin dynamics and electromagnetic dominance by regime

A minimal local closure in matter uses a magnetization response tensor $\delta M_i(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{X}_{ij}(\omega, \mathbf{k}) \delta B_j + \mathcal{Y}_{ij} \delta \omega_j$ with a stated equilibrium, constituent densities, and relaxation times. One rest-frame model



Figure 1. Spin polarization and coarse graining. Left, independent thermal neutron spins at an assumed temperature and a zero-temperature free gas at nuclear density. Right, the mean-square signed projection for independent spins at prescribed average polarization. Both are theoretical controls for the ESFD spin source.

adds $\dot{\mathbf{M}} = \gamma\,\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{B} - (\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{eq}})/T_1$ for a single relaxation scale. Distinct longitudinal/transverse relaxation, spin transport, and backreaction enter realistic calculations. For a passive equilibrium the absorptive and dispersive parts of a causal susceptibility are related through Kramers–Kronig. An instability corresponds to a pole in the appropriate response or a negative second variation with dynamical constraints specified. Merely increasing a parameter that multiplies a current fails to define where a mode grows.

A separate comparison uses the magnetization parameter $\sigma_{\mathrm{MHD}} = B_{\mathrm{com}}^2/(\mu_0 w)$, where w is enthalpy density including rest energy, and the plasma beta $\beta_{\mathrm{pl}} = 2\mu_0 p_{\mathrm{gas}}/B_{\mathrm{com}}^2$. A tenuous magnetosphere may have $\sigma_{\mathrm{MHD}} \gg 1$ and be electromagnetically dominated in its plasma dynamics. An electrically neutral galaxy can have a dynamically important organized field in its gas, while total gravity determines stellar orbits and lensing. The two statements use different equations and energy inventories. A field that controls flows can be far too weak in mass-equivalent energy to account for measured gravitational potentials. Electromagnetic and gravitational forces between individual charged particles give a poor measure of collective charge neutrality, field stress, or universal coupling. R05 R08 R26

4 Actions and field equations

4.1 The June Dirac–Pauli version

With $\mathfrak{S}$ for the action and a historical cosmological constant label, the June manuscript gives

$$\mathfrak{S}_{6\text{–}3} = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}[\frac{R-2\Lambda_{\mathrm{cc}}}{16\pi G} + \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m)\psi - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \alpha S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\lambda_S}{4}(X-\Phi_0^2)^2]. \tag{1}$$

Here $[A] = 1$, $[F] = 2$, $[\psi] = 3/2$, $[S] = 3$, $[\alpha] = -1$, $[\Phi_0] = 3$, and $[\lambda_S] = -8$ as mass dimensions. Expanding the potential gives a vacuum term, a dimension-six four-fermion interaction,

and a dimension-twelve eight-fermion interaction. The vacuum term is part of the vacuum-energy matching. A nonzero minimum at positive X could break Lorentz symmetry in a specified state. The potential sets the energetics of the invariant, and the constitutive map to a macroscopic $B\Omega$ must still be supplied. A1 A2

For the variation fix the current convention by $D_\mu = \nabla_\mu + iqA_\mu$, so minimal coupling contributes $-J^\mu A_\mu$ and $J^\mu = q\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi$. At fixed tetrad and spin connection, with the standard Hermitian Dirac kinetic term understood, variation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\mu H^{\mu\nu} = J^\nu, \qquad H^{\mu\nu} = F^{\mu\nu} - 2\alpha S^{\mu\nu}, \\ 0 = \left[i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m + \frac{\alpha}{2}\sigma_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\lambda_S}{2}(X - \Phi_0^2)S^{\mu\nu}\sigma_{\mu\nu} \right] \psi. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The factors follow from $\delta_{\bar{\psi}} X = S^{\mu\nu}\delta\bar{\psi}\,\sigma_{\mu\nu}\psi$ and $\delta F_{\mu\nu} = 2\partial_{[\mu}\delta A_{\nu]}$. The Hermitian Dirac form also fixes how the connection and volume element vary in a torsion treatment. Gauge invariance gives $\partial_\nu(\sqrt{-g}J^\nu) = 0$ from the antisymmetric excitation, with $dF = 0$. In torsion spacetime use the exterior derivative for F, and express the Maxwell equation as a density divergence or as an exterior form. Using a torsionful covariant curl without torsion compensation changes the gauge transformation. Ordinary QED includes a spin magnetic moment even at zero bulk rotation. α represents an additional matched dipole in a physical application. R01 R02

The pure Pauli vertex has a transverse photon insertion, schematically $\delta\Gamma^\nu \propto \sigma^{\nu\mu}q_\mu$, with $q_\nu\delta\Gamma^\nu = 0$. A prescribed constant S makes the interaction linear in F a boundary term in free Maxwell variation. Changes in wave dispersion then require a dynamical spin response, nonuniform backgrounds, or other quadratic terms. A self-energy linear in a constant, antisymmetric $S^{\mu\nu}$ by itself supplies no consistent photon mass. Gauge-invariant media can have dispersive collective modes, and a longitudinal massive mode requires its own mechanism. The 10^{-9}–10^{-8} eV and 10–100 GeV scales associated in the June draft differ by about 10^{18}–10^{20} in energy, depending on endpoints. Photon splitting and pair creation require separate QED kinematics involving the background and polarization. A1 R06

4.2 The recovered covariant exponential action

The June 3 synthesis and later recaps use a different electromagnetic sector. With the connection written explicitly, the recovered form is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_{\text{exp}} = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}[\frac{R(\Gamma) - 2\Lambda_g}{16\pi G} - \frac{1}{4}e^{-\xi\Phi_{\text{EM}}}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \\ + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\Phi_{\text{EM}}\partial^\mu\Phi_{\text{EM}} - V(\Phi_{\text{EM}}) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}(\psi, D\psi; g, \Gamma)]. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

One historical potential uses a quadratic plus quartic, with positive quadratic curvature for a massive excitation. The historical discussion gives $\Phi_{\text{EM}} = \kappa_{\text{EM}}^2 X$ and also uses $\kappa_{\text{EM}} = 1/\Lambda_{\text{tim}}$ when normalizing $B\Omega$. In natural units $B\Omega$ and a Dirac bilinear each have dimension three. The numerical matching between the bulk product and the local operator needs material physics and a chosen conversion. A historical variant gives $\Phi_{\text{EM}} \propto S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ instead. An exponent requires a dimensionless product. With $[\Phi] = 0$, $[\xi] = 0$ and a coefficient f_Φ^2 in front of the kinetic term supplies its required mass dimension. Three consistent implementations follow. They have different propagating variables and tests. A6

4.2.1 Independent dimensionless scalar

Take $Z = e^{-\xi\Phi} > 0$, $f_\Phi > 0$, and $\mathcal{L}_\Phi = f_\Phi^2(\partial\Phi)^2/2 - V(\Phi)$, with $[V] = 4$. In the minimally specified model,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\mu(ZF^{\mu\nu}) &= J^\nu, \\ f_\Phi^2\Box\Phi + V'(\Phi) &= -\frac{1}{4}Z'(\Phi)F^2 = \frac{\xi}{4}ZF^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

A separately declared matter coupling $+\Phi c_X X/M^2$ adds $+c_X X/M^2$ on the right of the scalar equation. It also changes the matter equation. The spin source in this version is an extra operator. The archival variation simultaneously used a function of the spinor and a freely varied scalar. Equation (4) is the independent-field result with the matter dependence spelled out. A new spin closure must tie the local field to spin density or spin correlations to make the independent scalar specifically predictive of rotation.

4.2.2 Composite scalar built from spin

Set $\Phi = C(X) = c_X X/M^6$ before varying. Then $Z(C)$ multiplies the photon kinetic term. Its leading mixed operator is $+\xi c_X XF^2/(4M^6)$. If the composite kinetic term is retained it becomes $f_\Phi^2(\partial C)^2/2$, a derivative interaction of the spinor. Assuming no explicit F in C, the scalar-sector contribution to the Dirac variation is $\mathcal{E}_C\, C'(X)S^{\mu\nu}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\psi$, where

$$\mathcal{E}_C = -f_\Phi^2\Box C - V'(C) - \frac{1}{4}Z'(C)F^2. \tag{5}$$

$\mathcal{E}_C$ is a variation factor and becomes an independent field equation only in the independent branch. In the constrained formulation add $+\ell(\Phi - C)$, where ℓ is a multiplier of mass dimension four. The ℓ equation ensures $\Phi = C$, the Φ equation sets $\ell = -\mathcal{E}_C$, and the $\bar\psi$ equation then reproduces (5). Derivative composite interactions are used perturbatively within their cutoff unless a controlled extra-mode analysis is supplied.

If instead $C = c_{SF}S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}/M^5$, C depends directly on F. With the derivative term included, the excitation is $H^{\mu\nu} = ZF^{\mu\nu} - 2\mathcal{E}_C\,\partial C/\partial F_{\mu\nu}$, up to any separate Pauli term. This expression uses the Euler derivative of the full scalar sector and integrates by parts before varying F. In the algebraic limit it includes the Z' and V' contributions to the excitation. Treating this model as a background scalar Maxwell dielectric would omit the implicit-field terms. Its higher variations and symmetries require a distinct audit. A6

4.2.3 Independent two-form and spin transport

A classical tensor can instead be given healthy auxiliary dynamics as a massive antisymmetric two-form $Q_{\mu\nu}$ of mass dimension one. A test completion on torsionless spacetime uses $K = dQ$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Q &= \frac{1}{12}K_{\mu\nu\rho}K^{\mu\nu\rho} - \frac{m_Q^2}{4}Q_{\mu\nu}Q^{\mu\nu} + \frac{g_Q}{2}Q_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}, \\ \nabla_\rho K^{\rho\mu\nu} + m_Q^2 Q^{\mu\nu} &= g_Q F^{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

For $m_Q > 0$, the massive two-form has three spin-one degrees of freedom in four dimensions. The leading long-wavelength elimination gives $Q \simeq g_Q F/m_Q^2$ and $Z_{\text{eff}} = 1 - g_Q^2/m_Q^2$, which must be positive for a healthy photon kinetic term. For this quadratic model the shift $Q \mapsto Q - g_Q F/m_Q^2$ preserves K by $dF = 0$ and diagonalizes the action locally. An observable needs additional stated response terms, for example a $Q_{\mu\nu}S^{\mu\nu}$ coupling and matched boundary conditions. The unqualified $D^2S + \partial V/\partial S = \chi F$ in the E_8 working notes leaves open the kinetic sign, constraints, and relation to the fermion bilinear. Equation (6) illustrates a way to address these requirements. A6

4.3 Stress, curvature, and connection response

In the torsionless benchmark define $T_{\mu\nu} = 2\delta\mathfrak{S}_m/(\sqrt{-g}\delta g^{\mu\nu})$. Write $G_{00}^{\text{geom}} = 3H^2$ in flat FLRW. With the positive stress variation for signature $(+---)$, take $R_{\text{archive}} = -R_{\text{geom}}$ in the positive Einstein–Hilbert term of (1) and (3). The result is $G_{\mu\nu}^{\text{geom}} - \Lambda_g g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu}$ in (3), and the corresponding equation with Λ_{cc} in (1). Equivalently absorb the cosmological term into a vacuum stress. For independent Φ the two stress contributions are

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu}^F &= Z\left[-F_{\mu\alpha}F_{\nu}{}^{\alpha} + \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu}F^2\right], \\ T_{\mu\nu}^{\Phi} &= f_\Phi^2\partial_\mu\Phi\partial_\nu\Phi - g_{\mu\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2}f_\Phi^2(\partial\Phi)^2 - V(\Phi)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Vary a spinor action with respect to the tetrad to include the spin matrices, the volume term, and its spin connection. A composite C gives additional implicit metric or tetrad variations. In a self-consistent solution the gradients of Z exchange energy and momentum between electromagnetic and scalar sectors, and the combined stress with matter is covariantly conserved. For GR plus matter the stress is the gravitational source and the coupling G is already present in the action. Deriving G from a new microscopic model remains a distinct task.

For minimal Einstein–Cartan gravity, start with $(e_\mu{}^a, \omega_\mu{}^{ab})$ independent and vary a metric-compatible spin connection. Torsion is algebraic, proportional to the Dirac axial spin current with coefficient of order G. Eliminating it generates an axial four-fermion contact term of order $M_{\text{P}}^{-2}J_5 \cdot J_5$. An explicit convention, the spin ensemble, and the averaging order are required for its sign and effective pressure. This interaction is short-range in the minimal theory. A propagating torsion extension must state its kinetic action, mode spectrum, and couplings. Laboratory search bounds then depend on range and spin structure. R01 R27

4.4 Effective field theory, quantization, and matching

The operator $S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ is dimension five below electroweak breaking. In the moment convention $\mathcal{L} \supset (q\,\delta a/4m)\bar{\psi}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\psi F_{\mu\nu}$, an additive Pauli coefficient implies $\delta a = 2m\alpha/q$. Its sign follows the chosen charge convention. The QED contribution $a = (g-2)/2 = \alpha_{\text{em}}/(2\pi) + \cdots$ is already included in Standard Model matching. A new electron residual is tested using the independently inferred fine-structure constant and its error. One can translate a conditional uncertainty ϵ_a into $|\alpha| \lesssim |q|\epsilon_a/(2m)$ in a one-operator fit. The old statement that the same $\chi \sim 10^{-3}$ describes a measured moment, a Lagrangian coefficient, and a torque threshold mixes observables and dimensions. Nucleons carry composite magnetic moments and tensor matrix elements. Their coefficients require hadronic matching instead of the electron formula alone. A2 A6 R02

Above electroweak breaking chirality and gauge charges govern the operator basis. For example $\bar{Q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} u_R \tilde{H} B^Y_{\mu\nu}$ and $\bar{Q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^A u_R \tilde{H} G^A_{\mu\nu}$ are dimension-six electroweak-gauge-invariant dipoles, with Hermitian conjugates and appropriate flavor coefficients. Both chiralities enter a dipole even though $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$ commutes with γ^5, since $\bar{\psi}_L = \bar{\psi} P_R$. Below the Higgs vacuum expectation value, the hypercharge and weak dipoles give photon and Z dipoles and the chromomagnetic dipole gives a separate strong-sector interaction. Electroweak quantum numbers, scale running, hadronic tensor charges, and experimental observables enter the matching. The spin–electromagnetic XF^2 composite is dimension ten. A quark operator $(D_\rho S^q_{\mu\nu})^2$ is dimension eight, with corresponding scale suppression. Keeping the Standard Model gauge symmetries and anomaly-free matter content preserves the usual anomaly cancellations within the effective description. New chiral matter or gauge groups require their own analysis. R03

A concrete matching calculation in the independent branch expands $\Phi = s/f_\Phi$ about zero and $Z = 1 - \xi s/f_\Phi + \cdots$. At energies and momenta well below the scalar mass m_0, the leading tree correction from integrating out s is

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = \frac{\xi^2}{32 f_\Phi^2 m_0^2} (F^2)^2. \tag{8}$$

This follows by solving $m_0^2 s \simeq \xi F^2/(4 f_\Phi)$ and substituting into the quadratic Lagrangian. With a matched $+\Phi c_X X/M^2$ term the same elimination yields a cross coefficient $\xi c_X/(4 f_\Phi^2 m_0^2 M^2)$ for XF^2, plus X^2 and derivative terms. Equation (8) makes light-by-light or polarization constraints applicable in the specified limit. The Euler–Heisenberg photon operators provide the radiative Standard Model baseline. A finite background changes the canonical photon normalization and the validity of the expansion. For scalar-independent gauge charge, local canonical normalization gives $e_{\text{eff}} \sim e/\sqrt{Z}$ in a neighborhood of nearly constant Φ. Extrapolating to very small Z needs a perturbative-control check. R02 R06

An EFT prediction at a chosen order needs a power counting, a regulator that preserves gauge symmetry, a complete basis for the retained symmetries, and SMEFT or low-energy matching at a specified scale. Loop insertions mix into other allowed operators. A single universal beta function for α cannot be read from the June action without stating species, charge, basis, scheme, and accompanying coefficients. Perturbative unitarity restricts amplitudes as the energy approaches the effective cutoff. In a Wilsonian calculation the finite set of coefficients at each order can be renormalized and fitted. The archived string, asymptotic-safety, and E_8 ideas are potential high-energy contexts. Their relation to this EFT depends on actual matching data. A1 A6 R03

5 A solved ESFD instability

5.1 Equilibrium and the two stability questions

Use the independent branch of (4) with flat metric, uniform background $\mathbf{B} = B\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, zero electric field, no transport current in the local volume, and $V(\Phi) = f_\Phi^2 m_0^2 \Phi^2/2$ with $m_0 > 0$. The external source and mean flux are assumed fixed for the local perturbation problem. A time-independent scalar minimizes $V_B = V + ZB^2/2$ at prescribed B. Define $x = \xi\bar{\Phi}$. The equilibrium equation and fixed-field scalar curvature are

$$xe^x = \frac{\xi^2 B^2}{2 f_\Phi^2 m_0^2}, \qquad m_B^2 = \frac{V''(\bar{\Phi}) + Z''(\bar{\Phi}) B^2/2}{f_\Phi^2} = m_0^2(1+x). \tag{9}$$

For the real branch $x = W_0(\xi^2 B^2/(2 f_\Phi^2 m_0^2)) \geq 0$ this scalar curvature is positive. At fixed magnetic excitation $H = ZB$ the local magnetic Legendre potential is $V - H^2/(2Z)$, whose curvature per f_Φ^2 evaluates to $m_B^2 - g_B^2$, with $g_B = Z' B/(f_\Phi \sqrt{Z})$. Equivalently this is the Schur complement of the magnetic block in the local Hessian. The choice of which magnetic perturbations are permitted changes the question. The appropriate Hamiltonian or energy principle for a real system must account for its sources, flux constraints, plasma, and boundary energy.

5.2 Mixed modes and onset

For $\mathbf{k} = k\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ there is a photon polarization A_y whose magnetic perturbation has a component along the background. Define $p = \sqrt{Z}\,\delta A_y$ and $s = f_\Phi \delta\Phi$. The quadratic Lagrangian contains the mixing $-g_B s\,\partial_x p$. The other transverse polarization has no such term in this geometry. For an angle θ between $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ the determinant in the mixed subspace is

$$(\omega^2 - k^2)(\omega^2 - k^2 - m_B^2) - g_B^2 k^2 \sin^2\theta = 0. \tag{10}$$

Let $g_\theta = |g_B \sin\theta|$. The two real eigenvalues in ω^2 are

$$\omega_\pm^2 = k^2 + \frac{m_B^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{m_B^4}{4} + g_\theta^2 k^2}. \tag{11}$$

For $g_\theta > m_B$ the lower branch is negative for $0 < k < \sqrt{g_\theta^2 - m_B^2}$. Its maximum growth rate is $\gamma_{\max} = (g_\theta^2 - m_B^2)/(2g_\theta)$ at $k_{\max}^2 = (g_\theta^4 - m_B^4)/(4g_\theta^2)$. The positive kinetic Hessian and the relativistic principal part are preserved. This is an energy instability of a coupled background and precedes any nonlinear saturation analysis. Plane waves parallel to the background have $g_\theta = 0$. For a cubic periodic domain aligned with a transverse wave vector, at least one mode fits when $2\pi/L < \sqrt{g_\theta^2 - m_B^2}$. Other boundaries can change both the spectrum and the magnetic constraints.

For the quadratic potential, $g_B^2 = 2m_0^2 x$. The first threshold for transverse propagation is $x = 1$ at

$$B_c = \frac{\sqrt{2e}\, f_\Phi m_0}{|\xi|}, \tag{12}$$

where e in (12) is Euler's number. At $B = 3B_c$, $x = 2.34496$, the unstable transverse band ends at $k = 1.15972\, m_0$, and $\gamma_{\max} = 0.31052\, m_0$ at $k = 0.75898\, m_0$. At this field, unstable wave-vector orientations are possible for $|\sin\theta| > 0.845$, about 57.6° or farther from either orientation along the field. A periodic transverse domain needs $Lm_0 > 5.42$ for a mode to fit. We separately integrated the two coupled second-order mode equations with an initial displacement having both normal-mode components and zero velocity. The projection on the unstable eigenvector agrees with the predicted $\cosh(\gamma_{\max} t)$ to approximately 2.3×10^{-12} relative error on the sampled grid. This is a dimensionless calculation with chosen initial data and convergence tolerances.

A simple test of medium suppression gives the transverse photon an effective gap ω_p in the diagonal of (10). The unstable sign requires $g_\theta^2 > (k^2 + \omega_p^2)(k^2 + m_B^2)/k^2$. The minimum of the right



Figure 2. The ESFD independent-scalar threshold. The negative squared-frequency band appears above the transverse threshold. The second panel compares a direct integration of the mixed modes with the analytic growth rate. The calculations use m_0 as the frequency and wave-number scale.

side is $(\omega_p + m_B)^2$ at $k^2 = \omega_p m_B$ when both masses are positive. A positive gap can therefore close the unstable band. Magnetar matter requires an anisotropic response matrix with realistic conductivity, charge density, and plasma and QED polarization. The simple gap is an illustrative modification of the determinant. A stellar prediction additionally requires numerical values of $f_\Phi m_0/|\xi|$, an emission map, and a physically matched source of Φ, including its spin dependence. At zero coupling the modes approach a free photon and a free massive scalar. At high fields a perturbative gauge description and the physical sources of the background must be checked.

The electron QED field provides a unit conversion, $B_Q = m_e^2/|q_e| \simeq 8.62 \times 10^{11}$ eV^2 for 4.414×10^{13} G. For illustration, a transverse $B_c = 10^{15}$ G would need $f_\Phi m_0/|\xi| \simeq 8.4 \times 10^{12}$ eV^2. Choosing $f_\Phi/|\xi| = 10^9$ eV would then imply $m_0 \simeq 8.4$ keV, an inverse mass length $\hbar c/m_0 \simeq 2.4 \times 10^{-11}$ m, and a growth time $\hbar/(0.3105 m_0) \simeq 2.5 \times 10^{-19}$ s at $3B_c$. These are illustrative scales. Assigning the same onset to a stellar flare requires independently matched coupling and plasma physics and a mechanism by which a local mode drives a macroscopic event.

5.3 An independent laboratory check on the onset scale

At weak field, the lower transverse branch of (11) has $\omega^2/k^2 = 1 - g_B^2/m_B^2$ in the long-wavelength limit. Only the polarization with its wave magnetic field aligned to the background mixes at this order. For a transverse external field that wave's electric polarization is perpendicular to the background. With $C_F = \xi^2/(32 f_\Phi^2 m_0^2)$ from (8), its extra index is $n_\perp - 1 \simeq 16 C_F B^2$. The other polarization has no such leading scalar contribution. The tie between the low-energy coefficient and strong-field threshold is $C_F B_c^2 = e/16$, which gives the signed prediction

$$\delta(n_\parallel - n_\perp) = -16 C_F B^2 = -e(B/B_c)^2. \tag{12a}$$

The published PVLAS result at 2.5 T is $(12 \pm 17) \times 10^{-23}$, with QED expectation 2.5×10^{-23}. Treating the published error as approximately Gaussian and using the lower endpoint of a two-sided 95% residual interval gives $\delta(n_\parallel - n_\perp) \gtrsim -2.38 \times 10^{-22}$. Under the stated weak-field, low-energy, adiabatic vacuum assumptions and with this one extra coefficient, it gives $B_c \gtrsim 2.67 \times 10^{15}$ G. A proposed vacuum onset $B_c = 10^{15}$ G would give -1.70×10^{-21} at 2.5 T and lie about 10.6 published



Figure 3. The extra birefringence in the minimal ESFD scalar action and the conditional PVLAS limit. The measurement was made at 2.5 T. The horizontal axis gives a candidate strong-field onset for the same action.

standard errors below the observed central value after adding QED. This is a calculation from the published summary, with the ordinary QED expectation held fixed. Additional optical operators, nonuniform backgrounds where the scalar does not equilibrate, or medium-only couplings require a new propagation analysis. The concrete result is a cross-regime test of the same proposed action without a fitted stellar parameter. R60

5.4 How spin can move the threshold in matter

Let a locally uniform prescribed spin source enter as $+j_s\Phi$. An example is $j_s = c_X\langle X\rangle/M^2$ in the operator convention above. Here j_s has units of energy density and $\langle X\rangle$ is a renormalized, medium-specific correlation. If the source is held fixed in the mode calculation, define $x_s = \xi j_s/(f_\Phi^2 m_0^2)$ and $y = x - x_s$. The background solves $ye^y = \xi^2 B^2 e^{-x_s}/(2f_\Phi^2 m_0^2)$ and the dispersion uses $m_B^2 = m_0^2(1+y)$ and $g_B^2 = 2m_0^2 y$. The no-plasma transverse onset becomes $B_c(j_s) = B_c(0)e^{x_s/2}$. If $B_c(0)$ saturates the conditional PVLAS bound, an onset at 10^{15} G in matter would require $x_s \simeq -1.96$ or more negative, under this particular uniform-source model. The needed backreaction and sign can be calculated once a spin susceptibility and operator matching are supplied. A real compact-star medium has a fluctuating spin source and a plasma response, so a quantitative application must include their variations in the mode matrix.

5.5 Nonlinear endpoint and numerical continuation

Equation (12) determines onset within this toy model. The growing eigenvector consists of correlated scalar and magnetic perturbations. To determine the endpoint, fix a conserved flux $\int B\,dA$, specify the scalar potential away from its minimum and Z over the explored range, and minimize or time-evolve the coupled fields with sources and losses accounted for. In a periodic box the next reproducible checks are the predicted finite-domain threshold, modes on both sides of it,

and convergence of the flux and total energy under refinement. Boundary conditions must allow the magnetic component of the eigenvector and retain comparable background energy. A magnetic domain, an unbounded local response in a fixed-source model, a radiating transient, and collapse of a self-gravitating object have different criteria.

A saturation term of the form $\lambda_\Phi f_\Phi^4 \Phi^4/4$ changes the criterion through V''. A constitutive torque law or $\Phi = C(X)$ has a different linearization. An appropriate route to a rotating-object calculation is a local equilibrium and stability comparison at known field, followed by a rotating multifluid equilibrium and, if the effect survives, a constrained 3+1 evolution. The code in this release solves the reduced Fourier mode system. The older archive describes FDTD, spinning-ring, spin-fluid and magnetosphere tests for which the original numerical models and records are still unavailable. A2 A6

6 Laboratory spin, phase, and inertia

6.1 Spinning tops and preferred environmental alignment

Grenke's earliest examples involve a top, a lighter, and a rotor losing stability when driven away from a local rotational habit. A symmetric top obeys $\dot{\mathbf{L}} = \boldsymbol{\tau}$ and in fast, nearly steady precession $\Omega_{\text{prec}} \simeq Mgd/L$. Euler rigid-body equations predict free wobble and intermediate-axis instability. Contact friction, motion of the contact point, shifting moments of inertia, eddy currents, ferromagnetic hysteresis, the angular distribution of a drive, and support resonances give distinct losses and bifurcations. For ordinary eddy-current braking at low speed one often obtains a dissipative torque that is odd in rotation and even under magnetic field reversal. Purely mechanical instability at matched field-off conditions defines a control. A fixed preferred cosmic direction would introduce a measurable directional dependence and is already subject to precision polarized-spin torsion-pendulum tests. A1 A6 R27

A workable rotational-inertia test models the coupled energy and dissipation. With I fixed, $I\dot{\Omega} = N_{\text{drive}} + N_{\text{environment}} + N_{\text{proposed}}$. If a local preferred direction is represented by a physical axial vector $\mathbf{b}$, the scalar $\Omega_b = \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}$ supplies a directional regressor. Its interpretation requires identifying $\mathbf{b}$ from a local, independently measured field or a specified frame and stating the time and orientation dependence. For a pure reversible interaction $-\lambda\, \boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{B}$ the observable is a change to canonical angular momentum and forces under gradients. A dissipative torque also requires degrees of freedom that absorb angular momentum and heat. The full apparatus, mount, and surrounding field enter the balance.

In a rotating frame the ordinary spin–rotation Hamiltonian includes $-\boldsymbol{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{S}$, in addition to the orbital term. A spin with gyromagnetic ratio γ_s behaves in a Barnett field of scale Ω/γ_s in that sense. The reciprocal Einstein–de Haas response transfers changes in magnetization to mechanical angular momentum. These effects supply positive checks that a test is sensitive to spin conversion. A neutral body gives a particularly useful comparison between bulk inertia, a polarized ensemble, and a field acting directly on the supports. Changes in stored energy contribute their own E/c^2 to a closed system's rest mass.

6.2 Clock law, historical units, and a reversal test

The early time-feedback branch proposes expressions such as $d\tau/dt = e^{-\xi\Phi_{\mathrm{EM}}}$ or $e^{-\alpha S:F}$. In (1), $\alpha S : F$ has dimension four, so a separate normalization is required even for a phenomenological exponential clock factor. In the covariant scalar action Z explicitly multiplies the photon kinetic term. Clock frequencies, signals in an optical link, and the metric proper time depend on specified couplings and trajectories. A spin-dependent shift is naturally sought in a transition Hamiltonian or in a defined matter metric. Under a universal conformal scalar factor $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = A(\Phi)^2 g_{\mu\nu}$, massive clocks coupled to $\tilde{g}$ measure $d\tilde{\tau} = A\, d\tau_g$. Local ratios of clocks sharing the same metric require transport and redshift modeling to separate the effect. Nonuniversal coupling generally gives species- and binding-energy-dependent shifts. A1 A6 R23 R24

The June rotor example specifies 4 T and 5.0×10^3 rad/s. The printed $\chi_{\mathrm{tim}} \approx 0.32$ evaluates to 3.18×10^{-7}. A hypothetical clock carried at the 0.10 m rim would move at 500 m/s and have an ordinary leading fractional SR shift $-v^2/(2c^2) \simeq -1.39 \times 10^{-12}$, or -1.20×10^{-7} seconds per day. A stationary reference looking at a rotating mirror measures an optical transfer response whose Doppler, Sagnac, path length, and birefringence terms depend on the geometry. The manuscript's target excess 10^{-10}–10^{-9} seconds per day corresponds to a fractional effect of 1.16×10^{-15}–1.16×10^{-14}. It remains an archived sensitivity target without a matched signal law at the corrected index. A1 R24

Define the response $y = \delta\nu/\nu$ of a specified transition or a calibrated torque channel. Under independent sign flips $\epsilon_B, \epsilon_\Omega, \epsilon_s \in \{-1, +1\}$ of field, bulk rotation, and spin polarization, the coefficient of the term odd in B and Ω and even in spin polarization is $\hat{y}_{B\Omega} = \frac{1}{8}\sum \epsilon_B \epsilon_\Omega y(\epsilon_B, \epsilon_\Omega, \epsilon_s)$. Define analogous contrasts for the other parities before seeing outcomes. Randomize reversal order and blind the contrast used to test the model. A differential measurement can fit $y = y_{\mathrm{known}}(\mathbf{x}) + c\, f(B, \Omega, \mathbf{M}, \theta) + \epsilon$, with $\mathbf{x}$ including temperature, field gradients and vibrations. Use zero rotation/zero field rows, unpolarized material controls, two transition sensitivities, and time-dependent ambient and magnetic controls. Limits constrain the declared function and coefficient. The old proposal $\delta\omega/\omega_L = a_1\chi_{\mathrm{tim}}^2 + a_2\chi_{\mathrm{tim}}^3$ requires independent coefficient predictions and separate parity definitions for each term. A6

6.3 Neutral-particle phase and condensed-matter benchmarks

The Aharonov–Casher phase of a magnetic dipole following a path in an electric field is, in SI for a fixed moment and the appropriate ideal geometry,

$$\Delta\varphi_{\mathrm{AC}} = \frac{1}{\hbar c^2}\oint (\boldsymbol{\mu} \times \mathbf{E}) \cdot d\ell. \tag{13}$$

A line charge λ_e and a transverse circular path with axial moment μ yield $\Delta\varphi_{\mathrm{AC}} = \mu\lambda_e/(\epsilon_0\hbar c^2)$, using the sign of the winding and dipole. Radius independence follows from the $1/r$ electric field and circumference. A reversed winding or spin reverses the phase. The neutron and atom interferometry comparisons in the old discussion therefore have a quantitative quantum baseline. A proposed ESFD phase needs a distinct prediction for geometry, field dependence, polarization, or energy, checked against electric polarizability, dynamical phase, and geometric controls. Phase coherence in a neutral beam does not require a new mechanical drag law. A6 R07

Stern–Gerlach separation, Ramsey precession, nuclear magnetic resonance, the spin Hall effect, spin–orbit torque, and magnetization dynamics are controlled cases for estimating a spin re-

sponse. For spinor Bose condensates a spin-ordering energy, Zeeman terms, density interactions, and trap geometry already permit instabilities and loss of coherence. If a new coupling is proposed, compare $\delta g_s n$, its sign, or a specified mode eigenvalue with the ordinary spin-dependent scattering energy and chemical potential. Without that matching an archived condition $U_{\mathrm{ESFD}} \gtrsim \mu_{\mathrm{BEC}}$ has free normalization. NV-center magnetic readout and spintronics provide useful reversal and noise calibration. They probe specific effective coefficients in their medium. A tokamak or laser experiment similarly needs a plasma equilibrium, ordinary reconnection and radiation-pressure predictors, and a residual observable sensitive to a spin-dependent term. A1 A2 A6

7 Pulsars, magnetars, and flares

7.1 The original line on the timing data

The rebuilt ATNF snapshot contains 4,503 objects. The timing subset is the 2,898 with finite $P > 0$ and $\dot{P} > 0$. There are 1,524 missing period derivatives and 81 supplied nonpositive derivatives. Treat the latter separately because cluster acceleration, kinematic contamination, and measurement noise can enter observed $\dot{P}$. The dipole proxy is the standard equatorial vacuum-convention value $B_{\mathrm{tim}} = 3.2 \times 10^{19}\sqrt{P\dot{P}}$ G for P in seconds. Fix the old normalization before looking at the labels. Writing $\tau_c = P/(2\dot{P})$,

$$\chi_{\mathrm{tim}} = \frac{2\pi(3.2 \times 10^{19})}{\Lambda_{\mathrm{tim}}}\sqrt{\frac{\dot{P}}{P}} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_*}{\tau_c}}, \qquad \tau_* = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{2\pi(3.2 \times 10^{19})}{\Lambda_{\mathrm{tim}}}\right)^2 = 1624.076\,\mathrm{yr}. \tag{14}$$

The numerical identity is satisfied to a maximum reported relative discrepancy of 5.6×10^{-16}. The rank ROC AUC for the ATNF AXP label is 0.9367 for both χ_{tim} and inverse characteristic age. The field proxy has AUC 0.9965 and mean precision over its recall ladder of 0.9143 in this retrospective sample. The high scores reflect the selected labels, population and timing assumptions. They do not supply out-of-population predictive accuracy. At the fixed cut there are 5 tagged passes, 17 tagged misses, and 4 other passes. The descriptive Wilson 95% interval for the tagged pass fraction is 0.101–0.434. Removing the catalogued globular-cluster objects leaves the 5 and 4 counts intact. Among 485 other objects with a matched intrinsic period-derivative estimate, the correction does not change their threshold side. R05 R08

The McGill snapshot lists 24 confirmed magnetars, six candidates, and one outburst pulsar. Twenty-two confirmed sources have uncensored positive timing for this calculation. Five pass the fixed line. Two of the three giant-flare hosts are above it at the selected catalog timing epoch, and SGR 0526−66 is below at $\chi_{\mathrm{tim}} = 0.695$. SGR 1806−20 and SGR 1900+14 give approximately 2.59 and 1.35. Event-time timing and monitoring exposure differ from catalog epochs and are required for a per-event necessary-condition test. The Crab is a rotation-powered pulsar above the line at $\chi_{\mathrm{tim}} \simeq 1.14$. Its nebular gamma-ray flares occur in a different emitting region than a magnetar surface or magnetosphere. The young pulsar J1846−0258 gives a productive intermediate case because a magnetar-like event was observed. SGR 1935+2154 provides a separate magnetar/radio-transient example. The two catalog samples overlap. R08 R09 R10 R11



Figure 4. ESFD cutoff explicitly overlaid on ATNF timing data, with the field-scale and orientation-sensitivity calculation for confirmed McGill magnetars. The field coordinates use a timing convention. The right-hand expectations use an illustrative isotropic distribution of angles.

7.2 Orientation and the observed high-field, fast-spin gap

A signed or magnitude-projected threshold can be written $s_B \chi_{\rm tim} \cos\theta$ or $s_B \chi_{\rm tim} |\cos\theta|$, with s_B an assumed field multiplier. For an isotropic independently distributed orientation relative to $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$, $|\cos\theta|$ is uniform on $[0, 1]$. The resulting expected pass probability is $\max(0, 1 - 1/(s_B \chi_{\rm tim}))$ in the magnitude version, and half this for a positive signed cut. Each expectation is the sum over the catalog. At $s_B = 1$ the expected number of McGill passes is 2.07 in the magnitude version, compared with five for the scalar product of magnitudes. At $s_B = 2$ the expected number rises to 5.35, while the aligned or magnitude limit gives 13. For ATNF tags the respective $s_B = 1$ counts are 1.60 expected and five magnitude passes. Orientation or obliquity inference in an actual population needs a different distribution linked to the torque and selection. A projection with multiplier fixed at unity can only reduce the count, point by point. The sensitivity analysis is new and fully reproducible.

Among the eligible ATNF sources the region $P \leq 0.1$ s and $B_{\rm tim} \geq 10^{13}$ G is empty. That is a genuine catalog observation. Birth distributions, short crossing or residence times, field evolution, torque prescriptions, beaming and radio surveys, intermittency and X-ray selection can contribute to the observed occupancy. A force-free spin-down law in the usual dipole notation has $\dot{E}_{\rm sd} \sim \mu^2 \Omega^4 (1 + \sin^2 \alpha_{\rm ob})/c^3$. It gives a nonzero aligned spin-down and changes the mapping from $\dot{P}$ to B relative to the orthogonal vacuum proxy. A hazard or birth-exclusion inference needs a forward population with the relevant selection functions and an age distribution. The empty region by itself supplies no estimate of a universal dynamical boundary. R05 R08 R12

A useful follow-up likelihood conditions on monitored source-time exposure $T_i(t, E)$ and separately models glitch, ordinary burst, giant flare, and radio-transient outcomes. A Poisson intensity, for example $\lambda_i(t) = T_i(t, E) \exp(\alpha_i + \beta^\top \mathbf{x}_i(t) + c_{\rm ESFD} h_i(t))$, permits age, dipole, twist, and activity history to enter separately. Calibrate time-variable spin-down irregularity before evaluating an event. Preselect independent field estimates such as lines with verified identification, phase-resolved emission geometry with model uncertainty, or simulated distinct internal stresses. A timing-based h_i identical to a monotone age transform cannot establish separate age and ESFD

effects without additional structure. Hold out entire sources and later observing time.

7.3 Glitches, energy reservoirs, and timing tests

The rebuilt glitch list has 625 events in 211 objects. The prior-glitch cohort uses 198 with eligible timing and a within-sample recurrence window, yielding 19 repeaters of which 18 sit below $\chi_{\rm tim} = 1$. The age-equivalent AUC is 0.742 and a past-glitch-count baseline gives AUC 0.752 and average precision 0.437, versus 0.220 for $\chi_{\rm tim}$. The recurrence comparison is retrospective and lacks harmonized monitoring exposure. A physically informative model compares pinned-superfluid angular-momentum transfer and crust/magnetospheric reconfiguration, with measured changes in spin frequency and braking. For $\dot{\Omega} = -K(t)\Omega^n$ one obtains $\Omega\ddot{\Omega}/\dot{\Omega}^2 = n + (\Omega/\dot{\Omega})\dot{K}/K$, so timing noise and torque evolution can mimic a new braking index. Quasi-periodic oscillations following giant flares supply a separate magnetoelastic mode diagnostic with uncertain mode identifications. R08 R09 R13

For illustration fix $M = 1.4\,M_\odot$, $R = 12$ km, $I = 0.3MR^2$, and $|W| = 0.6GM^2/R$. The Gaussian estimates $T = I\Omega^2/2$ and $E_B = B_{\rm int}^2 R^3/6$ assume a constant interior field and spherical volume. They give $B_{\rm int} = 9.48 \times 10^{17}$ G or $P = 0.303$ ms when either single term is equated to $|W|$. For $B_{\rm int} = 10^{15}$ G and $P = 5$ s, $(T + E_B)/|W| = 1.12 \times 10^{-6}$. Its illustrative magnetic energy is 2.88×10^{47} erg, above typical burst energies and comparable to the scale contemplated for the largest giant events if even a fraction can be released. The corresponding rotational reservoir is about 9.5×10^{44} erg. Using an illustrative 10^{17} G interior field gives $\chi_E \simeq 0.0111$. At 716 Hz and zero magnetic contribution, $\chi_E \simeq 0.047$. These numbers cohere as energy budgets. Stability depends on magnetic topology, deformation, stratification, cooling, mass shedding, and the equation of state. Flares may draw on local magnetic free energy and cross a reconnection threshold even when $\chi_E \ll 1$. A1 A3 R09 R14

7.4 Strong-field photon propagation and IXPE

The electron field $B_Q = m_e^2 c^3/(e\hbar)$ in Gaussian units is a QED scale independent of rotation. With weak fields and low photon frequency, the Euler–Heisenberg result for propagation at angle θ to the field has $n_\parallel - 1 \simeq 7\alpha_{\rm em}(B\sin\theta/B_Q)^2/(90\pi)$ and $n_\perp - 1 \simeq 4\alpha_{\rm em}(B\sin\theta/B_Q)^2/(90\pi)$. These are low-field expansions. High-field magnetar predictions require the full strong-field dielectric, plasma and vacuum resonances, surface radiative transfer, and line-of-sight geometry. At 1 keV the frequency is 2.42×10^{17} Hz and the angular frequency is 1.52×10^{18} rad/s. Direct substitution corrects the draft's frequency and angular-frequency interchange. The old $\Delta n \propto \alpha S_0/\omega^2$ needs a response tensor with dimensions, dispersion, and Ward identity checked. A competing q^2 form can be predicted from a dynamical scalar or two-form, with polarization specified. A1 R06

For a prescribed, slowly varying $Z(\Phi)$ with Maxwell action, geometric optics yields $k_\mu k^\mu = 0$ and amplitude transport of the form $\nabla_\mu(Z|\mathcal{A}|^2 k^\mu) = 0$ for a source-free ray. Both polarizations share the leading cone. Dynamical mixing as in (10), QED nonlinear terms, or a parity-odd $F\tilde{F}$ coupling yield other signatures. The archived soft X-ray test can thus compare phase, energy, and direction dependent Stokes parameters against a QED, atmosphere, and magnetosphere likelihood. For 4U 0142+61 the timing values give $B_{\rm tim}/B_Q \simeq 3.04$ and $\chi_{\rm tim} \simeq 0.154$. Its measured polarization changes with energy, including substantially different polarization angles across bands. The published polarization is a baseline constraint on emission and propagation. A separate ESFD parameter and an instrument response are required for an ESFD fit. R06 R15



Figure 5. McGill timing relative to the original ESFD line and electron QED field. Spin-down epochs and censoring are discussed in the text.

8 Neutron stars, mergers, and black holes

8.1 TOV, rotation, and matching a spin sector

For spherical perfect-fluid equilibrium in GR with $G = c = 1$,

$$\frac{dm}{dr} = 4\pi r^2 \epsilon, \qquad \frac{dp}{dr} = -\frac{(\epsilon + p)(m + 4\pi r^3 p)}{r(r - 2m)}. \tag{15}$$

Boundary conditions are regular $m(0) = 0$, prescribed central pressure, and $p(R) = 0$. The surface mass is $m(R)$. Six tabulated EOS give 540 equilibria. Their nominal maximum static masses span 2.031–$2.770\, M_\odot$. The AP4 table gives $dp/d\epsilon \simeq 1.34$ at its raw maximum, so that maximum requires a causal EOS treatment. The raw mass-radius curves and sound-speed flags are preserved. A $1.20 M_{\rm TOV}$ proxy illustrates uniform rotational support for a class of EOS. Actual mass shedding, thermal support, differential rotation and magnetic topology depend on the angular-momentum distribution and stability of the remnant. $dM/d\epsilon_c$ along an appropriate sequence is an indicator with hypotheses, and the dynamical boundary can be tested through a radial or nonaxisymmetric mode. Equating a global energy ratio to unity cannot substitute for checking the equilibrium and stability equations. A2 A3 R14 R16

An ESFD stellar model needs an interior $S^{\mu\nu}$, a thermodynamic EOS $p(n, T, Y_e, \ldots)$, composition and transport, a metric, a gauge configuration, and the calibrated relation of the effective spin term to $\delta T^\mu{}_\nu$. If stress is anisotropic, a spherical toy formula gives dp_r/dr an additional $2(p_t - p_r)/r$. In general, rotational/magnetic flattening requires an axisymmetric equilibrium or full evolution. A defensible numerical comparison pairs each ESFD solve with the same baryon mass, angular momentum, initial topology, resolution and EOS in its GRMHD control. Check constraints, surface and asymptotic conditions, gauge dependence and convergence of the proposed observable, such



Figure 6. General relativistic stellar benchmark. The integration uses six public tabulated EOS. The AP4 central sound-speed flag applies to its unmodified maximum. A plotted GR sequence supplies the reference for a future matched ESFD stress calculation.

as a shift in mass-radius relation or mode frequency. The GR reference tracks ordinary effects and anchors the $\alpha, \xi \to 0$ limit.

8.2 Kerr spin, observed distribution, and the precursor run

For a Kerr GR black hole $a_* = cJ/(GM^2)$, and its horizon in Boyer–Lindquist radius is $r_+ = (GM/c^2)(1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2})$. The horizon angular velocity is $\Omega_H = a_* c^3/[2GM(1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2})]$. The Kerr extremal limit $a_* = 1$ follows from the horizon solution. It is used as a control in the historical ESFD extension. An inferred remnant spin is conditional on the waveform and model used to infer it. The cumulative catalog snapshot has 391 distinct confident event summaries through GWTC-5.0, of which 282 have source-frame component medians and intervals. Both listed lower component endpoints exceed $3\,M_\odot$ for 273 of the 282. This count uses the tabulated interval endpoints as an operational mass cut. The uniform-waveform selection from the later PE products yields 189 remnant-spin medians, with median 0.696, 10th and 90th percentiles 0.647 and 0.749. Matched alternate waveform medians differ by 0.0049 in the median absolute difference over 84 pairs. GW190814 and GW230529 illustrate why population, EOS and binary modeling matter near the lower compact-mass boundary. R16 R19

If one inserts Ω_H into the archived timing ratio, the field needed for $\chi_{\rm tim} = 1$ has median about 8.73×10^{11} G in the same remnant subset. This algebraic estimate gives the horizon-threading field at which the timing index would equal unity. In vacuum Kerr the geometry carries angular momentum and a plasma can support currents outside it. The Blandford–Znajek energy-extraction baseline depends on horizon-threading flux and horizon rotation, roughly $P_{\rm BZ} \propto \Phi_B^2 \Omega_H^2 / c$ in one common normalization. An ESFD correction would have to specify horizon flux, disk or jet boundary conditions, charge supply, and an observable such as a residual in the waveform or jet power consistent with those parameters. Horizon flux requires disk and field modeling, independently



Figure 7. Source mass and waveform-inferred remnant spin distributions from the gravitational-wave data rerun. The displayed spin values are estimated under the selected waveform family.

of pulsar timing. R19 R20

Imaging and long-timescale timing offer complementary controls. EHT ring morphology constrains an exterior metric together with an accretion and emission model. Pulsar timing arrays infer a stochastic background from correlations in timing residuals over the sky. An ESFD signal in either case needs a model for the change in the null rays or the waveform and a covariance that includes the ordinary astrophysical population. Neither observable directly samples an interior spin density. R59

The archived BNS hypothesis predicts a polarized flash between 5 and 0.5 ms before coalescence, with a roughly 90° polarization-angle change. The GW170817 count-space check uses 872,114 raw Fermi/GBM entries across NaI 1, 2, and 5, with 465,709 photons after the pipeline's 10–50 keV channel-center selection. The nominal 4.5 ms window gives counts 2, 1, and 2. The pooled off-source expectation is 8.00 versus five observed. The one-sided excess probability under that Poisson reference is 0.900. An offset scan reaches 13 counts and has an empirical tail probability about 0.947 against 432 off-source control centers. A post-coalescence burst control shows the expected count excess. Clocks, propagation, localization, response matrices, and source timing assumptions delimit this one-event check. Polarimetry, energy fluence limits via response folding, and a population incidence constraint require additional data and calibrated injection recovery. A claimed 22 Hz precursor in another burst, for example the archived GRB 211211A lead, must be tested with that event's data, red-noise nulls, and a prespecified frequency or trials correction. A1 A6 R21 R22

9 Gravity, geometry, and the spin–entropy proposal

9.1 What a derivation of emergent gravity would have to produce

The early proof branch argues that constituent spin and electromagnetic field energy make mass and that long-range spin alignment accounts for inertia and attraction. The later regime-focused



Figure 8. Fermi/GBM count-space test for the old ESFD precursor window in GW170817. The window and offset trials use the same instrument selections. This plot is an intensity test with a single event.

version asks when electromagnetic stresses matter for gravitationally bound systems. In standard GR a localized electromagnetic or spin-dependent interaction contributes through the conserved stress-energy of the complete system. Bulk angular momentum gives gravitomagnetic terms in the exterior metric. Static attraction, light deflection, redshift, inertial response, post-Newtonian corrections, and radiation are additional linked predictions. A derivation of gravity from spin goes beyond computing corrections in an action containing the Einstein–Hilbert term. A4 A6 R23 R25

At distances large compared with neutral source sizes, a static ordinary magnetic dipole pair has energy proportional to $[\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - 3(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})]/r^3$ with both signs. Newtonian gravity requires a monopole $-GM_1M_2/r$ whose coupling survives for neutral, unpolarized bodies and for photons in the relativistic description. Polarization variance can be nonzero at zero mean. Its contribution is still set by the range, density scaling and tensor structure of the interaction. A physical source strength and universal charge must be derived. The proof draft's illustrative $G_{\text{naive}} = \alpha_{\text{em}}\hbar c/m_p^2$ is dimensionally possible and numerically 8.25×10^{25} in SI. It exceeds the measured G by about 1.24×10^{36}. It establishes a normalization problem, even before one confronts equivalence. A4

A light scalar with object-dependent charges q_A, q_B gives $U = -q_A q_B e^{-m_s r}/(4\pi r)$ at tree level in natural units. To emulate an extra universal attraction, q_A/M_A must match across compositions and environments or acquire an explicitly modeled screening dependence. Equivalence-principle experiments such as MICROSCOPE compare freely falling materials and bound differential accelerations at the few-10^{-15} scale. Spin-polarized torsion balances constrain orientation-dependent forces for specified ranges and couplings. A putative gravity replacement also has to match photon trajectories and post-Newtonian potentials, plus strong-field binaries. Einstein–Cartan spin contact interactions in the minimal theory and Pauli exchange have their own distance and spin structure. Force-range changes and collective condensates require an additional, specified physical mechanism. R01 R23 R25 R27

The archival connections to Mach and Sciama's inertial induction, Haisch–Rueda–Puthoff vacuum inertia, Sakharov's effective curvature term, Jacobson's thermodynamic Einstein equation, Verlinde's entropic proposal, and Cramer's transactional picture are research analogies. They have different assumptions about microscopic degrees of freedom, state spaces, background geometry,

and coarse graining. For example, integrating out matter can generate a curvature term in an effective action, with coefficient depending on particle content and matching, while a Clausius argument assumes local horizon temperature and an area entropy law. Each of these ideas leaves work for an ESFD mechanism. No recovered derivation gives the observed G, the graviton or other appropriate infrared representation, the equivalence principle, and a complete low-energy matter spectrum from spin–EM data. A2 A4 A6 R31 R32

9.2 Spin–entropy Field Dynamics (SEFD)

The June consolidation records a spin-entropy variable s and current J_s^μ, a gradient term, and the proposed coupling $-\beta_s s \nabla_\mu J_s^\mu$. It gives the combined index $\chi_{\text{tot}} = (B\Omega + \kappa_s s\Omega)/\Lambda_{\text{tim}}$, a separate $\chi_s = s\Omega/\Lambda_s$, and an effective density proportional to $\nabla_i(sJ_s^i)$. These are archived chat-level forms. They can be read as an order-parameter proposal. The thermodynamic entropy density, an entropy current, a microscopic spin tensor, and the von Neumann entropy of a reduced state are different quantities. For entropy density measured in units of k_B per volume, s has natural mass dimension three and κ_s has mass dimension -1 for $s\Omega$ to match $B\Omega$. A dimensionless coarse-grained order parameter would require a different κ_s. An actual entropy current has a constrained divergence under constitutive thermodynamics. A6

The archive form is equivalent to $+\beta_s J_s^\mu \nabla_\mu s$ up to a surface term. A test Lagrangian with $+\gamma_s(\partial s)^2 - U(s)$ and prescribed J_s^μ gives

$$2\gamma_s \Box s + U'(s) = -\beta_s \nabla_\mu J_s^\mu. \tag{16}$$

For a dynamical current, vary and specify its degrees of freedom, mutual response and boundary conditions. If $\gamma_s > 0$ and $U'' > 0$ at the background, the isolated scalar has a healthy kinetic term and positive small-perturbation squared mass. A condition $\chi_s \simeq 1$ becomes predictive once a solution, fluctuation operator, and parameter map are supplied. If using entropy as a hydrodynamic field, dissipation and positivity need a compatible physical closure. A reversible microscopic action and an irreversible coarse-grained entropy functional are connected by the reduction, environment, or stochastic model.

The archived effective gravitational density has a strong integral constraint. With a finite, regular, localized radial flux $s\mathbf{J}_s \to 0$ faster than r^{-2}, its integrated divergence vanishes by Gauss's theorem. For the literal fitted profile with outward amplitude Ce^{-r/r_s}, the enclosed effective mass and density are

$$M_{\text{div}}(< r) = 4\pi C r^2 e^{-r/r_s}, \qquad \rho_{\text{div}}(r) = Ce^{-r/r_s}\left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{1}{r_s}\right). \tag{17}$$

The solution needs a regular center or a core modification. There is a sign change at $2r_s$ and the total tends to zero. An outer $1/r^2$ flux tail gives a finite boundary charge and requires its own origin. An assumed positive exponential density has a positive asymptotic mass when integrated. Some old drafts use both as halo sources. Treating (17) as a projected effective acceleration is mathematically different from claiming the positive energy of a field. Matching the density to a conserved field stress and to light deflection is essential. An entropy-force ansatz $T\nabla s$ supplies a force once T and s are defined. It does not itself predict a radial law, an observed G, or the same coupling for every test body. A1 A6

9.3 Emergent space from waves and hierarchical spin

In the author's later wave-based description, waves organize into atom-like shells, their relationships build larger structures, and successive additions and reorientations could generate geometry itself. A mathematical version starts with constituent degrees of freedom, an algebra of local observables, and an evolution rule. One example to explore would define a weighted graph through a connected two-point function $C_{ij} = \langle O_i O_j \rangle - \langle O_i \rangle \langle O_j \rangle$ for specified spin or phase observables. An emergent graph distance, a normal-mode or correlation spectral dimension, and a continuum limit could then be studied. The state and the mapping from C to distances have to be declared before assessing whether the result has approximate isotropy, Lorentz symmetry, locality, and an Einstein-like response. Choosing a Hilbert-space tensor factorization or a lattice already uses assumptions about adjacency and independence. An apparent geometric shape formed by a wave visual does not select a unique metric. A6 A7

The required cross-scale checks are concrete. At atomic scales a new interaction must preserve Coulomb hydrogen's spectrum, orbital angular momentum and spin–orbit, Zeeman and hyperfine splittings to observed precision. At molecular scales chemistry depends on exchange, bonding, and electronic states. Macroscopic phase order can arise in spins or a superfluid, with a finite stiffness and correlation length. A field that generates long-range geometry would need independent and covariant predictions as that coarse graining changes. A toy spin network, lattice gauge system, or propagating nonlinear order parameter can test aspects of this proposal. Lattice wave propagation in an already assigned space supplies a dynamical analogy. Emergence of the spatial manifold also requires a reconstruction of geometry from relational observables, along with time evolution and clocks that agree on causal order in the tested limit. R31 R32

10 Galaxies, the Great Attractor, and the dark sector

10.1 What the three archived rotation-curve mechanisms predict

The Electromagnetic Universe and associated galaxy drafts propose (i) a direct field or alignment effect, (ii) a positive spin-supported density with a fitted scale, and (iii) the SEFD divergence source. Some chat versions use $\rho_{\text{spin}} \propto [\langle S \rangle \Omega]^2/(\mu_0 c^2)$ with a coupling, or $V^2_{\text{spin}} \propto \chi\, \alpha(r/R_d) V^2_{\text{bar}}$. These require defined units and an independently measured or predicted $\langle S \rangle$, or a replacement stress law. The older wire estimate with $I = 10^{18}$ A and $r \simeq 3 \times 10^{20}$ m gives $B = 6.67 \times 10^{-10}$ T, 6.67×10^{-6} G, and $\chi_{\text{tim}} \simeq 7.1 \times 10^{-36}$ for a typical orbital rate. The earlier 10^5 G and $\chi \sim 10^{-11}$ values were unit and arithmetic errors. The field of a finite return-current geometry should also replace the ideal infinite-wire approximation when predicting observables. A1 A4 A6

The full SPARC snapshot supplied 3,391 measured radii in 175 galaxies. The rebuilt fit requires quality flag at most 2, inclination at least 30°, finite positive radius and velocity errors, positive measured rotation, and positive baryonic V^2. This leaves 3,166 eligible radii in 153 galaxies and 3,032 radii in 131 galaxies with at least eight points. Baryons use signed contribution $V|V|$ and stellar mass-to-light ratios 0.5 for disks and 0.7 for bulges. The paired profiles were fit with diagonal velocity errors and common fitting choices, and a radial extrapolation comparison trained on the innermost $\lfloor 0.7n \rfloor$ radii and held out 967 outer radii in total. Distances, inclinations, mass-to-light systematic errors, radial covariance and population selection matter for a global astrophysical inference. This is an internally comparable curve-fit test on fixed data choices. R28 R29

For $\rho_{\rm exp} = \rho_0 e^{-r/r_s}$ the enclosed mass is

$$M_{\rm exp}(<r) = 4\pi\rho_0 r_s^3 \left[2 - e^{-x}(x^2+2x+2)\right], \qquad x = r/r_s. \tag{18}$$

As r increases the mass tends to $8\pi\rho_0 r_s^3$ and the outer speed eventually falls as $r^{-1/2}$. At small r the finite central density gives a solid-body rise. Add to the baryonic squared speed using $V_{\rm add}^2 = GM_{\rm exp}(<r)/r$. The fixed historical NGC 2403 example $\rho_0 = 1.7\times10^{-20}$ kg m^{-3}, $r_s = 6$ kpc gives a peak extra speed around 435.7 km/s against a measured peak 136 km/s in this compilation. The earlier fitted examples for NGC 3198 and DDO 154 are addressed with the same fitting code and fixed baryonic choices. A fit with its own ρ_0, r_s per galaxy constrains a shape family. A first-principles ESFD prediction must determine the normalization and spatial structure from spin and field observations or shared parameters.

Profile	Median full-curve RMSE (km/s)	Median outer holdout RMSE (km/s)
Baryons	44.73	55.15
Published RAR control	13.60	11.86
ESFD archived exponential alone	6.34	14.67
Baryons + ESFD archived exponential	5.43	10.13
Baryons + NFW	5.18	7.84
Baryons + pseudo-isothermal	4.25	6.94
Baryons + literal SEFD flux (17)	5.19	8.40

The exponential plus baryons beats NFW on outer RMSE in 52 of 131 galaxies. The paired median per-galaxy excess in RMSE is 4.89 km/s, with a galaxy bootstrap 95% percentile interval of 0.23–7.25 km/s. The fixed published RAR uses overlapping data in its historical calibration, so its comparison supplies a known relation evaluated under the same cuts. The archived Draco scales give $1.68\times10^5\,M_\odot$ within 0.295 kpc, compared with about $1.70\times10^7\,M_\odot$ inferred under standard kinematics. For Abell 1689 the fixed exponential gives $8.59\times10^{14}\,M_\odot$ inside 2.39 Mpc versus a published weak-lensing-derived summary of about $1.87\times10^{15}\,M_\odot$. These fixed comparisons use published summaries and do not reproduce a full kinematic or lensing likelihood. A6 R28 R29 R33

10.2 A stronger energy-budget calculation

To measure the scale mismatch for ordinary electromagnetic energy, use the outermost eligible measured radius of each of the 131 matched galaxies and write $v_x^2 = v_{\rm obs}^2 - v_{\rm bar}^2$. In a deliberately simple spherical, weak-field mass proxy, $M_x = rv_x^2/G$. Set the volume-average Maxwell energy divided by c^2 equal to the corresponding mass density. This gives

$$B_{\rm rms,req} = \sqrt{2\mu_0 c^2 \frac{3v_x^2}{4\pi G r^2}}. \tag{19}$$



Figure 9. Held-out SPARC radii and inner-fit extrapolations for the three prominently named galaxy examples. The curve labeled exponential in the plot is the archived ESFD profile family in (18).



Figure 10. Rebuilt comparison of median galaxy-level residuals. The archival ESFD and SEFD parameterizations appear as the exponential and radial-flux profiles. Both use coefficients fitted to velocity data.



Figure 11. Volume-rms magnetic field that would supply the inferred extra acceleration via ordinary field energy in a spherical mass proxy. One measured outer radius per fitted SPARC galaxy. Comparison bands show assumed field strengths. The plotted points give the required fields.

All 131 selected outer points have positive v_x^2 under the fixed baryonic prescription. The 10th, median and 90th percentiles of the required volume rms field are 3.24×10^4, 5.93×10^4, and 1.04×10^5 μG. For the median point, 10 μG supplies about $1/(3.51\times10^7)$ of this energy budget. Even a uniform 100 μG supplies only about $1/(3.51\times10^5)$. As an example $v_x = 100$ km/s at 10 kpc implies $2.33\times10^{10}\,M_\odot$ and 9.21×10^4 μG. Published spiral-galaxy magnetic studies use synchrotron, polarization and Faraday signals, and ordinary large-scale values are in the μG range. Unknown geometry, anisotropic stresses, volume filling and baryonic uncertainty change (19). The several orders of magnitude in the mismatch cannot be accounted for by an order-unity change to the stress factor. Equation (19) tests gravitation by ordinary measured field energy. A distinct effective field or modified gravity needs its own magnitude from the action. R26 R28

Can the exponential itself close (19)? In the magnetic, quadratic equilibrium of (9), the scalar potential above its vacuum value plus the magnetic energy is $u = V(\bar{\Phi}) + ZB^2/2$. The equilibrium condition gives $V = (x/2)ZB^2/2$, hence $u/u_{\text{Maxwell}} = e^{-x}(1 + x/2)$ at fixed B. For the equilibrium branch $x \geq 0$ this ratio is at most one and decreases, reaching about 0.208 at $3B_c$. This specific exponential response suppresses the local equilibrium energy instead of amplifying it. On a fixed-field energy budget alone, increasing the 10 μG contribution to the median required level would need a factor 3.51×10^7, i.e. a pure multiplicative $Z \simeq e^{17.4}$. That sign and magnitude lie outside the stable homogeneous branch that produced (9). An alternative potential, kinetic energy in inhomogeneous configurations, or explicitly different sourcing of gravity must be developed and checked separately.

For a usable positive ESFD galaxy test, derive a mapping from radio polarization, field reversal, plasma density and vorticity to a prediction for Ψ and Φ_N. A weak-field metric in Newtonian gauge has $g_{00} \simeq 1 + 2\Psi/c^2$ and $g_{ij} \simeq -(1 - 2\Phi_N/c^2)\delta_{ij}$. Slow matter responds to $\nabla\Psi$. Lensing tests transverse gradients of $\Psi + \Phi_N$. A scalar conformal factor can move these potentials in opposite directions and leave null trajectories unchanged for a fixed underlying geometry, even when it

changes dynamics of massive particles. A plasma refraction model also predicts chromaticity. These distinctions are critical in joint gas, stellar-orbit and weak-lensing likelihoods. Begin with galaxies that have matched field and rotation data, fit shared coefficients, and validate on disjoint galaxies with fixed nuisance priors before extrapolating to clusters.

10.3 Cosmic filaments, the Galactic plane, and large-scale flows

The Radcliffe Wave, Galactic disk and supercluster flows connect directly to Grenke's large-scale intuition about organized currents. The Radcliffe Wave is a spatially coherent gas and star-formation structure. Its phase-space motion, vertical velocity and age distribution can distinguish disk gravity and disturbance models. Plasma structures and filamentary magnetic configurations also occur, and morphology alone has weak model specificity. Faraday rotation measures an integral proportional to $\int n_e B_\parallel dl$. Synchrotron intensity and polarization weight electron populations and magnetic fields differently, with foreground and geometry degeneracy. A mechanism claiming that magnetic topology organizes the mass distribution should predict gas, stellar and lensing features with distinct phases or alignment and hold out sky regions. The Great Attractor and Laniakea are first quantified through galaxy peculiar velocities. A field-centered alternative must predict those velocity gradients and a consistent gravitational potential using magnetism data independent of the flows. The localized Galactic magnetic field can affect gas and cosmic rays in a standard approach. A6 R26 R34

A cluster-collision test is essential because the Bullet Cluster shows a separation between much of the X-ray-emitting baryonic plasma and the peaks inferred from weak lensing. A useful prediction specifies the spatial distributions of ordinary gas, collisionless stars and any new spin field before scoring the shear. The old high-redshift rotation, DES or other shear, thermal/kinetic Sunyaev–Zeldovich (SZ), and growth claims need the original samples and predicted covariance, or an independently implemented mechanism with both metric potentials. A scientifically complete alternative should return joint residuals for redshift and scale bins, with covariances, selection, galaxy bias, feedback and projection effects. A circular-speed profile at $z \simeq 0$ has limited reach into these observations. A6 R35

10.4 Early cosmology, magnetogenesis, and dark energy

For statistically isotropic random fields, $\langle B_i B_j \rangle = \langle B^2 \rangle \delta_{ij}/3$. Maxwell stress is traceless and its isotropic coarse-grained equation of state is $p_B = \rho_B/3$ in energy units. Under flux freezing in an expanding background of scale factor a, $B \propto a^{-2}$ and $\rho_B \propto a^{-4}$ for constant Z. A varying Z exchanges energy with the scalar, so the two sectors must be evolved together. The magnetic component has anisotropic stress before the appropriate average, and its contributions to CMB spectra are limited by observations. To behave like cold matter, a proposed spin or scalar component needs sustained clustering with small effective pressure and sound speed on the relevant scales. A coherently oscillating canonical massive scalar with an approximately quadratic potential and $m \gg H$ can have $\langle p \rangle \simeq 0$ in a homogeneous approximation. The perturbations, production and couplings determine whether it is viable. This route adds a dark effective degree of freedom whose properties can be tested. R36 R37

As a background consistency scale, within base ΛCDM the Planck values $\omega_b \simeq 0.0224$ and $\omega_c \simeq 0.120$ with conventional relativistic $\omega_r \simeq 4.18 \times 10^{-5}$ give matter–radiation equality near $z \simeq 3400$. Holding the radiation budget fixed, replacing the matter term by baryons alone gives $z \simeq$

535, after standard recombination. A new theory can change the expansion or add another pre-recombination clustering stress. The required result is a matched calculation of temperature, polarization, peak heights, damping, transfer functions, lensing, BAO and baryon abundance in the alternative model. The archival exponential or SEFD radial flux beside a late galaxy supplies no background stress with these properties. R36

Inflationary magnetogenesis can be explored by evolving $Z(\Phi)$ with the scalar and charged matter. Amplification has backreaction, conductivity, initial state and strong-coupling conditions. A parity-even ZF^2 gauge factor alone does not select one circular polarization at leading fixed-background propagation. Cosmic birefringence can arise with a pseudoscalar coupling $-\frac{1}{4}g_{\varphi\gamma}\varphi F\tilde{F}$ and, in the simple homogeneous slow-background limit, polarization rotation $\Delta\beta = \frac{1}{2}g_{\varphi\gamma}[\varphi_{\rm obs} - \varphi_{\rm em}]$ up to the convention for $\tilde{F}$. Survey calibrations, dust foregrounds and band dependence are required. Any archived order-unity local non-Gaussianity, transfer-function deviation or GW propagation claim needs a defined primordial ensemble and an evolved spectrum, alongside the measured $f_{\rm NL}$, tensor-mode, and CMB constraints. A positive nearly constant scalar potential with small kinetic fraction can mimic vacuum-like $w \simeq -1$. Deriving its magnitude, radiative stability and perturbations is the problem for the dark-energy branch. A6 R36 R37

11 Spin–torsion collapse, white holes, and daughter universes

11.1 A solvable high-density toy model

The early idea treats increasing concentration, spin, and field strength as feedback toward a horizon and then a new phase. In the strongest extension, the high-density core bounces and an expanding region develops on the other side of a global geometry. Start with a toy FLRW patch and a conserved fermion number $n \propto a^{-3}$. Use an effective matter density $\rho_m = mn$ and a negative spin-correlation correction $\rho_s = -\beta_s n^2$, $\beta_s > 0$, motivated by particular averaged spin-fluid treatments, with $p_s = \rho_s$. The sign and magnitude are stipulated here. The quadratic scaling is the essential assumption. For flat geometry and zero vacuum term

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(\rho_m + \rho_s), \qquad \dot{H} = -4\pi G(\rho_m + 2\rho_s). \tag{20}$$

At the balance $n_b = m/\beta_s$ and $\rho_b = mn_b$, $H = 0$ and $\dot{H} = 4\pi G\rho_b > 0$. Define $t_b = 2/[3\sqrt{(8\pi G/3)\rho_b}]$ and let a_b be the minimum. The result is

$$\frac{a}{a_b} = \left[1 + (t/t_b)^2\right]^{1/3}, \qquad H = \frac{2(t/t_b)}{3t_b[1 + (t/t_b)^2]}. \tag{21}$$

It follows by setting $y = (a/a_b)^3$ and integrating $\dot{y}^2 = 9(8\pi G/3)\rho_b(y-1)$. The expanding branch was independently integrated using the Raychaudhuri equation and $da/dt = aH$, starting at the regular turnaround. The analytic and numerical solutions agree to better than 10^{-9} in the dimensionless scale factor and Hubble parameter over the tested interval. FLRW Ricci and Kretschmann scalars stay finite in this toy solution. Effective negative stiff stress violates the null energy condition near the bounce. Its high-density projection and the validity of the averaged fluid at the balance density require a microphysical model. R01 R38



Figure 12. ESFD spin–torsion extension under the chosen homogeneous, isotropic matter and negative-stiff-fluid assumptions. This is the analytic bounce and the two competing density scalings.

A positive shear term in a homogeneous anisotropic model often scales as a^{-6} as well. A bounce driven by the negative spin-fluid term then needs its coefficient to exceed the positive shear contribution in the same Friedmann normalization. For relativistic matter with $\rho \propto n^{4/3}$ the balance density scales as $(\rho/n^{4/3}\beta_s^{-1})^{3/2}$. With an ordinary gravitational-strength contact, the scale is very high. Extrapolation from nuclear densities using a nonrelativistic dust law can badly misestimate the density. Strong-interaction phases, relativistic matter, anisotropic or inhomogeneous collapse, shocks, angular momentum and finite EFT cutoff all matter. This check explains how a bounce can arise and which assumption produces it.

11.2 Global causal structure and observational implications

A trapped surface is defined through the signs of the null expansions. A classical singularity theorem requires causal, energy and global hypotheses. A finite matter density or a regular minimum in $a(t)$ cannot determine the null expansions and event horizon of a rotating exterior. To turn (21) into an astrophysical model, specify initial stellar data and constraints, obtain a regular interior, match across a surface or physical shell to an exterior, track energy and angular momentum including emission, and locate trapped and anti-trapped regions through null geodesics. The interior may describe an expanding patch causally inaccessible to exterior observers. A white-hole-like exterior requires different global matching and a predicted escape channel. Ringdown changes, delayed bursts, and echoes each require a propagation and emission model plus a data likelihood. Existing black-to-white-hole tunneling and Einstein–Cartan daughter-universe proposals supply comparison models with their own assumptions. A6 A7 R38 R39

The reported handedness imbalance in a JWST deep field enters the archive as an observational lead. Projected galaxy winding, the intrinsic rotation vector, and global cosmic vorticity require an inclination and selection model to connect. A credible anisotropy test predefines redshift bins and sky masks, handles image mirroring and algorithmic symmetry, uses sky coverage beyond one field, and includes a kinematic explanation from observer motion and sample selection. An ESFD daughter-universe model would predict an axis, amplitude, sign and redshift dependence before the data split. It must also fit CMB isotropy and directional observables. The observed field imbalance measures its sample. It cannot identify a global formation mechanism without this

model. A7 R36 R40

12 Quark and gluon spin, the Higgs field, and CERN

12.1 Quark spin and the heavy-ion proposal

In the June 2 project discussion Grenke explicitly asked that intrinsic quark spin be part of the master theory. The archived terms are a quark tensor dipole and a gradient correction, $\alpha_q S^q_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \beta_q (\nabla_\rho S^q_{\mu\nu})^2$, with $S^q_{\mu\nu} = \bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu}q$ in that version. This normalization differs by two from the June Dirac $S_{\mu\nu}$. The term must be embedded with covariant derivatives and color and electroweak contractions when required. In a proton the total spin decomposition involves quark helicity, orbital angular momentum and gluon contributions, with operator definitions and a scale. In the Ji decomposition $J_q = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Sigma_q + L_q$ and $J_q + J_g = \frac{1}{2}$, with a sum on flavors. Tensor charges relate transversity to the forward tensor bilinear. They are distinct from axial charges and the moments controlling magnetic couplings. Connecting the proposed operator to nucleon and neutron-star matter needs scale evolution and matched tensor matrix elements in the relevant composition and density. A1 A6 R03 R17

Peripheral high-energy nuclear collisions have orbital angular momentum, electromagnetic fields and short-lived vorticity. A fluid proxy for rotation seen by spin is thermal vorticity $\varpi_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \beta_\nu - \partial_\nu \beta_\mu)$ with $\beta_\mu = u_\mu / T$. Hyperon polarization inferred from weak decays and vector-meson spin alignment supply distinct observables. STAR measured global Λ polarization consistent with vortical dynamics, and an isobar blind analysis found no positive chiral magnetic signal under its predefined criterion. Charge-dependent backgrounds and isobar modeling enter the latter study. An ESFD term needs prediction of an additional dependence on flavor, p_T, rapidity, centrality, beam energy and spectator plane, with ordinary strong spin transfer and detector systematics. Compare isobars, matched centralities, and sign reversals only where the physical reaction-plane convention supplies a specified prediction. R04 R18 R30

The old claim of a 10^{-24} s electromagnetic microburst is a proposed formation timescale, an energy scale of $\hbar/\Delta t \simeq 0.66$ GeV. The 10^{-18} s instrumentation mentioned in the same draft is a million times coarser than that timescale. The suggested 10^6–10^7 photons per event in a 1–10 GeV band face a strict collision energy check. A 200 GeV-per-nucleon-pair Au–Au event has at most about 3.94×10^4 GeV of total center-of-mass beam energy before subtracting spectators and ordinary production. A 5.02 TeV Pb–Pb collision has about 1.04×10^6 GeV at the full-incoming-nuclei level. A million photons at 1 GeV already cost 10^6 GeV. The literal yield range therefore cannot describe a routine emitted component of these events. A feasible search uses direct-photon and low-mass dilepton spectra, angular anisotropies, photon correlations or polarization if measured, and comparisons with pp baselines and validated cocktail and thermal contributions. The coefficient should be matched to an emission rate and integrated over the spacetime history of each modeled event, including $\mathbf{B}(t)$ rather than an instantaneous upper estimate. A1 A6 R41

12.2 Higgs and the possibility of a common origin of mass and gravity

The established Higgs field is an electroweak scalar. Its vacuum value gives the weak vector masses and fermion masses through their respective couplings. The physical Higgs has spin zero. Most rest mass of nucleons emerges from the QCD state, including quark and gluon energies and

trace-anomaly physics, with the decomposition depending on scheme and scale. Energy of bound states is a source in GR regardless of how each constituent mass arose. The older ESFD proposal that Higgs, spin, gravity and electromagnetism descend from a common structure needs explicit matching to these distinct established processes. The invariant Φ in (3) is a proposed collective field or composite operator. It would mix with a Higgs-like scalar only through declared gauge-invariant terms and a specified vacuum. A4 A5 A6 R17 R42

Permissible comparison operators include $\Phi H^\dagger H$ with an appropriately dimensioned coefficient for a dimensionless Φ, nonminimal curvature $H^\dagger H R$, or the dimension-six electromagnetic matching contribution $(H^\dagger H)B^Y_{\mu\nu}B_Y^{\mu\nu}/M^2$ and weak-field analogues. After breaking, the last operator affects the gauge normalization and physical Higgs–gauge vertices in correlated ways. The long-range gravitational limit, observed $\gamma\gamma$, ZZ and WW channels, fifth-force limits, and electroweak precision data would jointly constrain such a model. The observed Higgs decay is a control measurement of the available couplings and correlated final states. It does not set the ESFD timing scale. R03 R42 R43

12.3 The off-shell density matrix and an ESFD residual

The September CERN expansion proposed $d\rho(q^2) = \rho_{\text{ESFD}}(q^2) - \rho_{\text{SM}}(q^2)$ in Higgs decays to four leptons, with q^2 the lower dilepton invariant mass squared under a fixed pairing. Timelike lepton currents in $H \to ZZ^{(*)} \to 4\ell$ encode the spin correlations of the vector channel. The second vector is generally off shell because $m_H < 2m_Z$. For a quantitative prediction start with the observable four-lepton amplitude, including identical-particle interference and gauge-complete contact and mixed $Z\gamma$ terms where applicable. Let q_1, q_2 be the dilepton momenta, D_Z the propagator factor, and $J^{(i)}$ the chiral lepton current. A schematic neutral-vector vertex description is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_{ZZ} \propto J^{(1)}_\mu J^{(2)}_\nu D_Z(q_1^2) D_Z(q_2^2)\big[a_1 m_Z^2 g^{\mu\nu} + a_2(q_1\cdot q_2\, g^{\mu\nu} - q_2^\mu q_1^\nu) \\ + a_3 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} q_{1\rho} q_{2\sigma}\big].\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The tensor structures give spin and CP tests in a specified basis, with coefficients and form factors constrained by gauge symmetry and matching. For amplitudes $\mathcal{M}_\lambda$ projected to such a basis, $R_{\lambda\lambda'} = \int \mathcal{M}_\lambda \mathcal{M}^*_{\lambda'} d\Pi$ in a bin and $\rho = R/\operatorname{tr} R$. At first order, $\delta\rho = (\delta R - \rho_{\text{SM}} \operatorname{tr}\delta R)/\operatorname{tr} R_{\text{SM}}$, where δR includes interference. This enforces the trace constraint. Test physical positivity, fit the particular direction in angular coefficient space predicted by the operator, and background-subtract and fold detector acceptance with the same binning. A renormalized electroweak amplitude, joint covariance, and a detector model are necessary for a bound on the new coefficient. A5 R03 R44 R45

ATLAS's two published combined angular coefficients give observed minus Standard Model values $+0.26 \pm 0.45$ and -0.56 ± 0.44 using the quoted experimental marginal errors. The resulting marginal pulls are $+0.58$ and -1.27. They share analysis inputs and have no demonstrated joint ESFD likelihood in the recovered work. The 4.7σ ATLAS result concerns the assumed separable-state comparison in the angular analysis. CMS reports an I_3 95% interval [2.52, 2.75] in a restricted $C_\parallel$ fit and [0.28, 2.87] with both parameters profiled, with the Standard Model central reference 2.60. Event reconstruction and fit assumptions affect these comparisons. The study of top-quark spin entanglement is another Standard Model laboratory for density-matrix validation. It probes a different final state and interactions. A5 R44 R45 R46



Figure 13. Published measurements used in the ESFD collider residual study. ATLAS points are relative to the reported Standard Model expectations. CMS intervals illustrate how the fit choice affects the witness. The figure contains measured values and Standard Model comparisons. A matched ESFD curve requires the amplitude in (22) to be specified.

13 Exceptional symmetry and ultraviolet completion

The archival July paper sketches $E_8 \supset \mathrm{Spin}(11,3) \to \mathrm{Spin}(3,1) \times H$ and an eventual low-energy Standard Model plus gravity. The frame-Higgs sector would connect a tetrad with a symmetry-breaking field. Heavy off-diagonal modes were proposed as a source of extra fermion, field, and torsion operators, with possible axion-like or heavy electroweak boson signatures. The proposal needs the real form, embedding of hypercharge, representations, chirality and generations, spectrum and vacuum, kinetic signs, symmetry breaking and anomaly checks. A positive identification of a gauge group supplies no Wilson coefficient without this chain. A6 R47

The E_8 root system has 112 vectors $\pm e_i \pm e_j$ for $i < j$ in $\mathbb{R}^8$, and 128 half-integer vectors $\frac{1}{2}(\pm 1, \ldots, \pm 1)$ with an even number of minus signs. Eight Cartan generators give dimension 248. In the compact real algebra or its complexification, the $\mathfrak{so}(16)$ branching reads $\mathbf{248} = \mathbf{120} \oplus \mathbf{128}$. The **120** is the adjoint, and the **128** is one chiral spinor of $\mathfrak{so}(16)$. This elementary representation check does not fix the noncompact embedding or supply four-dimensional chiral matter. Distler and Garibaldi identify representation-theoretic obstructions in the class of direct real/complex E_8 embeddings of gravity and the Standard Model that includes Lisi's proposal. An ESFD construction in the same class faces those assumptions. Higher-dimensional compactification, different algebraic structure, or different representations would have to be specified explicitly for a different proposal. R47

The old estimate $\chi \sim g_{E8}^2/M_X^2$ has mass dimension -2. Integrating out a healthy heavy vector with linear coupling to a fermion current can give a dimension-six current–current term $-g_X^2 J_X^2/(2M_X^2)$ at tree level in the stated vector convention. The low-energy spin–photon dipole of (1) has coefficient dimension -1. Its electroweak-gauge-invariant predecessor is a different dimension-six operator. Depending on the mediating fields, a dipole may first arise at loop level with Yukawa or fermion-mass insertions, or may require additional interactions. The minimal deliverable for this branch is a chiral table, charge and anomaly equations, canonical kinetic terms, an integration-out

calculation, and comparison of a single set of coefficients against multiparticle data. E_8 geometry, exceptional spinors, and analogies with the atomic wave hierarchy are motivations for this calculation. A6 R03 R47

14 Quantum coherence, collapse, and observers

14.1 Entanglement and a constrained spin-decoherence model

The older ESFD "shared envelope" gives spin correlations a common field description. Standard quantum states already permit nonfactorizing spin expectation values at spacelike separation. For a spin singlet $E(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) = -\mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}$ and the optimal CHSH value is $2\sqrt{2}$. A locally causal model with independent settings and outcomes represented by $A_i(\lambda), B_j(\lambda) \in \{-1,+1\}$ has $|S| \leq 2$. For each hidden variable λ, either B_0+B_1 or B_0-B_1 is zero, so $A_0(B_0+B_1)+A_1(B_0-B_1)$ is ± 2. A shared pre-existing classical spin field and signals restricted to a future light cone still obey this bound under those assumptions. A change imposed at event A reaches only its causal future. Quantum field entanglement, a modified statistical assumption, or explicit nonlocal dynamics with operational no-signalling is needed if the model aims to reproduce the Bell correlations. An entanglement witness extracted from collider distributions has different operational assumptions than a freely chosen, spacelike separated Bell test. A1 A5 R48

A concrete test target for a local spin-sensitive environment is an additional positive dephasing rate $\Gamma(B,\Omega,\mathbf{M})$ above measured noise, with a completely positive Markovian model

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H,\rho] + \Gamma(\sigma_z\rho\sigma_z - \rho). \tag{23}$$

The off-diagonal term decays as $e^{-2\Gamma t}$ in the commuting Hamiltonian frame. With independent such channels on the two qubits of $|\Phi^+\rangle$, the coherence multiplier is $\lambda = e^{-2\int(\Gamma_A+\Gamma_B)dt}$, and the maximal CHSH value is $2\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}$. Local completely positive trace-preserving operations preserve the distant marginal for unconditioned outcomes. A proposal coupling this rate to ESFD needs a dimensioned power law and control for magnetic gradients, control pulse noise, bath fluctuations and drift. For an objective-collapse hypothesis, the unconditioned dephasing equation gives an observationally different question from an account of individual outcomes. To go beyond ordinary dephasing, state the stochastic evolution of a run, probability rule, Lorentz/no-signalling limit and any heating or spontaneous radiation. Then use independent interferometry, entanglement visibility or timing constraints to infer a bounded rate. R48 R49

14.2 Time, observer layers, and consciousness

The Trap of Reality proposes that perception and spacetime are stabilized layers, that fields and spin may connect to an underlying observer, and that the nervous system may act as an interface or transducer. The public companion discussion also asks whether individual perspectives, continuity, and the origin of experience admit a broader field account. The analogy to Hoffman's Markovian conscious agents supplies a formal vocabulary for perception, decisions and actions. Tom Bilyeu's identity and continuity discussion supplies a philosophical comparison in the source. The ESFD field action as recovered models A, ψ, Φ and geometry. A consciousness or observer theory needs a defined variable, dynamics and independent observations linking it to these fields.

Connection by analogy, or the existence of spin coherence somewhere in matter, leaves that interface unspecified. A7 R50

For an operational model, assign an observer state o a state space $\mathcal{O}$, a generator $\mathcal{K}_o[\rho, \Phi, u]$, a readout $P(y|o, \rho, \Phi)$ for declared observables, and a reciprocal or explicitly open-system effect on matter. Fix units, a stress or energy account for any physical backreaction, and null limits. This would allow a preregistered laboratory comparison using the same instrument and environment with automated, blinded, and recorded conditions. Standard brain electrophysiology and signal artifacts are controls for a physical field claim. Subjective time and memory need independent definitions from proper time and population coherence. Philosophical claims about identity, free will, death, simulation, or consciousness in AI remain underdetermined by photon, pulsar and collider data. The archived views are retained as questions and can acquire empirical content through a specified discriminator. A7 R49 R50

15 Solar, geophysical, and vacuum extensions

15.1 Solar activity, local shear, and Earth

The rebuilt solar baseline uses the science-quality GOES composite flare measurements and WDC–SILSO daily counts. Removing invalid rows and repeats leaves 82,229 unique valid catalog entries. The monthly intersection has 81,721 flares across 381 complete months from February 1995 through October 2026, including 6,057 M/X flares and 366 X-class flares. A daily-exposure Poisson count baseline uses contemporaneous log-transformed activity, with 299 months before 2020 for the fit and 82 later months for evaluation. Its out-of-time mean Poisson deviance is 12.80 versus 41.71 for a constant-rate model. The all-period Spearman correlation of monthly M/X daily rate with sunspots is 0.863. Dependence within a solar cycle and concurrent activity preclude treating this as an advance warning forecast. The analysis is a calibrated solar-activity control for a later field-threshold model. R51

A generous 10 kG field and the Sun's representative bulk sidereal spin give $\chi_{\text{tim}} \simeq 4.56 \times 10^{-17}$. A model of active-region instability needs local vorticity, field projection and volume, photospheric flux emergence, helicity injection, preflare topology and reconnection physics. Start with a GOES event-to-active-region match, HMI vector magnetograms, and velocity estimates at uniform cadence. Approximately 37,247 solar entries in the full-month joined sample have a region identifier. The rest require an explicit missing-data model or a declared matched-cohort bound. A forecast should fit pre-event time only, and validate by active region and solar cycle, with disk position, sensitivity, false-alarm rate and retries of repeated flares handled consistently. A local plasma model compares magnetohydrodynamic current sheets, shearing and helicity thresholds with the spin closure; Earth's atmospheric response is another system with its own propagation and lags. A6 R51 R52

The older Earth-reset and tectonic proposals can be stated as a time-dependent field or torque claim. At an assumed geomagnetic field of 50 μT the magnetic pressure is about 1.0×10^{-3} Pa. A 100 nT perturbation gives a cross-stress scale $B\delta B/\mu_0 \simeq 4\times10^{-6}$ Pa. Geomagnetic reversals involve the dynamo field and require their own paleomagnetic chronology. They do not imply reversal of the planet's mechanical angular momentum. A missing high-gain triggering mechanism would require an energy pathway, independently observed electric currents or stresses at depth, and a lag, location and magnitude prediction scored on held-out catalogs. USGS reports no established



Figure 14. Solar baseline rerun on GOES and SILSO data. The dotted split marks the later monthly evaluation. The activity model uses contemporaneous sunspot measurements. Local spin and magnetic-field geometry remain an active-region-level test.

causal link between solar flares or magnetic storms and earthquakes. Independently demonstrate any such statistical relation against time clustering, catalog completeness, seismic seasonality and multiple searches. Earth-rotation and atmospheric angular-momentum exchange respond to geophysical and fluid forcing. They provide controlled alternative predictions. A6 R52 R53

15.2 Vacuum energy, claimed propulsion, and resonance traditions

The research archive links the early proposed spin torque and “vacuum resistance” to later work on Casimir physics, government research programs, and anomalous observations. The static Casimir energy of ideal parallel plates depends on separation, with $E/A = -\pi^2\hbar c/(720d^3)$ before material and geometry corrections. A closed reversible change of boundary configuration returns that energy difference during reset. The dynamical Casimir experiment generated photons under externally modulated boundaries, with the modulation supplying energy. These results are strong examples of field dynamics under boundary changes. An energy claim requires sustained power delivered under load and a full input, storage and environmental balance across the cycle. Open-circuit voltage alone can persist with very little transferable energy. A8 R54

The related Pattern Nexus work names NASA exploratory efforts, the DARPA vacuum-engineering program, a 2026 proposer slide reporting 100–250 mV at very low current density, a Casimir power-cell patent, and inertial reduction claims in the Pais patent record. These are traceable documents of research proposals, legal claims or reported bench observations. The physically decisive data for a putative vacuum source are long-duration $V(I,t)$ curves, integrated load energy, independent replication, and changes upon control stacks, chemical history, thermal gradients, ambient RF and leakage changes. Likewise for anomalous propulsion one compares the measured force with net momentum flux through the closed system, using calibrated thermal, outgassing, radiated power, cable and magnetic force budgets. A photon beam carrying power P emits mo-

mentum per time P/c in its direction. A closed internal electromagnetic cycle exchanges momentum within its components. A nonzero net thrust needs momentum carried across a boundary or a specified additional coupled field that carries it. The precise EMDrive remeasurement found that conventional thermal and apparatus effects can generate false positives. None of these documents calibrates an ESFD propulsion coefficient. A8 R54 R55 R56

The historical resonance discussion invokes ancient structures, Schumann modes, Tesla, Russell and Schauberger, and rotating or charged structures. The Great Pyramid electromagnetic simulation studied driven scattering and field concentration given specific material and geometry assumptions. For any finite passive resonator, $dU/dt = P_{\text{in}} - P_{\text{out}} - P_{\text{diss}}$ in the chosen convention. At 7.8 Hz, the approximate fundamental Schumann frequency, the free-space wavelength is about 3.84×10^7 m. A 200 m air-filled half-wave path instead has a simple scale of 7.5×10^5 Hz. Real dielectrics, losses and cavities change that scale, and coincidence with a global Earth–ionosphere oscillation requires actual coupling and loaded power measurements. Qualitative precedents of vortices, spirals, cavity modes or luminous discharges supply test geometries. Evidence of a historical energy device needs archaeological or physical records and a working electromagnetic power budget. A6 R57

The archived UAP and metric-engineering discussion maps reported accelerations or missing exhaust signatures to candidate physics. Calibrated range and velocity, platform motion, time-correlated independent sensors, energy and momentum accounting, and a known instrument transfer function are the data that would allow such an inference. An unresolved report supplies no quantitative ESFD coupling. A spacetime engineering claim is more demanding still, requiring a metric, a physical $T_{\mu\nu}$ and boundary data consistent with the source and causality. Public exploratory reports and intellectual overlaps support a history-of-ideas entry. The stronger claims about classified technology or deliberate suppression require independent evidence. A8 R56

16 Local spin-field response

16.1 Direct coupling and the saturation potential

In the printed June action, $V_{\text{sat}}(X) = \lambda_S(X - \Phi_0^2)^2/4$ sets a preferred spin invariant. At fixed magnetic background use a homogeneous magnetic-sector ansatz $S_{12} = s$ and $F_{12} = B$ with the other components zero. Thus $X = 2s^2$ and $S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} = 2sB$. In this restricted static calculation, treat s as a material polarization amplitude. Its energy at prescribed B is $B^2/2 + V_{\text{sat}}(2s^2) - 2\alpha Bs$. The electromagnetic term is constant in this variation. With $u = \sqrt{2}s/\Phi_0$ and $\beta = \sqrt{2}\alpha B/(\lambda_S\Phi_0^3)$, the stationary condition is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U(u)}{\lambda_S\Phi_0^4} &= \frac{1}{4}(u^2-1)^2 - \beta u + \text{const}, \\ u^3 - u &= \beta, \qquad U_{,uu}/(\lambda_S\Phi_0^4) = 3u^2 - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

There are two minima and one maximum when $|\beta| < 2/(3\sqrt{3})$, apart from the endpoint degeneracies. At the folds one minimum meets the maximum. The absolute minimum changes orientation at zero field. The favored large-$|\beta|$ solution grows as $|\beta|^{1/3}$. In particular the potential produces local metastability and a decreasing differential susceptibility without setting a finite hard cap on $|s|$. This calculation gives a concrete instability mechanism within the assumed sector. A real spinor or material must supply the transport law that determines whether a rotor follows that branch, switches at a fold, or nucleates a domain earlier.

The standard spin coupling admits both reactive and dissipative behavior. An equilibrium potential determines the torque $\mathbf{N} = -\partial U/\partial\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ for an orientation angle $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$. Damping additionally requires a lagging response. For a stationary medium let $\widehat{S}(\omega) = \chi_S(\omega)\widehat{B}(\omega)$ with the convention $e^{-i\omega t}$. The mean absorbed power for a sinusoidal drive is proportional to $\omega\,\mathrm{Im}\,\chi_S(\omega)|\widehat{B}|^2/2$. A mechanical energy-loss claim can be tested against measured heating and phase lag, while a conservative orientation effect can be tested by measuring precession and reversing a static field. The susceptibility needs units, species dependence and a boundary prescription.

16.2 Spin-built exponential response and two instability scales

The exponential-source excerpts make Φ_{EM} quadratic in a spin tensor. To calculate one regular long-wavelength limit, retain a single real magnetic polarization amplitude s and assign it a canonical collective kinetic term. Here s has mass dimension one, with the tensor normalization absorbed into $g > 0$. This gives $Z(s) = \exp(-gs^2)$ and $V(s) = m^2s^2/2 + \lambda s^4/4$. It is a material closure for the quadratic spin dependence. Its m and λ are new phenomenological coefficients of this calculation. A microscopic prediction would match them to the spin susceptibility and gradient energy of the state. Use a uniform magnetic background and positive m^2, λ. The stationary equation at fixed mean flux is

$$s\left[m^2 + \lambda s^2 - gB^2e^{-gs^2}\right] = 0, \qquad B_0 = \frac{m}{\sqrt{g}}, \quad b = \frac{B}{B_0}, \quad y = gs^2, \quad \ell = \frac{\lambda}{gm^2}. \tag{26}$$

The unpolarized state has no linear photon mixing because $Z'(0) = 0$. Its scalar curvature is $m^2(1-b^2)$. Perturbations with $k^2 < m^2(b^2-1)$ grow when $b > 1$. Exactly at zero polarization the



Figure 15. The left panel resolves stationary solutions of the printed June saturation potential. The right panel shows growth rates for the homogeneous unpolarized state and ordered branches in the spin-built exponential model.

photon mode retains its vacuum propagation. The model adds a different prediction once spin order is present. An ordered state satisfies $(1+\ell y)e^{y} = b^{2}$ and has

$$\frac{M^{2}}{m^{2}} = 2y(\ell+1+\ell y), \qquad \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{mix}}^{2}}{m^{2}} = 4y(1+\ell y),$$
$$(\omega^{2}-k^{2})(\omega^{2}-k^{2}-M^{2}) = \mu_{\mathrm{mix}}^{2}k^{2}\sin^{2}\theta. \tag{27}$$

Here $M^{2} = V'' + B^{2}Z''/2$ and $\mu_{\mathrm{mix}}^{2} = B^{2}(Z')^{2}/Z$ on the equilibrium. Holding B fixed when varying s gives the diagonal curvature. Permitting transverse photon fluctuations yields the coupled determinant. The ordinary transverse polarization remains separate. For the mixing polarization a finite unstable band requires $\mu_{\mathrm{mix}}^{2}\sin^{2}\theta > M^{2}$, and its upper edge is $k^{2} = \mu_{\mathrm{mix}}^{2}\sin^{2}\theta - M^{2}$. At $\theta = 90^{\circ}$ and $\ell > 1$ the secondary onset is $y = 1 - 1/\ell$, or $b = \sqrt{\ell}\exp(1-1/\ell)$. For $\ell = 2$ this is $b \approx 1.816$, after the first ordering at $b = 1$. In a periodic direction of length L, the smallest nonzero wave number $2\pi/L$ must fit in the band for this mixed mode.

The direct June coupling can tilt the two spin minima. Pure quadratic dependence on s preserves their two signs. The independent scalar test in the earlier instability chapter has a term linear in its scalar and therefore a different background and mixing law. These are three measurable distinctions of the dynamics, even if their bulk phenomena are all referred to as saturation. The available archival material supplies no unique numerical map from B_{0} or the local bias β to the timing constant Λ_{tim}.

16.3 Long-range gravity and what the Proof action supplies

The vacuum action in the 22-page Proof p. 2 has the factor $+\kappa S^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}/2$. It gives $\partial_{\mu}(F^{\mu\nu}/\mu_{0} - \kappa S^{\mu\nu}) = 0$ with external current zero. The equivalent polarization current $J^{\nu}_{\mathrm{pol}} = \kappa\partial_{\mu}S^{\mu\nu}$ obeys current conservation by antisymmetry. For a smooth, localized static S, $Q_{\mathrm{pol}} = \kappa\int d^{3}x\,\partial_{i}S^{i0}$ is the surface integral at infinity and vanishes. The tree-level static spin exchange therefore has a momentum factor $k_{i}k_{j}/|\mathbf{k}|^{2}$ from two vertices and the photon Green function. Away from overlap the real-space kernel is proportional to

$$\partial_i \partial_j \frac{1}{4\pi r} = \frac{3\hat{r}_i \hat{r}_j - \delta_{ij}}{4\pi r^3} \quad (r > 0). \tag{28}$$

The simple localized dipole interaction is anisotropic. Obtaining the Proof's proposed universal $-GM_1M_2/r$ requires a different long-distance response, for example an explicitly derived collective pole with a charge proportional to total inertial mass. This requirement remains even if a medium amplifies microscopic alignment. A universal force must also account for light and relativistic stress. In the other recovered branch, an explicit Einstein–Hilbert term with G generates metric dynamics from the outset, so a calculated spin stress there gives a gravity correction.

The Proof §3 gives a magnetic critical scale and discusses a strong-field parameter of a charged particle. The Lorentz scalar

$$\chi_{\text{part}} = \frac{|q|}{m^3}\sqrt{-(F_{\mu\nu}p^\nu)(F^{\mu\rho}p_\rho)} \tag{29}$$

probes the electric field in that particle's rest frame in $c = \hbar = 1$ units. A charged particle instantaneously at rest in a purely magnetic field has $\chi_{\text{part}} = 0$ even when B/B_Q is large. Magnetic quantization and polarized vacuum propagation can still matter. The ratio B/B_Q, the particle invariant, the bulk $B\Omega/\Lambda_{\text{tim}}$ index and an energy-to-binding ratio address different physics.

17 Data-model expansions across scales

17.1 Cold spin contact and static compact stars

The EOS tables give pressure as a function of total energy density. Reconstruct a relative baryon density $z = n/n_\star$ by integrating the cold first law $d\ln n = d\epsilon/(\epsilon + p)$. The reference $n_\star$ is fixed by a rest-mass-equivalent energy density of 5.4×10^{17} kg m^{-3}. For an added energy density $Q(z)$, this same thermodynamics gives the added pressure $zQ'(z) - Q(z)$. Two exploratory contact prescriptions were used:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\text{all}}(z) &= \eta\epsilon_\star z^2, \\ Q_{\text{core}}(z) &= \eta\epsilon_\star z^2 \frac{[\max(0, 1 - z_0^2/z^2)]^3}{(1 - z_0^2)^3}, \qquad z_0 = 0.55. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The second choice adds a smooth onset while preserving the quadratic behavior asymptotically. Positive and negative η bracket a stiffness dependence. The sign and magnitude of a microscopic torsion contribution depend on how the spin ensemble is averaged and matched. A density-squared term in this scan is a surrogate for that calculation. It may exceed the minimally normalized torsion term by many orders of magnitude. It may also capture an ordinary change in the nuclear EOS. Measurement of a mass shift alone cannot determine the underlying origin.

The calculation follows the EOS segment connected continuously to the low-pressure crust, enforcing positive pressure and energy, $d\epsilon/dn > 0$, and $0 < dP/d\epsilon \leq 1$ before integration. It reports an interior first mass maximum separately from cases that terminate at an EOS or causality boundary. The six equations of state retain their original pressure and energy arrays in the archive. These sequences are spherical and static. A spinning, magnetized star has anisotropic stress, fluid



Figure 16. Sensitivity of six tabulated EOS sequences to added contact stress. EOS endpoints and actual mass maxima are marked separately.

rotation and shape changes. The appropriate extension matches conserved baryon mass and angular momentum, then compares magnetized equilibria, turning points and actual modes, with uncertainties from the field geometry.

17.2 Out-of-galaxy transfer of the spin–entropy model

The original galaxy argument contains a local divergence proposal and a separate positive halo-density profile. In spherical symmetry the literal decaying radial flux gives $M_{\rm div}(< r) = 4\pi C r^2 e^{-r/r_s}$. Test this shape using R_d from disk photometry and a baryonic scale $M_b^\star = 0.5L_{3.6} + 1.33M_{\rm HI}$ in solar units. The mass scale is a fixed photometric and atomic-gas proxy for the additional term. The baseline rotation curves still use the radius-dependent gas, disk and bulge contributions. With $x = r/R_d$ and $\ell_r = r_s/R_d$, the two hypotheses are

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\rm flux}^2 - v_{\rm bar}^2 &= \frac{G\eta_g M_b^\star}{r}\, x^2 e^{-x/\ell_r}, \\ v_{\rm exp}^2 - v_{\rm bar}^2 &= \frac{G\eta_g M_b^\star}{r}\, \frac{\gamma(3, x/\ell_r)}{\Gamma(3)}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Fit only one amplitude η_g and scale ℓ_r to each training subset. Each held-out galaxy is entirely absent from fitting, in contrast with the earlier experiment that withheld exterior radii and retained interior data from the same galaxy. The training residual weights quoted diagonal velocity errors after adding 5 km/s in quadrature and assigns equal influence per point count. The reported test score is each galaxy's unweighted velocity RMSE and the median across galaxies. The comparison RAR uses the published fixed function whose literature calibration used SPARC. It supplies a reference relation on this sample. Both the calibration overlap and the absence of independent magnetic measurements limit the interpretation. The flux-model amplitude is fit from orbits. A



Figure 17. Five-fold prediction with all radii of a test galaxy withheld. Curves farther left have smaller held-out velocity error.

successful physical derivation would predict the amplitude from a matter and field model, and reproduce light deflection with the same parameters.

The divergence imposes $\lim_{r\to\infty} M_{\mathrm{div}}(<r) = 0$ for this profile. Its *density* changes sign at $r = 2r_s$, while its finite enclosed mass is positive if $C > 0$. A positive mass in a finite orbit band can thus be fit even when the asymptotic correction vanishes. The proposed microscopic carrier and the stress that gravitates remain open. Models that use a different current boundary condition or a nonlocal response require their own calculation.

17.3 Time-domain prediction and instrument response

The rebuilt timing pipeline first tests the published $B\Omega$ line with the same normalization and with adopted polar-field and orientation conventions. The extended replay uses three seven-year windows on the frozen ATNF records, selecting pulsars that already had at least one recorded glitch when each window began. The positive cases are later recorded recurrences. Spin data are from the modern catalog and detection exposure varies. These results describe retrospective ranking. Individual pulsars can enter more than one window, so the windows are not independent samples for an error bar. When both timing variables come from $P, \dot{P}$, the $B\Omega$ and inverse-age ranks are identical by algebra and in all three runs. A ground-level prediction of a distinct spin effect needs comparable monitoring and independent field information.

Fermi's event data permit an injection check for the merger precursor proposal. Use the declared 10–50 keV channel-center selection and a 4.5 ms window with a ± 50 ms timing scan. The count statistic is the largest count across the same 101 offsets on the event and each off-source control. Uniform source arrival times within a trial 4.5 ms window constitute a specific signal model. The injection uses detector counts and samples photon numbers from a Poisson distribution. An astrophysical flux or luminosity requires an assumed spectrum, the detector response, geometry and arrival timing. The Fermi control burst after coalescence is included in the base run as an



Figure 18. Chronological glitch and solar checks plus the injection-derived detectability of a specified Fermi precursor count signal.



Figure 19. Legacy and science GOES overlap and a held-out check of the northern share of located flare reports.

instrument and time-origin check. R21

The solar time tests compare forward-blocked count predictions based on earlier months and on the same month as the flare count. Current sunspots are a descriptive covariate for the same period. The historical release and hemispheric rerun bring in two additional snapshots. Use overlap counts for catalog comparisons and a binomial northern-share model for events with an explicit non-equatorial heliographic designation. Instrument changes, unlocalized reports and region visibility affect which events enter. Sunspot counts constrain activity correlations. A direct ESFD flare test needs measured local B, vorticity or helicity and sufficient cadence to compare predictions to independent active-region transitions.



Figure 20. The upper-level collider comparison depends on the coefficient covariance. The companion panel shows the distinct effect of dephasing and visibility on Bell violation for the benchmark state.

17.4 Observable coherence and collider sensitivity

The shared-field picture of quantum measurement can be tested by specifying which degrees of freedom store correlations and how a measurement couples to them. An operational benchmark is a dephased singlet plus a fraction $1 - V$ of white noise. Let D be integrated spin dephasing with $\rho_{01,10} = -Ve^{-D}/2$. In the basis selected by the dephaser the correlation matrix is $\mathrm{diag}(-Ve^{-D}, -Ve^{-D}, -V)$. Positivity follows from the convex state preparation with $0 \le V \le 1$, $D \ge 0$. The two largest eigenvalues of $T^\top T$ give

$$S_{\max} = 2V\sqrt{1 + e^{-2D}}, \qquad \mathcal{C} = \max\{0,\, Ve^{-D} - (1 - V)/2\}. \tag{32}$$

Here $S_{\max}$ is the optimized CHSH statistic and $\mathcal{C}$ is concurrence. The covariance-based calculation in the companion code verifies the first expression at 805 state settings. For $D = 0$, Bell violation requires $V > 1/\sqrt{2}$. Entanglement and a particular Bell violation are experimentally distinguishable. The dephasing map preserves local marginals and supplies a measurable locus for a proposed excess D as field, orientation, dwell time or spin composition changes. A new ESFD noise term would have to predict both this locus and its frequency and species dependence independently of the visibility. R61

For the CERN claim, use a common Standard Model baseline and an ESFD prediction for a differential distribution at fixed fiducial cuts. Fitted spin correlations use the joint quantum decay amplitude including both propagator denominators and interference. The comparison coefficients in the archive are published summaries. The covariance sensitivity scans ρ for the reported pair while holding marginal uncertainties fixed, and reports the conditional statistic $d^\top \Sigma(\rho)^{-1} d$. The correlation scan exposes the effect of omitted covariance on the inference. An actual significance needs the measured covariance and the correlated theoretical and detector errors. In particular the scan cannot serve as evidence for a particular off-shell ESFD vertex. A predictive extension fixes an operator and maps it to several independently measured helicity or angular moments as functions of the reconstructed dilepton masses. A5 R44 R45

18 Limits on proposed macroscopic extensions

18.1 Torsion, anisotropy and a possible bounce

The archive includes a proposal that high-density spin interactions create a cosmological or interior turnaround. A homogeneous negative stiff stress scales like a^{-6}, as does positive Bianchi I shear in the absence of anisotropic sources. To test robustness of the idealized bounce, add shear to the dust model with a nonnegative constant vacuum contribution. With $y = a^3$ and time in units of the inverse reference Hubble scale, the constraint and its positive root are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{y}^2}{9} &= \lambda_v y^2 + y - (1-\Sigma), \\ y_b &= \frac{2(1-\Sigma)}{1+\sqrt{1+4\lambda_v(1-\Sigma)}}, \qquad \Sigma < 1, \quad \lambda_v \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Σ is the ratio of the positive shear coefficient to the negative spin coefficient at the reference scale. It is constant in this toy system. A positive-volume bounce occurs only when the spin term wins. For $\lambda_v = 0$, $y = y_b + 9t^2/4$. The nonnegative vacuum contribution changes the bounce volume and later expansion without changing the sign criterion. As Σ approaches one from below, the minimum volume shrinks and the curvature scale grows, eventually testing the assumed EFT cutoff. Spin transport, inhomogeneity and anisotropic stress can change the powers and the sign balance. The analytic trajectories and numerical constraint checks in the ZIP cover all three vacuum choices. R38 R62

A credible black-hole or white-hole version needs global matching of interior and exterior geometries, induced metric and extrinsic curvature on the boundary, or a specified physical surface layer. In spherical symmetry one can compare null expansions $2\partial_{\pm} r/r$ using areal radius r and report where they change sign. For a rotating remnant a homogeneous dust metric cannot define those surfaces or preserve the necessary angular-momentum and stress budgets. A daughter-universe hypothesis additionally requires causal connectivity and an observable consequence for an exterior or descendant observer. A proof of a local positive minimum of a settles none of those boundary questions.

18.2 Wave organization, vacuum pressure, and boundary observables

The archive describes recurring waves and shells across atomic, galactic and larger scales. A direct physics test distinguishes a feature in a power spectrum from a dynamical recurrence. One example workflow fixes physical separation bins and a predicted phase relation between independent observables, computes the complex cross spectrum in a common frame and window, and propagates instrument and sampling effects through a null that preserves each field's auto spectrum. A phase relationship or shared dispersion law can reveal coupling where images alone are ambiguous. A cosmological claim further needs a transfer function accounting for redshift, flux freezing and gravitational potential. A galaxy handedness claim can be held out across survey fields and tested with mirror images to check classification symmetry before selecting any preferred axis. A6 R34 R36 R40

An isotropic average of a statistically tangled, source-free magnetic field has $p_B = u_B/3$ and $u_B = B^2/(2\mu_0)$ in SI units. The sign of $u_B + 3p_B$ is positive. A proposed accelerated expansion therefore



Figure 21. Analytic dust-spin-shear trajectories. Increasing shear lowers the bounce volume and removes the positive root when the shear coefficient equals the spin coefficient.

requires additional spin-dependent stress or a new vacuum response. The archived benchmark compares positive Maxwell energy with $u_\Lambda = \Omega_\Lambda\, 3H_0^2c^2/(8\pi G)$ for a declared reference cosmology. Equal energy magnitude still leaves the pressure and perturbation dynamics to explain. For a dynamical model, simultaneous observables include $H(z)$, matter growth, CMB lensing and the two scalar metric potentials, all computed with shared parameters and consistent initial conditions. R36 R37

18.3 Time, inertia, Earth and resonance claims

An archival clock law writes $d\tau = dt\, \exp(-\alpha S_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu})$. If α is the coefficient in the June action, αSF is an energy density in natural units. The exponent then needs an explicit energy-density normalization. A covariant alternative would give matter a physically defined effective metric or a species-dependent clock Hamiltonian with calibrated sensitivities. Distinguish a common clock rate shift from a shift of one atomic transition. Sampling both clock species at the same location, in two field magnitudes and in reversing orientation, exposes common and differential responses. Coordinate time, proper time and subjective perception describe different variables. An observer-feedback proposal requires an operational state preparation or output and a change to the measured probabilities.

For Earth, a perturbation in an existing magnetic field changes Maxwell pressure by $\Delta(B^2)/(2\mu_0)$. At illustrative $50\ \mu$T background and $1\ \mu$T perturbation the change is around 4.02×10^{-5} Pa. This tests the direct stress route at the assumed field strength. A triggering hypothesis about a metastable fault or a chemical pathway needs its own gain, lag and directional prediction, matched to measured geology and calibration. A prospective study needs time-matched negative controls, treatment of aftershock clustering and solar or geomagnetic covariates known at the forecast time. The presence of nearly coincident events alone supplies no energy, timescale or transport model. For solar flares, the same separation between driver and triggering conditions applies. Global rotation and active-region shear have different gradients and time dependence.

For low-frequency resonance, an isolated loss model gives $\dot{U} = P_{\text{drive}} - \omega_0 U/Q$. Measuring both

the coupling and Q gives a bound on the steady stored energy, $U = QP_{\text{drive}}/\omega_0$. A field-frequency coincidence without a calibrated drive does not determine power. Even a large internal stored field can exchange momentum with supports, radiation and cables. A force or inertial-device claim needs a closed-system momentum measurement, field toggling, heating controls, and real independent readouts before it can be assigned a new mechanism. The historical and speculative topics are mapped to specific observables and conservation relations. Their attribution depends on the original archive, including the missing drafts in the source register. A6 A7

19 Maxwell, Tesla and the ESFD standing wave

The full companion calculation is archived in **provenance/**. A10

Maxwell published twenty component equations in 1865. They included the potentials, electric displacement, conduction and continuity alongside the field equations. Heaviside later reformulated the theory in vector form. In Maxwell's own §100, the field equations propagate transverse disturbances under the assumptions of the derivation. He then explicitly asks about longitudinal oscillations and considers them possible if one adds an electric medium with its own inertia. That passage gives a precise historical question to recover from the original formulation. Maxwell, 1865, §70 · Maxwell, §§95–100 · Heaviside reformulation

Maxwell's groups	Role in a modern formulation
A and C	The total current combines conduction and displacement. Their combination gives $\nabla \times \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{J} + \partial_t \mathbf{D}$ in SI notation.
B and D	Magnetic induction comes from the curl of the vector potential. In the medium at rest the electric field comes from the scalar potential and the time derivative of the vector potential. Taking their curl or divergence gives Faraday's law and the magnetic divergence constraint.
E and F	Dielectric polarization and electrical resistance are material relations. Treating these relations as dynamical can change the modes of the coupled system.
G and H	Electric charge is related to displacement by Gauss's law, and charge and conduction current obey continuity.

This comparison follows the roles of the original groups with present-day units and signs. The potentials can still be used explicitly as $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. A new polarizable or spin-carrying medium needs a constitutive equation of its own. Maxwell, 1865, groups A–H

Tesla's 1900 article describes a stationary electrical wave through the analogy of a signal and an echo. His 1919 explanation discusses transverse and longitudinal excitation around a conductor and uses Earth as the conductor in his transmission proposal. These public accounts provide historical leads for the standing-wave and material-response cases. A universal three-wave law and its alleged removal remain unverified. Tesla, *The Problem of Increasing Human Energy* · Tesla, *The True Wireless*

19.1 Which waves are independent?

The Faraday tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ has six components, encoding $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. In a source-free vacuum plane wave the equations require $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0$ and $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{E})/\Omega$ in natural units. The two remaining independent electric amplitudes are the two photon polarizations. Writing a real field in terms

of complex exponentials introduces a conjugate negative-frequency piece. Reversing the direction of travel at the same positive frequency is a different operation. Quantum fluctuations of the electromagnetic vacuum are correlations of the quantized field, with each free transverse mode quantized as an oscillator. A field component can have zero vacuum mean and a nonzero two-point correlation. The classical equations give the mode structure for that calculation. Tong, *Quantum Field Theory*, §§6.1–6.2 · Cambridge, *Introductory Quantum Optics*

19.2 The wave–anti-wave overlap

For this calculation, an anti-wave is an equal co-polarized wave travelling in the opposite direction. Take $\Omega = k$ and work in $c = \hbar = 1$ units with metric signature $+---$. Define $C_{\pm} = \cos(kz \mp \Omega t)$. The sign flip of the magnetic part follows from the reversed propagation direction.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} &= E_0(C_+ + C_-)\,\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \\ \mathbf{B} &= E_0(C_+ - C_-)\,\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \\ F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} &= 2(\mathbf{B}^2 - \mathbf{E}^2) = -8E_0^2 C_+ C_- \\ &= -4E_0^2\left[\cos(2kz) + \cos(2\Omega t)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Either wave by itself gives $F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} = 0$. Together they generate a nonzero field invariant, with a fixed spatial pattern and a modulation at twice the wave frequency. This overlap is a precise mathematical place for the idea in the ESFD action. It becomes a new physical response only if another dynamical field couples to it.

19.3 Pumping a dynamical spin mode

Use $Z(s) = e^{-gs^2}$ and $V(s) = m^2 s^2/2 + \lambda s^4/4$ from the spin-built model in the master report. The field s is a canonically normalized collective spin amplitude and $g > 0$ is a specified coupling. The equation in a prescribed electromagnetic background is

$$\Box s + V'(s) + \frac{1}{4}Z'(s)F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} = 0.$$

Near $s = 0$, $Z'(s) \simeq -2gs$. The overlap changes the oscillation frequency through the coefficient of s. Project on one spatially uniform spin mode over an integer number of standing-wave periods. The spatial cosine then averages to zero in that mode. With off-resonant spatial sidebands neglected and both electromagnetic waves maintained by an external drive, its amplitude obeys

$$\ddot{s} + \left[m^2 + q\cos(2\Omega t)\right]s = 0, \qquad q = 2gE_0^2.$$

The first resonance is near $\Omega = m$. The weak-pump growth rate at resonance is $|q|/(4m)$. I propagated the two independent solutions for each pump period and computed growth from the larger Floquet multiplier. For an illustrative $q/m^2 = 0.08$, the first growth interval is $0.97990 < \Omega/m < 1.01990$. At its center the calculated rate is $\gamma/m = 0.0199963$. The numerical transfer determinant stayed within 1.9×10^{-14} of unity across 241 frequency settings.

The same quadratic model advances the quantum covariance of a single normalized oscillator from its unpumped ground state. Let U be the real canonical transfer matrix for one pump period. After N periods at the same pump phase, the covariance is $C_N = U^N(U^N)^\top/2$. Switch off



Figure 22. The first growth band with retained spatial sidebands. Left holds Bloch momentum zero and adds damping. Right shows the shift due to spatial momentum with zero damping.

the prescribed drive abruptly and measure occupation in the original oscillator basis. This gives $\langle n_s \rangle = (\operatorname{tr} C_N - 1)/2$. At $\Omega = m$ and $N = 25$ this yields **5.29 spin-mode quanta on average**, conditional on the assumed oscillator and drive. The external electromagnetic waves supply the energy. A classically exact initial state with $s = \dot{s} = 0$ stays at zero under this homogeneous equation. In the quantized model the ground-state variance supplies the initial fluctuations.

19.4 Spatial sidebands and losses

The uniform-mode approximation can be checked with the full linear equation for the prescribed pump. Keep both parts of the invariant and add a phenomenological loss rate Γ that is constant over a cycle.

$$\partial_t^2 s - \partial_z^2 s + 2\Gamma \partial_t s + \left[m^2 + q\cos(2kz) + q\cos(2\Omega t)\right] s = 0. \tag{34}$$

The spatial and temporal drives separate in this idealization. On a periodic spatial cell, allow Bloch momentum p and expand in $e^{i(p+2nk)z}$. The spatial matrix has diagonal $m^2 + (p + 2nk)^2$ and off-diagonal $q/2$ between adjacent Fourier components. For $p = 0$, the two components at $\pm 2k$ shift the lowest stiffness by $-q^2/(8k^2)$ at leading nonzero order. The computed lowest eigenvalue includes all sidebands retained by the Fourier truncation. The limit $p = 0$, $q = 0$ recovers m^2.

For a spatial eigenvalue ϵ_j^2, put the temporal amplitude equal to $e^{-\Gamma t} y_j$. The equation for y_j is a Mathieu oscillator with unmodulated stiffness $\epsilon_j^2 - \Gamma^2$. Its principal growth from one-period transfer is $\Omega \operatorname{acosh}(|\operatorname{tr} U|/2)/\pi$ when $|\operatorname{tr} U| > 2$. Subtract Γ to obtain the physical growth of the amplitude. The new run compares the instability band to independent Mathieu characteristic values and repeats the spatial diagonalization at different Fourier cutoffs. The dissipative model measures classical linear growth. A quantum bath description would add its noise to the finite-loss process.

19.5 When a photon probe sees a third branch

The ordered case is a separate small-signal experiment. Establish a background spin amplitude $s_0 \neq 0$ and magnetic bias $\mathbf{B}_0$, then perturb with a weak electromagnetic probe. One transverse photon polarization mixes with the spin oscillator through $Z'(s_0)\,\mathbf{B}_0\cdot\delta\mathbf{B}$. The other photon polarization propagates with $\omega^2 = k^2$. Define $X = \omega^2 - k^2$, $M^2 = V''(s_0) + B_0^2 Z''(s_0)/2$ and $\mu^2 = B_0^2 Z'(s_0)^2/Z(s_0)$. With θ the angle between propagation and the bias, the complete dispersion determinant is proportional to

$$X\left[X(X-M^2) - \mu^2 k^2 \sin^2\theta\right] = 0.$$

The two mixed solutions and the remaining photon polarization give three normal modes in this reduction. At nonzero mixing they have different frequencies if the roots are stable. The upper branch approaches a pure spin mode as the mixing vanishes. In a photon probe its fractional weight follows from the residue of $(X - M^2)/[X(X - M^2) - \mu^2 k^2 \sin^2\theta]$.

$$W_+^{(\gamma)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{M^2}{\sqrt{M^4 + 4\mu^2 k^2 \sin^2\theta}}\right).$$

With the master report's illustrative $B/B_0^{\text{crit}} = 1.2$, $B_0^{\text{crit}} = m/\sqrt{g}$, and $\lambda/(gm^2) = 2$, this weight at $k = m$ is **0%** along the bias, **13.75%** at 30°, **24.04%** at 60°, and **26.72%** across the bias. The calculation independently diagonalized the two-field matrix and agreed with the residue to floating-point precision. The weight is a squared photon component of a normalized mode. A measured transmission or power requires an instrument and material model. Standard QED already allows field-dependent nonlinear optical effects, and materials and cavities can add their own resonances. A discriminating test would follow the extra resonance in frequency, spin bias and angle using the same coefficients. Spin-built exponential response, Eq. 27 · PVLAS and its QED baseline

19.6 Why the cosmic claim needs a second calculation

The tensor coupling and the bounce solve different dynamical questions. A minimally coupled Maxwell-plus-canonical-spin action with $Z(s) > 0$ satisfies the null energy condition. For a null vector n^μ, let $v_\alpha = n^\mu F_{\mu\alpha}$. The stress contraction is

$$T_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu = (n^\mu \partial_\mu s)^2 - Z(s) v_\alpha v^\alpha \geq 0,$$

because v_α is orthogonal to a null vector and hence spacelike or null. In ordinary Einstein gravity with a spatially flat FLRW geometry, $\dot{H} = -4\pi G(\rho + p) \leq 0$. A bounce there requires $\dot{H} > 0$ at $H = 0$. The ESFD bounce example in the master report introduced an additional negative spin–torsion stress that can overcome the shear term. Connecting the local wave calculation to a cosmic solution requires deriving such a stress from the microscopic spin state and checking its regime of validity. A white hole or daughter universe further requires a global spacetime solution with the appropriate horizon and matching conditions. Flat-bounce energy condition · Spin–torsion bounce and shear



Figure 23. Calculated normal-mode frequencies, photon weight of the spin-like branch, and numerical growth and excitation of the proposed uniform spin mode under two opposing waves. The upper panels use an ordered bias. The lower panels use a zero-mean spin field and a prescribed standing-wave pump.

20 Force balance, curvature, and the ESFD coupling

20.1 What cancels in the electromagnetic calculation

There are three distinct quantities a proposed cancellation can target. An upward force can balance a downward acceleration for a selected body. The metric can change the relative acceleration of freely falling bodies. The source stress can also change the sign of cosmic acceleration in a homogeneous geometry. In weak gravity these are respectively a force law, a Riemann curvature measurement, and a combination of energy density and pressure.

The wave overlap supplies a tunable quantity in the first category whenever matter responds directly to a spin field. Let the two electric polarizations have relative angle φ. Put $I = F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ and $J = F_{\mu\nu}\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$, with $J = -4\mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}$. Write $C_\pm = \cos(kz \mp \Omega t)$ for the counterpropagating phase factors. Then

$$\begin{aligned} I &= -8E_0^2 \cos\varphi\, C_+C_-, \\ J &= -8E_0^2 \sin\varphi\, C_+C_-, \\ u &= \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathbf{E}^2+\mathbf{B}^2) = E_0^2(C_+^2+C_-^2), \\ S_z &= E_0^2(C_+^2-C_-^2), \qquad \partial_t u + \partial_z S_z = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

The code evaluates the stress and flux on a periodic grid and verifies the energy continuity equation using spectral derivatives. Moving from parallel to orthogonal electric polarizations eliminates I for the ideal pair and maximizes J. The energy, instantaneous energy flux, and cycle-mean energy density are unchanged by this operation. With equal incident amplitudes the latter is E_0^2 at



Figure 24. Changing polarization transfers the overlap from one invariant to the other while the energy remains fixed. An instantaneous node and the time-mean energy are shown on the right.

every z. Transverse stresses can vary with position. Averaging over both the spatial and temporal periods gives diagonal stress components $(T_{00}, T_{xx}, T_{yy}, T_{zz}) = (E_0^2, 0, 0, E_0^2)$.

For positive $Z(s)$ and a canonical spin amplitude, the Maxwell and spin kinetic terms satisfy $T_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu \geq 0$ for any null vector n^μ in the minimal Einstein branch. The vanishing trace of classical Maxwell stress means the Ricci **scalar** can vanish with electromagnetic energy present. The Ricci tensor and full curvature generally remain nonzero. For a localized, stationary weak-gravity system, the active source is the integral of $(T_{00} + \sum_i T_{ii})/c^2$ in an orthonormal rest frame. In a closed apparatus with localized stress, integrating $\partial_j(x^i T^{jk}) = T^{ik}$ gives vanishing integrated total spatial stress. The far-field mass increment then follows the change in the complete apparatus energy divided by c^2. Reflecting walls, supports and steady stress belong in that calculation. R63

This gives a numerical scale for gravity driven directly by stored energy. Balancing g at one point by the pull of an ordinary compact source a metre away requires $E = gc^2r^2/G$ in the monopole estimate, with the source positioned to pull in the opposite direction. Such a balance has its own tidal gradients. Quantum fields can contribute a renormalized interaction energy of either sign. The ideal-plate Casimir value $E_C/\mathcal{A} = -\pi^2\hbar c/(720d^3)$ is a useful benchmark. Its gravitational contribution is part of the total energy of the plates, supports and field. R64

A homogeneous canonical spin scalar adds $\epsilon_s + 3p_s = 2\dot{s}^2 - 2V(s)$ and $\epsilon_s + p_s = \dot{s}^2$ in natural units. A sufficiently positive potential can drive homogeneous cosmic acceleration. The same scalar obeys the null energy condition, so it cannot by itself give $\dot{H} > 0$ in a spatially flat Friedmann bounce within general relativity. The sign of this cosmological source and the sign of the force in Eq. (36) are governed by different terms in the equations.

20.2 How the spin oscillator could acquire a gravitationally relevant charge

An acceleration opposed to ordinary gravity can be calculated if matter has a separately specified scalar charge. In the weak-field illustration, let body i have mass $M_i(s)$ and dimensionless charge $\beta_i = M_{\rm Pl}\partial_s \ln M_i$ at the operating background. Use the reduced Planck mass $M_{\rm Pl}^{-2} = 8\pi G$ in natu-

ral units. In the source-free regime a linear perturbation of the canonical spin amplitude has a positive kinetic term and a mass setting its range L_s. When coupled to nonrelativistic matter, the static linear equation and point-source potential are

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla^2 - L_s^{-2})\,\delta s &= \frac{\beta_S}{M_{\rm Pl}}\rho_S,\\ U_T(r) &= -\frac{GM_SM_T}{r}\left[1+\alpha_{ST}e^{-r/L_s}\right], \qquad \alpha_{ST}=2\beta_S\beta_T.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Equal-sign charges increase attraction. Opposite-sign charges produce a repulsive contribution. The sign difference is possible as a specified material response. A universal canonical scalar with $\beta_S=\beta_T=\beta$ gives $\alpha_{ST}=2\beta^2\geq 0$. The result assumes a stable linear response and an unscreened scalar. In forming a laboratory or astrophysical prediction the charges must come from the action and the states of the materials.

Here is one way to match a charge to the existing $Z(s)F^2$ coupling. Consider a fixed-geometry isolated configuration with electric displacement and magnetic flux held fixed under a virtual change of s. Use stored energies $U_E=\int \mathbf{D}^2/(2Z)\,d^3x$ and $U_B=\int Z\mathbf{B}^2/2\,d^3x$. If additional binding and mechanical responses are negligible in this idealized calculation, the field part of the charge is

$$\begin{aligned}\left.\frac{\partial(M_ic^2)}{\partial s}\right|_{\mathbf{D},\mathbf{B}} &= \frac{Z'(s)}{Z(s)}(U_B-U_E),\\ \beta_i^{(\rm field)} &= \left[M_{\rm Pl}\,\partial_s \ln Z(s)\right]\frac{U_B-U_E}{M_ic^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

This matching is a new result for the stated boundary conditions. A voltage or current source would require including the work and energy of its reservoirs. With $Z=e^{-gs^2}$ and $s_0=0$, $Z'(0)=0$. The original composite wave coupling supplies no linear field charge about that symmetric state. At a biased s_0, the two energy contributions can give opposite signs. An ideal standing wave averaged over full spatial and temporal periods has $U_B=U_E$ and vanishing uniform charge in this approximation. The local, spatially alternating driver in Eq. (35) still exists. Boundary and material responses can change the effective charge, and need separate calculations. The other archived direct tensor coupling has a different spin equation and requires its own matter matching.

20.3 Earth as a finite source

For an exterior point at $r=R_\oplus+h$ and a spherically symmetric, uniformly charged-per-mass Earth, the required radial acceleration is

$$\begin{aligned}g_T(r) &= \frac{GM_\oplus}{r^2}[1+\alpha_{ST}Y(r,L_s)],\\ Y(r,L_s) &= (1+r/L_s)e^{-r/L_s}\,\frac{4\pi}{M_\oplus}\int_0^{R_\oplus}\rho(u)u^2\frac{\sinh(u/L_s)}{u/L_s}\,du.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Here inward is positive. Cancellation at a chosen location fixes $\alpha_{ST}=-1/Y$. The source radius matters because only nearby mass contributes strongly at short range. The benchmark integrates the original PREM density polynomials, including their outer ocean layer, and verifies the kernel



Figure 25. Finite-range acceleration computed from PREM and a homogeneous Earth. A sign-reversed force can produce the given surface balance only for the strengths shown. The third panel reinterprets the published Ti–Pt differential measurement under the unscreened ansatz.

against the exact homogeneous-sphere result $3(x\cosh x-\sinh x)/x^3$ for $x = R_\oplus/L_s$. The numerical evaluation combines the decaying exponent with the hyperbolic function to avoid overflow. The PREM density is a seismic reference model averaged over the Earth. A local short-range experiment needs the site's crust, topography and test geometry. R65 R66

A tuning at one radius still has a residual radial gradient. Holding the coupling fixed at cancellation at $r = r_*$,

$$\left.\frac{dg_T}{dr}\right|_{r_*} = \frac{GM_\oplus}{r_*^2}\frac{r_*}{L_s(L_s+r_*)}. \tag{39}$$

Ordinary metric tides are a separate observable. In a Newtonian Earth exterior the magnitude of the radial tidal gradient is $2GM_\oplus/r^3$. If the scalar modifies test-body acceleration through a conformal matter metric, $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = e^{2\beta_T\delta s/M_{\rm Pl}}g_{\mu\nu}$, the associated shifts in the two weak-field metric potentials have opposite signs. The sum controlling leading light deflection is unchanged by that conformal factor alone. A new stress that changes the Einstein metric can change lensing, and requires including its own stress-energy. Thus an apparent weight change for one body and a change to the gravitational geometry have distinct physical tests.

The MICROSCOPE constraint used here is the published Ti–Pt Eötvös summary with a nominal 710 km altitude. For $a_i = g_N(1+\alpha_i Y)$,

$$\eta = \frac{2(a_{\rm Ti}-a_{\rm Pt})}{a_{\rm Ti}+a_{\rm Pt}} = \frac{(\alpha_{\rm Ti}-\alpha_{\rm Pt})Y}{1+(\alpha_{\rm Ti}+\alpha_{\rm Pt})Y/2}. \tag{40}$$

The quoted illustrative bound uses independent Gaussian statistical and systematic errors in quadrature and a conservative envelope about zero. It constrains the **differential** charge in the small-correction regime at orbital altitude. A hypothetical charge associated with specially prepared spin states absent from that comparison requires a separate free-fall experiment. A short-range or screened field can have a different terrestrial transfer function. R66 R67

21 Dense spin, bounces, and a laboratory discriminator

21.1 The coefficient of the negative stress

The previous ESFD bounce introduced a negative stiff spin component. To test its scale, adopt the published minimal Einstein–Cartan spin-fluid closure

$$\epsilon_s = p_s = -a_{\mathrm{EC}} n_f^2, \qquad a_{\mathrm{EC}} = \frac{\kappa(\hbar c)^2}{32}, \qquad \kappa = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}. \tag{41}$$

This is a specific averaged spin-fluid model. Its sign and coefficient do not follow from the electromagnetic standing-wave pump. They also need not hold for a differently prepared, correlated many-body state. The numerical benchmark adds Eq. (41) to a cold ideal relativistic neutron gas with $p_F = \hbar(3\pi^2 n_f)^{1/3}$. It separately evaluates the density, null-energy and active-acceleration combinations. R68

Let $r_s = |\epsilon_s|/\epsilon_f$ and $w = p_f/\epsilon_f$ denote the positive matter's equation-of-state ratio with p_f here denoting pressure. Then

$$\begin{gathered}\frac{\epsilon + 3p}{\epsilon_f} = 1 + 3w - 4r_s, \qquad \frac{\epsilon + p}{\epsilon_f} = 1 + w - 2r_s, \\ \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_f} = 1 - r_s.\end{gathered} \tag{42}$$

For relativistic matter $w = 1/3$, the three zero crossings are $r_s = 1/2,\ 2/3,\ 1$. They describe onset of accelerated expansion, the null-energy threshold and vanishing density in the flat Friedmann equation respectively. They are different conditions even in a uniform model. The undamped Maxwell-plus-canonical-wave stress does not supply the negative stiff term of Eq. (41).

At high density the ideal gas approaches $\epsilon_f = 3n_f p_F c/4$. With the standard coefficient the formal density zero is $p_F c = 3\sqrt{\pi}\, E_{\mathrm{Pl}}$, where $E_{\mathrm{Pl}} = \sqrt{\hbar c^5/G}$ is the unreduced Planck energy. The numerical solution agrees with this limit. This is beyond the controlled low-energy regime of the assumed action. The original ESFD contact-EOS scan varied an added macroscopic stress. This new comparison tests the actual size of one microscopic normalization against that scan.

The existing dust-and-shear bounce can also be rerun with radiation. Use normalized time and $H^2 = Da^{-3} + Ra^{-4} - (1-\Sigma)a^{-6}$, with $D, R \geq 0$, $D + R = 1$ and Σ the ratio of shear to the positive magnitude of the spin coefficient. A positive root satisfies $Da_b^3 + Ra_b^2 = 1 - \Sigma$. In pure radiation the solution has $a_b = \sqrt{1-\Sigma}$, while dust gives $a_b = (1-\Sigma)^{1/3}$. The numerical test evolves both branches and a mixture, including consistency with the constraint. This remains a homogeneous, conditional bounce. To claim a white hole or daughter universe requires a regime where the microscopic calculation is controlled, plus an interior and exterior solution and a physical causal boundary.

21.2 A null measurement that distinguishes the coupler

The local wave calculation produces a test rather than a conclusion about gravity. In the biased regime, the amplitude of the response to I is odd in the spin bias when read out coherently, because



Figure 26. Left compares the exact ideal-gas energy density with the standard spin–torsion normalization. Right separates the three source cancellations under the relativistic-fluid approximation.

$Z'(s_0)$ is odd. Its power is even. Switch between parallel and orthogonal pump polarizations at equal electromagnetic energy, and record the signed response during both spin orientations. A coherent interaction produces an amplitude proportional to $P\cos\varphi$ for spin reversal $P = \pm 1$ in the linear readout model. A suitable four-state contrast is

$$\widehat{A} = \frac{Y_{+,\parallel} - Y_{-,\parallel} - Y_{+,\perp} + Y_{-,\perp}}{2}. \tag{43}$$

This cancels an additive spin-only offset, a polarization-only offset and a common offset. The synthetic run randomizes the state order within a block with within-block correlated noise and drift. Independent magnetic, thermal and polarization monitoring matters because a classical instrumental term with the same joint parity would also survive the contrast. Measure frequency, orientation, pump strength and noise independently of the fit. In particular distinguish the predicted first band from an ordinary material or cavity resonance.

To link a detected spin resonance to a force, first match the static source and probe response coefficients and predict the sign and size of a differential acceleration before testing it. Use an independently monitored reference with a distinct or reversed spin response and measure the position and range dependence. A claim about metric gravity needs a common tidal or lensing prediction rather than just a material force. The wave calculation, galactic acceleration fits, neutron-star equilibria and theoretical bounce then constrain the same coefficients only after an explicit, reproducible mapping across their environments.

21.3 A joint range and frequency prediction

If the resonance and force use the same unscreened relativistic spin field in the same background, the dispersion relation fixes its rest gap from the force range. Let m_{vac} denote its mass in SI. The gap in cycles per second and the corresponding first-band vacuum photon wavelength in the weak-pump, long-spin-wavelength limit are



Figure 27. Synthetic null and injection recovery for the four-state test. The horizontal axis is a signal relative to assumed measurement noise, with no inferred ESFD force magnitude.

$$L_s = \frac{\hbar}{m_{\mathrm{vac}} c}, \qquad f_{\mathrm{gap}} = \frac{m_{\mathrm{vac}} c^2}{h} = \frac{c}{2\pi L_s}, \qquad \lambda_{\mathrm{pump}} \simeq 2\pi L_s. \tag{44}$$

This relates two independent measurements with one parameter. A vacuum spin gap of order hertz corresponds to a terrestrial-scale range. A gigahertz rest gap implies a range of only centimetres. An ordinary vacuum standing-wave cavity at the terrestrial gap frequency would require a length of order tens of thousands of kilometres. A compact transducer would need a separately solved geometry, such as a time-dependent near field, with the correct invariant modulation and spin boundary conditions. In a biased or dense medium the effective spin gap and propagation may differ from the vacuum values. A model that uses this effect must compute the medium shift and recover the same underlying mass and coupling when the background changes.

22 Full rerun and extended results

22.1 Input groups reproduced

The November 23 build verified 28 original manifest entries and 2 supplemental archive files. The baseline calculations, expanded spin and data checks, and report figures were regenerated. The legacy zero-byte license entry was retained as provenance and supplies no measurement. Each count below is taken from the rebuilt outputs.

Dataset or calculation	Reproduced coverage and outcome
ATNF timing and HEASARC comparison	ATNF 2.9.0 has 4,503 rows, and 2,898 rows with positive period and period derivative. HEASARC has 4,503 rows. The fixed timing line flags 5 of 22 eligible ATNF AXP tags, with 4 flags outside the tag.
McGill magnetars and epochs	31 catalogued entries. 5 of 22 confirmed, usable timings land above the historical line. 0 sources switch sides at a usable alternate timing epoch.
Pulsar glitches	625 events from 211 sources, plus the three recurrence windows below.
Baseline static neutron stars	540 equilibria across six EOS tables. Computed first static mass maxima range from 2.03 to 2.77 solar masses before imposing the extended EOS screen.
GWOSC and Zenodo PE releases	391 event records. The selected releases provide 189 fiducial remnant spin medians, with a sample median of 0.696.
SPARC	175 galaxies and 3,391 raw radial measurements. Standard eligibility and minimum curve length yield 131 galaxies for the radial holdout and 131 for the full-galaxy transfer exercise.
Fermi photon streams	872,114 photon records across three detectors, with 465,709 in the selected band over the stored streams. The nominal 4.5 ms window has 5 counts versus 8.00 expected background.
Solar	81,721 science-composite flare observations across 381 complete merged months. The extended run incorporates 77,597 legacy GOES records and the SILSO hemispheric series.
Collider and IXPE	6 ATLAS summary rows, 6 CMS scenario rows and 3 IXPE polarization rows. These are published transcriptions. ATLAS shifts in experimental standard-error units are +0.58 and -1.27.

22.2 Spin dynamics and compact-star sensitivity

The printed June static potential folds at $|\beta| = 0.384900$. Its favored branch reaches $u = 2.309$ at $\beta = 10$, consistent with continuing growth after the fold. The spin-built exponential benchmark covers 2,584 field, state and angle settings. At $\ell = 2$ ordering starts at $B/B_0 = 1$. The transverse growing mixed branch starts at $B/B_0 = 1.816$. At $B = 2B_0$ its peak growth rate is 0.0516 in units of

m. The independent-scalar PVLAS check places an onset lower limit of $\simeq 2.67 \times 10^{15}$ G within its own matter-free closure.

The spin-contact run evaluated 42 EOS and closure combinations. It integrated 1,200 configurations and located 18 interior maxima. The other completed sequences end at a table or physical EOS pressure limit. 8 of the twelve negative all-density combinations and 9 of the thirty core-activated combinations fail the continuously admissible EOS test before the sampled NS sequence. The smooth positive $+3\%$ cases have peak or endpoint masses +0.33 to +0.70 solar masses relative to the same EOS at zero added contact. The shifts are sensitivity to a scanned stress term.

22.3 Chronological timing and photon detectability

Window	Eligible sources	Recorded repeaters	Repeaters below fixed line	Timing index AUROC	Prior seven years AUROC	All prior records AUROC
2004–2010	99	53	50	0.827	0.773	0.717
2011–2017	152	46	44	0.757	0.763	0.784
2018–2024	198	19	18	0.742	0.716	0.752

The timing variable gives the same rankings as inverse characteristic age in every window. A useful age proxy can score in rank tests while a fixed cutoff misses most recorded repeaters. A physical recurrence model needs exposure and sensitivity by source and epoch.

The Fermi scan reaches 13 counts at the most favorable tested offset. With 432 matched controls, the first count cutoff with estimated tail area below 5% is 20 counts. The discrete cutoff has a measured control-based tail estimate of 2.1%. The search recovers 56.4% of injections at a mean of 12 added counts and 99.2% at 24. This is a sensitivity calibration for one event and the declared signal and detector band.

22.4 Whole galaxies and exterior radii

The five-fold transfer test covers 131 unseen galaxies and 3,032 radial observations. The pairs are resampled with their fixed out-of-fold predictions. The bootstrap range describes this sample and omits uncertainty from refitting or a different survey selection.

Model	Median curve RMSE (km/s)	Galaxies improving on baryons	Galaxies improving on RAR	Median difference from RAR and 95% paired range (km/s)
Baryons	44.73	0	9	+28.49 [+25.84, +34.37]

Model	Median curve RMSE (km/s)	Galaxies improving on baryons	Galaxies improving on RAR	Median difference from RAR and 95% paired range (km/s)
Spin-entropy flux	19.82	124	36	+6.40 [+3.23, +8.29]
Positive exponential	20.52	125	35	+7.10 [+4.01, +8.56]
Published RAR	13.60	122	0	+0.00 [+0.00, +0.00]

The earlier radial holdout trained on the first 70% of eligible radii within each individual galaxy. Its median outer RMSE is 10.13 km/s for the exponential model added to baryons, 7.84 for NFW and 6.94 for the cored isothermal profile. Both ESFD-motivated shapes improve the baryon-only speeds in most whole-galaxy holdouts. The fixed published acceleration relation scores better overall. The source of the additional stress is still undetermined. Matching the selected outer-point residual using ordinary gravitating Maxwell energy requires a median equivalent rms field of 59,287 microgauss under the spherical approximation.

22.5 Solar archive, collider covariance, and cosmic scales

The GOES releases contain 2,315 legacy M/X reports and 3,855 science-composite events across 263 overlapping months. Monthly ranks correlate at 0.986 and the total counts differ. In the hemisphere check 405 located flares across 41 held-out months contribute. The per-flare log loss is 0.511 for the sunspot-share model and 0.680 for the fixed training share.

GOES M/X count model in 2020–2024	Held-out mean Poisson deviance
Constant historical rate	46.97
Prior month sunspots	16.24
Prior month and prior year sunspots	16.04
Same month sunspots	11.65

At zero assumed covariance the ATLAS pair has a conditional Standard Model tail probability of 0.377. The sensitivity curve depends substantially on the chosen coefficient correlation. A collider test of ESFD requires a supplied matrix element or differential response. A dephasing visibility of 0.85 in the quantum benchmark permits CHSH violation for integrated depth below 0.478.

The spin–shear calculation covers 723 coefficient combinations and 4,812 analytic trajectory points. At zero vacuum term and shear-to-spin ratio 0.9 the scale factor bottoms at 0.464 of the reference. An equal or larger shear term removes the positive-volume turnaround in that model. The Maxwell field at the reference vacuum-energy density is 363.4 microgauss. The illustrative 1 nanogauss field carries only 7.6e-12 of that energy and has the pressure sign of radiation.

The June current calculation with its printed galaxy input gives $B \approx 6.67 \times 10^{-6}$ G and $\chi_{\mathrm{rot}} \approx$

7.08×10^{-36}. The arithmetic correction applies to the specific current, radius and speed. Explaining the orbital residual with a collective mechanism would require field maps, a transfer law and the corresponding metric prediction.

23 Recomputed wave and gravity results

23.1 Electromagnetic and spin response

The companion calculation reproduced the ordered-mode mixing weights. At $k/m = 1$, the illustrative spin-like mode carries a photon fraction of 0% for $\theta = 0^\circ$ and 26.72% for $\theta = 90^\circ$ under the stated bias and parameters. The companion's uniform standing-wave solve reproduced $\langle n\rangle = 5.293$ after 25 pump periods at $q/m^2 = 0.08$ and $\Omega/m = 1$, starting from its specified vacuum state. This is particle production in the effective spin oscillator with an external pump.

The independent stress test used 19 relative polarizations and recovered mean energy density $1E_0^2$ at each angle. The largest dimensionless energy-conservation residual was 1.11×10^{-13}. The spatial and damping sweep evaluated 1,719 combinations of pump, wave number, frequency and damping.

$q/m^2 = 0.08$, central Bloch mode in the undamped periodic domain	Ω/m at lower edge	Ω/m at upper edge
Uniform reference	0.979903	1.019898
Full spatial modulation	0.979477	1.019520

The edges moved down by about $4\times10^{-4}m$ in this example. Increasing the Fourier cutoff changed the lowest spatial eigenvalue by $4.60\times10^{-14}m^2$. At the fixed $\Omega/m = 1$ of the loss scan, the exponent at zero Bloch momentum crosses zero at $\Gamma/m \simeq 0.02000$. A material response therefore needs losses small enough for the proposed gain to survive, or an independently resolvable subthreshold response.

23.2 Conditional force estimates and bounds

The spherical PREM integral gives $M_\oplus = 5.97318 \times 10^{24}$ kg and $g_N(R_\oplus) = 9.82191$ m/s². The solver evaluated 183 ranges. It agrees with the analytic uniform-density kernel to a maximum relative error of 1.89×10^{-11}. Repeating the layered integration at two resolutions changed the result by at most 6.04×10^{-14}. These are numerical checks under a spherical charge-per-mass approximation.

Scalar range	Y at surface	α_{ST} at balance	Residual gradient (s^{-2})	Same-mode vacuum gap (Hz)
1 km	4.69072e-05	-21319	9.82×10^{-3}	47,713.452
10 km	0.000981315	-1019	9.81×10^{-4}	4,771.345
100 km	0.0136468	-73.277	9.67×10^{-5}	477.135

Scalar range	Y at surface	α_{ST} at balance	Residual gradient (s^{-2})	Same-mode vacuum gap (Hz)
1,000 km	0.175994	-5.682	8.49×10^{-6}	47.713
$R_\oplus$	0.798629	-1.2521	7.71×10^{-7}	7.489
63,710 km	0.996145	-1.0039	1.40×10^{-8}	0.749

At a range of one Earth radius the required $\alpha_{ST} = -1.252$ for the selected body comes from an imposed product of opposite charges. The finite-difference check of Eq. (37) includes six ideal fixed-flux or fixed-displacement configurations. Assigning electric or magnetic energy imbalances of opposite signs and fractional magnitude 10^{-6} to source and test bodies would require $|M_{\rm Pl}\partial_s \ln Z| \simeq 7.91 \times 10^5$. These fractions are illustrative inputs, including for the Earth. They do not estimate actual terrestrial or laboratory stored energy. R65 R66

For ordinary Ti and Pt in the unscreened small-correction regime, Eq. (40) converts the published summary at 710 km into a conditional differential envelope $|\Delta\alpha| \lesssim 9.12 \times 10^{-15}$ at the same scalar range. The difference of charges is what enters this envelope. Independently, the ordinary-mass scale at 1 m would be 1.32×10^{28} J for a compact monopole giving one g. One joule changes the energy-equivalent mass by 1.11×10^{-17} kg. For the ideal Casimir interaction at $1\,\mu$m, the signed interaction contribution is -4.82×10^{-27} kg/m². R64 R67

If the same vacuum mode supplies both effects, a range of $R_\oplus$ predicts a rest gap of 7.489 Hz, or 3.10×10^{-14} eV. The corresponding first-band vacuum pump wavelength is 40,030 km. A 1 GHz vacuum rest gap would mediate a force over 4.77 cm. This comparison supplies a falsifiable link between the force-range and wave-response hypotheses under the shared-mode assumption.

23.3 Dense spin and simulated measurements

The minimal spin-fluid contact term is 6.65×10^{-42} times the ideal neutron-gas energy density at $n_f = 0.16$ fm^{-3}. Reaching 3% at that density in this normalization requires a multiplicative enhancement of 4.51×10^{39}. Its formal active-source, null and density zeros occur at $p_F c/E_{\rm Pl} = 3.760,\ 4.342,\ 5.317$, respectively. Extrapolating the model to these scales places the ideal-gas and gravitational approximations outside their controlled regime. The 12 normalized dust, radiation, and mixed trajectories satisfy the Friedmann constraint to a maximum normalized residual of 3.60×10^{-9}. At $\Sigma = 0.9$, the calculated bounce scales are 0.31623 for radiation and 0.46416 for dust. R68

The four-state readout used 24,000 seeded synthetic experiments, 48 randomized blocks per experiment, and six injected amplitude levels. The zero-signal false-positive rate was 5.45%. The interval excluded zero in 98.32% of simulations with an injected effect one-half the single-read noise. This validates the analysis for the assumed noise and additive offsets. The available measurement here is the published free-fall comparison. The laboratory readout is simulated, and the dimensions and noise floor of a physical ESFD detection remain to be measured.

24 What the proposed field equations imply

The original *Proof*, pp. 1–3, starts from a Maxwell term, a local tensor coupling and a potential. It subsequently proposes a separation-dependent spin correlation with potential proportional to $-\kappa^2\langle S_A S_B\rangle/r$. The missing step lies between those statements. Which propagator has a massless pole? Do its sources have a monopole charge in a neutral, unpolarized body? Does that charge track inertial mass? Each question can be answered for a specific action. This chapter tests three explicit readings of the proposal and follows one surviving dynamical possibility into a closed cavity. A1 A4 A10

24.1 A local tensor response can be eliminated exactly

In the normalization of equation (6), let Q be an independent real two-form, $K = dQ$, $F = dA$ and $m_Q > 0$. Contract indices with the $(+---)$ metric. Completing the square gives an identity at arbitrary external momentum,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -\tfrac{1}{4}F^2 + \tfrac{1}{12}(dQ)^2 - \tfrac{m_Q^2}{4}Q^2 + \tfrac{g_Q}{2}Q_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}\\ &= -\tfrac{1}{4}(1-g_Q^2/m_Q^2)F^2 + \tfrac{1}{12}(dQ')^2 - \tfrac{m_Q^2}{4}(Q')^2,\\ Q' &= Q - g_Q F/m_Q^2, \qquad dQ' = dQ.\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The last step uses the Bianchi identity $dF = 0$. A minimal external electromagnetic current measures the rescaled Maxwell propagator. A massive two-form can still carry its own initial data, and a separate matter source for Q would couple the sectors again after the change of variables. With the displayed couplings alone, incident light cannot launch an independent third propagating photon polarization. For $|g_Q| < m_Q$ the photon has positive kinetic energy. Equality makes its kinetic operator degenerate and larger mixing reverses its kinetic sign. The massless two-form limit requires a separate gauge analysis. The calculation retains finite frequencies, so the absence of an extra pole extends beyond a static approximation. The supplied test evaluates both sides on 900 independent off-shell field configurations.

The *Proof* prints a potential without a kinetic term for S. In that literal starting expression its spin equation is algebraic. For an auxiliary Q with $V = m_Q^2Q^2/4 + \lambda_Q(Q^2)^2/16$, variation at fixed field gives $(m_Q^2 + \lambda_Q Q^2/2)Q_{\mu\nu} = g_Q F_{\mu\nu}$. Near zero field the regular solution starts at $Q = g_Q F/m_Q^2$. Substitution gives

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\tfrac{1}{4}(1-g_Q^2/m_Q^2)F^2 - \frac{\lambda_Q g_Q^4}{16 m_Q^8}(F^2)^2 + O\big((F^2)^3\big)\,. \tag{46}$$

This is a concrete nonlinear-optics mechanism. In a prescribed background it changes the field response, which can be compared with vacuum birefringence. The computation uses a local invertible branch near zero field. A nonanalytic potential, a background condensate or independent derivative couplings require a new expansion. In particular, a composite fermion bilinear in equation (1) has quantum dynamics inherited from its constituents. Treating that bilinear as a free canonical tensor would count different degrees of freedom.

24.2 Neutral spin sources and the range of a force

A microscopic magnetic moment couples to $F_{\mu\nu}$, which contributes one power of exchanged momentum at each vertex. Those two powers remove the scalar $1/\mathbf{q}^2$ monopole singularity in one-photon exchange. In real space two separated permanent moments have the interaction

$$U_{\mathrm{dd}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi r^3}\left[\boldsymbol{\mu}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - 3(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1\cdot\hat{\mathbf{r}})(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2\cdot\hat{\mathbf{r}})\right]. \tag{47}$$

This follows by taking two spatial derivatives of $1/(4\pi r)$ and dropping the contact term at $r = 0$. The interaction can attract or repel as orientation changes. Independent isotropic ensembles have zero first-order average. Induced moments and correlated fluctuations can yield a residual with its own power law and material polarizabilities. An emergent inverse-square force therefore requires a collective long-distance pole **and** a rule for its residue in each material. Writing the observed $1/r$ directly into a spin correlator leaves both to be derived. A4 R79

There is a calculable fluctuation force even when an even gauge coupling $Z(s) = Z(-s)$ has $Z'(0) = 0$. Take a canonical vacuum scalar of mass m, two small stationary bodies far apart compared with their sizes, and a weak coupling $\frac{1}{2}c_i s^2$ at each body. Use $\hbar = c = 1$. After the local self energies are subtracted, the cross term in the Gaussian vacuum determinant is $-c_1c_2/2$ times the integral of a squared Euclidean Green function. At frequency ζ, that Green function is $G_\zeta(r) = \exp[-r\sqrt{\zeta^2+m^2}]/(4\pi r)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} U_{12}(r) &= -\frac{c_1c_2}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{d\zeta}{2\pi}G_\zeta(r)^2 = -\frac{c_1c_2m}{32\pi^3r^2}K_1(2mr), \\ U_{12}(r)\big|_{m=0} &= -\frac{c_1c_2}{64\pi^3r^3}. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

For $m > 0$, putting $\zeta = m\sinh u$ gives the Bessel function. For $m = 0$, the remaining integral is elementary. Equal-sign couplings attract. Their massless force falls as r^{-4}, and a mass supplies two-particle exponential suppression. A numerical integration at 76 values of mr checks the analytic result. This weak, zero-temperature, point-source calculation tests a different physical exchange from the one-photon calculation. Neither derives a universal Newtonian interaction. A linear coupling on a biased background instead permits a single-scalar pole. Its sign and magnitude can be tested with real matter. R69

24.3 An electromagnetic source charge for ordinary matter

Let M_P denote the reduced Planck mass and let $\alpha_{\mathrm{em}} \propto Z^{-1}$. For canonical s, define $d_e = M_P\partial_s \ln\alpha_{\mathrm{em}}$ on the background. Hold quark, electron and gluon-sector couplings fixed. The scalar charge per unit mass of a neutral atom is then $\beta_i = M_P\partial_s \ln m_i = d_e Q_{e,i}$. The published leading electromagnetic charge can be approximated by

$$Q_{e,i} \simeq 10^{-4}\left[-1.4 + 8.2\frac{Z_i}{A_i} + 7.7\frac{Z_i(Z_i-1)}{A_i^{4/3}}\right]. \tag{49}$$

Here Z_i is the proton number, unrelated to the gauge-kinetic function. The nuclear mass prefactor $A_i m_{\mathrm{u}}/m_i$ is set to unity. The primary calculation uses representative mass numbers. A second runs with tabulated mean atomic masses as a composition sensitivity. We form a mass-weighted

charge for each test alloy and Earth layer, with the dominant listed elements renormalized within the core and silicate mantle, a mantle proxy for crust, and water at the outside. PREM supplies the density weighting. These choices approximate composition gradients and crustal heterogeneity. R65 R70 R71

Write the positive orbital Yukawa kernel per unit Newtonian acceleration as $K_q(L,h)$, including source charge and the finite radial profile as in equations (38)–(40). The test-body acceleration enhancement is $2d_e^2 Q_{e,i} K_q$. The predicted free-fall difference is

$$\eta_{\mathrm{Ti,Pt}} = \frac{2d_e^2 K_q (Q_{\mathrm{Ti}} - Q_{\mathrm{Pt}})}{1 + d_e^2 K_q (Q_{\mathrm{Ti}} + Q_{\mathrm{Pt}})}. \tag{50}$$

Every relevant bulk charge has the same sign for the chosen portal. Either sign of d_e gives an **attractive** correction between the Earth and these alloys. The force-balance example in equation (39) permitted freely chosen test charges of opposite signs. Matching them to this specific electromagnetic response removes that freedom. We invert (50) using $|\eta_{\mathrm{obs}}| + 1.96\sqrt{\sigma_{\mathrm{stat}}^2 + \sigma_{\mathrm{syst}}^2}$ as a conservative envelope. It is a reinterpretation of the mission summary, with no access to the mission's acceleration time series. A universal extra coupling, material screening, an external controlled source, or another mediator changes the mapping. A stationary balance of forces on one composition would also leave the surrounding gravitational curvature to be measured. R67 R70

24.4 Finite energy in the proposed standing-wave response

The earlier calculation held the counterpropagating pump fixed. That gives a clean onset condition and allows its energy reservoir to remain indefinitely large. To calculate what happens after onset, project to one real electromagnetic cavity coordinate a and one spatially uniform spin coordinate s. Set the bare spin gap to one, let k be the photon frequency in those units, and choose a positive quartic restoring coefficient λ. A closed-mode Hamiltonian with the same even interaction is

$$H = \frac{p_a^2}{2Z(s)} + \frac{Z(s)k^2a^2}{2} + \frac{p_s^2 + s^2}{2} + \frac{\lambda s^4}{4}, \qquad Z(s) = e^{-gs^2}. \tag{51}$$

With $a(0) = 0$, $p_a(0) = \sqrt{P}$ and a small seed, the photon term produces $\ddot{s} + [1 + gP\cos(2kt)]s = O(s^3)$ before depletion. A resonant growing solution can therefore draw only the initially stored energy. $s = p_s = 0$ is an invariant solution of this classical even system. Thermal, quantum or deliberately seeded excitation would change its initial state. The seven integrations in the results chapter vary the seed, detuning and quartic term and check energy conservation. They describe a material or collective degree of freedom postulated by ESFD, so a laboratory claim requires a separately measured gap, coupling, linewidth and readout response. The calculation supplies a frequency and seed dependence that can be tested.

24.5 Returning to the spinning top

For an axially symmetric rigid body on a fixed pivot, let I_1 and I_3 be its pivot moments, M its mass, ℓ the distance to its centre of mass, and Ω its axial spin. Near the upright equilibrium the horizontal tilt $u = n_x + in_y$ satisfies

$$I_1\ddot{u} - iI_3\Omega\dot{u} - Mg\ell u = 0, \qquad \Omega_c = \frac{2\sqrt{I_1 Mg\ell}}{I_3}. \tag{52}$$

A transition in wobble can occur through rigid-body dynamics alone. The simulations start with a small known tilt and evolve the full vector angular-momentum and axis equations. The tabulated six runs cross (52) without a material spin parameter. A freely slipping tabletop top has contact friction, rolling, dissipation, an evolving spin and sometimes a moving point of contact. Observations of such a top cannot be mapped quantitatively onto the fixed-pivot example without those additional measurements. R72

For a direct spin–field test, consider toggling rotation and applied magnetic field. An ordinary Barnett moment induced by rotation can produce a torque linear in ΩB in a nonparallel geometry. A putative ESFD correction of the same symmetry produces the identical mechanical regression column. The illustrative design $[1, \Omega^2, B, \Omega B, \Omega B]$ has rank four even with multiple signed speeds and field-off controls. A separately calibrated measurement of rotation-induced magnetization adds a fifth independent constraint. Recording field direction, remanent moments, surface geometry, speed, wobble angle and losses would let a replication place a signed bound on the remaining torque. The source archive contains the motivating observation and no synchronized rotor measurements. A1 R72

25 Superconductors as the required experimental phase

Grenke specifies that the laboratory effect requires a superconductor. That condition changes the experiment and the interpretation of a null result. Equation (50) describes a composition coupling that persists in ordinary matter. A term proportional to a superconducting order parameter vanishes in the normal phase and can escape that particular test. It has direct tests of its own. Niobium supplies precision rotation and magnetic-penetration measurements. Yttrium barium copper oxide (YBCO) supplies published gravity tests with a superconducting source. The measurements access different response coefficients.

25.1 Which material is best for which measurement?

Material	Representative transition and operating condition	Measurement it can anchor
Niobium	9.25 K for the cited screening analysis	Best grounded rotation benchmark here. The pair mass-to-charge response was measured in a rotating ring, and depth-resolved magnetic measurements exist on six differently prepared specimens.
Nb_3Sn and NbN	About 18 K and 16 K in the cited materials table	Conventional comparison materials with different stiffness, penetration depth and condensation energy.
MgB_2	39 K at ordinary pressure	A noncuprate, multiband comparison with a higher transition temperature and an independent superconducting transition.
YBCO, a member of the REBCO family	Zero resistance at 91 K in the cited sample. Oxygen content affects the transition.	Best evidenced material here for testing a gravity claim. Static levitated and rotating-disk experiments provide direct benchmarks. The superconducting state is accessible at 77 K in sufficiently oxygenated material.

Material	Representative transition and operating condition	Measurement it can anchor
$HgBa_2Ca_2Cu_3O_{8+\delta}$	About 133 K conventionally. Deng et al. reported a **151 K resistive onset at ambient pressure after pressure quenching**.	High-temperature comparison. The retained metastable specimen and its transition criterion matter. A rotation or weight measurement on this state would require separate evidence.
Lanthanum superhydride	About 250 K at approximately 170 GPa in the cited study	A high-pressure temperature benchmark. Its pressure-cell geometry is a different experiment from rotation of a bulk disk at ordinary pressure.

The transition temperature determines where superconducting order can exist. The proposed force depends additionally on the coupling, the volume that changes state, field penetration and the source and probe geometry. The material with the highest resistive onset need not produce the largest measurable acceleration. R81 R82 R83 R84 R85 R86

25.2 Rotating charge condensate and London moment

Write the macroscopic pair order parameter as $\Psi = \sqrt{n_p}\exp(i\theta)$ with pair charge $q_p = -2e$. A vortex-free contour has phase momentum $m'\mathbf{v}_s + q_p\mathbf{A} = \hbar\nabla\theta$ in the simple isotropic London description. In the co-rotating bulk $\nabla \times \mathbf{v}_s = 2\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. Taking the curl or integrating around a ring gives

$$\mathbf{B}_L = -\frac{2m'}{q_p}\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \qquad \oint (m'\mathbf{v}_s + q_p\mathbf{A})\cdot d\mathbf{l} = nh, \qquad |\Phi_0| = \frac{h}{2e}. \tag{53}$$

Niobium ring measurements gave $m'/(2m_e) = 1.000084(21)$. The difference from the historical electrochemical calculation 0.999992 is 92 ± 21 ppm using experimental uncertainty alone. The 1989 letter and 1990 full study concern the same result. A field at 100 rad s^{-1} inferred from the measured slope is 1.1372 nT. That last number is a calculated scale at a chosen angular velocity. The observable is flux or magnetic field and its slope with rotation. An independent acceleration readout would be needed to assign a gravitational coupling to it. London moments have also been measured in high-temperature superconductors. A spin-singlet pair has zero total intrinsic spin, while the condensate phase, charge current and magnetic flux can be sharply defined. ESFD must specify which of these quantities carries its effect. R81 R87

25.3 Measured magnetic screening in niobium

We refit the six niobium specimens reported in the staged local analysis of McFadden et al., supplement Table S4. At measured temperatures near 3 K the authors give extrapolated penetration

depths and impurity-derived electronic mean free paths. The test uses the quoted errors on both coordinates,

$$\lambda_0(\ell) = \lambda_L\sqrt{1+\frac{\pi\xi_0}{2\ell}}, \qquad \chi^2 = \sum_i \left[\frac{(\ell_i-\ell_{i,\mathrm{obs}})^2}{\sigma_{\ell,i}^2} + \frac{(\lambda_0(\ell_i)-\lambda_{i,\mathrm{obs}})^2}{\sigma_{\lambda,i}^2}\right]. \tag{54}$$

The fitted local quantities are $\lambda_L = 33.15$ nm and $\xi_0 = 32.24$ nm, with $\chi^2 = 3.78$ for four degrees of freedom. Leaving out each specimen in turn gives 2.54 nm RMS error for its measured penetration depth using the held-out mean free path. The authors' staged local extraction gives 33.1 and 32.6 nm. Their preferred nonlocal analysis gives 29.1 ± 1.0 and 39.9 ± 2.5 nm. Preparation and electrodynamic model alter the inferred length on the same element. This comparison starts from six published specimen summaries. Their signal extraction from the muon arrival histograms precedes our fit. R82

25.4 Coupling a superconducting phase to the ESFD variable

For a minimal, separately identified extension, take a neutral scalar s with $s \mapsto -s$ symmetry and a charged superconducting order parameter Ψ. Add the usual gauge-covariant gradient energy $|(-i\hbar\nabla - q_p\mathbf{A})\Psi|^2/(2m_p)$ and electromagnetic energy to the homogeneous free energy

$$f = a(T)n + \frac{b}{2}n^2 + \frac{m_s^2}{2}s^2 + \frac{\lambda_s}{4}s^4 + \frac{u}{2}ns^2, \qquad n = |\Psi|^2, \qquad b, \lambda_s > 0. \tag{55}$$

At $s = 0$ the superconducting order is $n_0 = \max[0, -a(T)/b]$. The curvature in the spin direction is $m_s^2 + un_0$. A positive u raises the gap and a sufficiently negative u allows a second transition. Eliminating n on the positive-occupation branch gives $\lambda_{\mathrm{eff}} = \lambda_s - u^2/(2b)$. We use $\lambda_{\mathrm{eff}} > 0$ for the continuous transition. The analytic minimum and an independent bounded numerical minimization agree over 453 temperature and coupling combinations. With normalized $a = T/T_c - 1$, $b = \lambda_s = 1$, $m_s^2 = 0.02$ and $u = -0.5$, the second onset is $T/T_c = 0.96$. This value is selected by the illustrative coefficients. Neither the 151 K report nor the niobium fit measures u. A low-drive spectroscopic test would measure a change of **squared mode frequency** with independently inferred condensate density, followed by a predicted onset or upper bound with the same u. A mean-field expansion near T_c gives no controlled prediction of the entire low-temperature spectrum.

In this even model an unperturbed state gives a shift in the spin gap as soon as superconductivity sets in. A linear source for a long-range scalar requires a distinct term, for example $g_1 ns$ if the symmetry permits it, or a quantified bias. Even then, motion of a separate neutral body requires a coupling to that probe. For a signed weight signal, magnetic forces, trapped vortices, changing buoyancy, thermal gradients and vibration each have independently observable controls. Recording a co-located superconducting transition, pickup flux and differential acceleration at several heights tests the three links separately. A superconducting ring can respond strongly through (53) in the absence of any change of the external gravitational field.

25.5 Direct gravitational tests and geometric reach

Li et al. compared the acceleration over a static, magnetically levitated YBCO sample and reported changes below $2 \times 10^{-8} g$. The earlier reported stationary weight change of 5×10^{-4} is 25,000 times

that sensitivity. Hathaway et al. also reported a null in their rotating YBCO apparatus. Its approximately 50 g test body and 0.5 mg repeatable balance sensitivity correspond to roughly 10^{-5} in fractional weight. They reached at most about 550 rpm, measured at a different height, and described differences in levitation and disk preparation. These values constrain the experiments that were actually run. Their sensitivities are quoted as reported and do not define universal confidence limits over every spin speed, material or interaction range. R83

To express what the static result can test, suppose the superconducting material changes a uniformly distributed, weak, attractive or repulsive Yukawa source with range L. Approximate its active volume by a cylinder of radius R and thickness d. Let z be the on-axis probe height above the top face and A_0 the acceleration of an infinite slab of the same integrated effective source density in the unsuppressed Newtonian limit. Integrating the Yukawa Green function over the actual finite disk gives

$$\frac{|\Delta a(z)|}{|A_0|} = \frac{L}{d}\left[F(z) - F(z+d)\right], \qquad F(h) = e^{-h/L} - e^{-\sqrt{R^2+h^2}/L}. \tag{56}$$

We use the reported 10 cm diameter, 1.25 cm thickness and the nominal 18 cm height. At a 10 cm range the transfer is 0.01491. For this point-probe geometry, the reported sensitivity corresponds to $|A_0|/g$ of about 1.34×10^{-6}. The table explores 104 ranges and verifies the analytic result by direct integration. Source screening, a surface-only source, a response confined to vortices, or a finite sensor with a different location would alter the kernel. A uniform reduction of Earth's gravity has a different spatial dependence. R83

There is also a conventional energy scale. At low temperature the condensation free-energy density approaches $B_c^2/(2\mu_0)$. Using a representative thermodynamic $B_c = 0.21$ T for Nb, the corresponding energy of one cubic centimetre is about 0.0175 J, equivalent to about 1.9×10^{-18} N of weight in Earth's field. At finite temperature internal-energy and free-energy differences differ by $T\Delta S$. A cycle that includes the apparatus, cooling bath and heat exchange must account for the full energy balance. This scale applies to the sample's equilibrium condensation energy. The accelerometer above a disk measures a different quantity again. R84

25.6 The superconducting condition in a neutron star

A proton-paired stellar core supplies a physically motivated way to revisit the magnetar hypothesis. In a type-II core sustaining magnetic flux tubes, the areal proton flux-tube density is $n_\Phi = B_{\rm core}/\Phi_0$. The neutron superfluid instead carries circulation, with vortex density $n_v = 2\Omega/\kappa_n$ and $\kappa_n = h/(2m_n)$. The two densities scale with different observables. In a dilute array the characteristic magnetic tension can scale as $B_{\rm core}B_{c1}/\mu_0$ compared with the normal Maxwell tension $B_{\rm core}^2/\mu_0$. Formation history and trapped flux matter below the nominal lower critical field. The core field, proton pairing gap, topology and entrainment cannot be inferred uniquely from the timing dipole. R90

We evaluated three explicitly assumed core-to-timing-field ratios (0.1, 1 and 10) for all 22 confirmed magnetars with usable uncensored timing. For the equal-field illustration the median triangular flux-tube spacing is 3.08×10^{-13} m and the median ratio of flux tubes to neutron vortices per unit area is 8.86×10^{17}. Only three of the 22 fall below our conservative dilute-domain cut of one-tenth of a representative $B_{c1} = 10^{15}$ G. The code reports tension ratios solely inside that domain. These are conditional scales, not observations of stellar interiors. A physical extension

would couple the relative orientation, pinning and motion of the two arrays to an independently timed glitch, precession or thermal observable. Percent-level static contact stresses tested against NICER are a different model and are not derived from these flux counts.

If the superconducting condition is required at galactic scales as well, the rotation, radio and lensing catalogs used here do not measure such a phase in the galactic disk. Extending the mechanism from a stellar core to a galaxy requires identifying the paired species, its critical temperature and field, the occupied volume, and the stress it communicates to neutral stars and to light. The galaxy fits cannot identify that material for the theory.

26 Independent observations and a revised galaxy equation

The June synthesis names the *spin–entropy* extension SEFD. ESFD is the wider project. Neither "SFFT" nor the speech variant "SCFD" identifies another validated galaxy theory in the recovered source record. The literal divergence profile in equation (17) can improve a baryons-only curve. Its enclosed effective mass approaches zero at very large radius. The central question is whether a physically motivated replacement can transfer from one galaxy to another, predict weak lensing, and retain evidence for an electromagnetic origin. The three tests here probe those questions with different observations. A6 R28 R29

26.1 A regular core with a flat outer rotation speed

For an isolated spherical effective field, write the extra speed as a fraction of a limiting speed V_∞. One simple closure with a linear central acceleration and an asymptotically flat rotation curve is

$$\begin{aligned} V^2_{\mathrm{pred}}(r) &= V_b^2(r) + V_\infty^2 \frac{r^2}{r^2+r_c^2}, \qquad V_\infty^4 = GM_b a_\star, \qquad r_c = \eta R_d, \\ \Phi_f(r) &= \frac{V_\infty^2}{2}\ln\frac{r^2+r_c^2}{r_0^2}, \qquad \rho_f(r) = \frac{V_\infty^2(r^2+3r_c^2)}{4\pi G(r^2+r_c^2)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

Here R_d is the stellar disk scale length and r_0 is an arbitrary reference length. M_b is set by the photometry and gas catalog. $a_\star$ and η are shared by an entire training population. This radial potential is the established spherical logarithmic halo form, with the baryonic Tully–Fisher scaling imposed. Its empirical success can select a radial shape while leaving the source ambiguous. One explicit mapping to the archival equation $\rho_f = \nabla\cdot(s\mathbf{J}_s)$ is

$$(sJ_s)_r = \frac{M_f(<r)}{4\pi r^2} = \frac{V_\infty^2}{4\pi G}\frac{r}{r^2+r_c^2}. \tag{58}$$

The required weighted flux is regular at the center, falls as $1/r$ in the outer galaxy and has nonzero divergence there. If sJ_s were instead strictly conserved and source-free in a stationary exterior, spherical symmetry would force $r^2 sJ_s$ to be constant. Both conditions cannot hold over the same extended region. The required mass grows linearly at large radius. A cosmological embedding, an outer cutoff and a budget for the sustained weighted flux remain necessary. No microscopic ESFD coefficient has been used to calculate $a_\star$. R77

The flat tail can also follow from an ordinary modified-Poisson construction. For a scalar potential with $\nabla\cdot[\mu(|\nabla\Phi|/a_\star)\nabla\Phi] = 4\pi G\rho_b$, spherical symmetry integrates to $\mu(g/a_\star)g = GM_b/r^2$ outside the matter. Taking $\mu(x)\simeq x$ gives $g = \sqrt{GM_b a_\star}/r$ exactly in that limit. A Newtonian field from the effective density in (57), a nonlinear gravitational response, and a hypothetical organized spin source can therefore share a velocity asymptote. The same measured $a_\star$ must predict an observable involving field or spin for the interpretation to become mechanism-specific. R29 R78

26.2 Whole galaxies and comparisons with dark-matter profiles

We use the archived five mass-balanced folds, holding out entire galaxies and all their radii. The training objective weights each velocity residual by $1/[\sqrt{N_g}\sqrt{\sigma_v^2 + (5\ \mathrm{km\,s^{-1}})^2}]$. The empirical radial acceleration relation (RAR) is refit on each training set with one free acceleration scale. The alternative NFW and Burkert halos have a common dimensionless mass normalization proportional to M_b, and a scale radius proportional to R_d, with two trainable population constants per profile. For $x = r/(\eta_h R_d)$ their dimensionless enclosed-mass shapes are $\ln(1+x) - x/(1+x)$ and $\frac{1}{2}\ln(1+x) + \frac{1}{4}\ln(1+x^2) - \frac{1}{2}\arctan x$. Per-galaxy halo fits and the fixed published RAR remain in the earlier chapters. The population comparison does not marginalize cosmological halo scatter, varying stellar mass-to-light ratios or adiabatic response. NFW and Burkert are dark-matter comparators. RAR is an observed baryonic–dynamical acceleration relation that can have several physical interpretations.

We first calculate the RMS velocity error within each galaxy, then report its median across galaxies. For paired inference we calculate the difference of the two errors *within each galaxy*, then bootstrap that median difference with 5,000 galaxy-level resamples. A difference between separate sample medians and a median paired difference generally disagree. The new profile was developed with knowledge of the earlier project's results. The five folds test parameter transfer within SPARC. They cannot turn today's choice of profile into a prediction registered before the survey. R28 R29

26.3 LITTLE THINGS provides a distinct reduction of dwarf-galaxy kinematics

Oh et al. published normalized rotation curves for 26 systems, the normalization radii and speeds, and independent stellar and gas estimates. We recover the dimensional observed velocity and radius using the supplied scale factors. Only the rows marked as data enter the test. Inclination of at least 30°, available positive stellar and gas masses, an optical scale height, and positive finite radii, speeds and errors define eligibility. All 175 SPARC positions were matched against the 26 published centers with a conservative ten-arcminute sky radius, including alias names. Every training galaxy within that radius of any LITTLE THINGS source was removed before fitting the global constants. Results are also supplied for only the targets without a SPARC positional match. R73 R28

The public figure inputs do not give an independent resolved baryonic velocity curve for every point in this standardized comparison. Approximate each stellar and gas contribution with a thin exponential disk of total mass M_d and scale length h. With $y = r/(2h)$ its speed contribution is

$$V_d^2(r) = \frac{2GM_d}{h}\, y^2[I_0(y)K_0(y) - I_1(y)K_1(y)]. \tag{59}$$

The stellar scale is five times the catalogued height, in the authors' convention. The gas scale is assumed to be twice the stellar scale, varied to 1.5 and 3 in sensitivity tests. The stellar and helium-corrected gas masses are from the LITTLE THINGS tables. Gas irregularity, inclination uncertainty, radial pressure support, distance selection and baryonic profile approximations can all move the scores. Ratios or scale lengths are never tuned on the test velocities.

26.4 Transfer to gravitational lensing

We take the authors' deprojected circular-speed equivalents and published statistical and systematic errors from the revised KiDS machine-readable table. For each mass and morphology bin the baryonic source is approximated as a point mass with the published bin mean. The primary comparison uses late-type objects and 50–300 kpc. The longer range to 1 Mpc and early-type and combined samples are tabulated. The code uses within-bin SPARC disk-size percentiles 16, 50 and 84 as a sensitivity. No lens bin is used to fit the speed law. We use a spherical metric interpretation under which the inferred lensing potential responds to the same additional potential as nonrelativistic dynamics. A field that only pushes magnetized material would instead contribute no new lens potential. R74

In weak-field metric language light responds to $(\Phi + \Psi_g)/2$, while slow neutral tracers measure Φ. With $V_b^2 = GM_b/r$, the bin diagnostic $[V_{\rm lens}^2 - V_b^2]/[V_{\rm pred}^2 - V_b^2]$ equals one for the assumed common response at fixed mass. Binning, redshift distribution, deprojection, environment, baryon inventory and disk-to-lens population differences all enter this diagnostic. The public table supplies bin errors but no complete inter-bin covariance for our experiment. We therefore report unweighted speed RMS and no likelihood or gravitational-slip detection. R74

26.5 Can actual magnetic data add predictive information?

Tabatabaei et al. reported integrated total and polarized 4.8 GHz flux densities scaled to 10 Mpc, an optical radius, star-formation rate (SFR) and a rotation speed for each of 26 nearby galaxies. We transcribed all 26 central values and used galaxy-level leave-one-out predictions of $\log_{10} V$. We successively included $\log_{10}$ SFR, $\log_{10} R_{25}$, total radio flux and polarized radio flux. The influence of polarization is assessed against the model already containing the first three controls. A residual-permutation calculation uses 9,999 draws with those controls retained. It is exploratory and assumes approximately exchangeable residuals. R80

The measured radio signal does not use the velocity being predicted, but disk size, gas density, inclination, magnetic ordering, cosmic-ray electrons, star formation and distance calibration can jointly affect these quantities. Only three galaxies match the 131-object SPARC fold set by normalized names and aliases in the packaged crossmatch. That overlap cannot establish an incremental magnetic effect on the *unexplained radial acceleration*. Predicting a galaxy's characteristic speed and predicting a radius-by-radius residual after baryons are different observational questions. A decisive sample needs resolved radio polarization, Faraday information or another field proxy and independent gas and stellar kinematics over the same radii. R80

27 Compact stars, quantum measurements and cosmic horizons

27.1 Two observed stars against each common stellar equation of state

Choudhury et al. and Salmi et al. released equally weighted joint samples of gravitational mass and equatorial radius for PSR J0437–4715 and PSR J0740+6620 respectively. We retain each original mass–radius pair. For every admissible static stellar sequence in the preceding chapters we retain the first stable branch up to its refined mass maximum or causal endpoint. We interpolate

linearly in mass between computed radii and never extrapolate beyond that branch. For each of the authors' posterior draws j, the compatibility statistic is the posterior fraction

$$C_i(\epsilon,\delta) = \frac{1}{N_i}\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{M_{ij}\in\mathcal{M}}\,\mathbf{1}_{|R_{ij}-R_{\mathrm{TOV}}(M_{ij})-\delta|\le\epsilon}. \tag{60}$$

The primary half-width is 0.5 km and the nominal static offset is zero. Alternative half-widths of 0.25 and 1 km and illustrative equatorial offsets of 0.3 and 0.6 km appear in the tables. C_1C_2 quantifies joint overlap for statistically independent posterior draws on the same EOS and contact coefficient. A Bayesian comparison of EOS models would require reconstructing the likelihood relative to each original prior, a central-density or mass population prior, a rotational stellar solver, and nuisance and EOS uncertainties. The band width itself sets the normalization of this descriptive measure. R75 R76

27.2 Bell outcomes, characteristic age and causal boundaries

The Delft event-ready experiment allows an end-to-end test of the quantum branch using original herald timing, settings and spin readouts. We apply the released herald windows, opposite detector channels, excitation and invalid-marker exclusions, and published readout gates before forming trial outcomes. For settings (a,b) and signs (x,y) the game is won when $xy=(-1)^{ab}$. Conditional correlators give $S = E_{00}+E_{01}+E_{10}-E_{11}$. The single-game binomial upper tail under the local bound also includes the authors' small allowed input bias. An independent, identical Werner-noise model with ideal CHSH axes has $p_{\mathrm{win}} = \frac{1}{2}+v/\sqrt{8}$ and can be inverted for an illustrative visibility v. That assumption applies only to the visibility interval. The data directly challenge a local classical account satisfying the Bell assumptions. A spin-field theory with the usual entangled quantum probabilities is compatible with this test and owes a separate predicted deviation to become distinguishable. R88

For the timing branch, $B_{\mathrm{timing}} \propto \sqrt{P\dot{P}}$ and $\Omega = 2\pi/P$ imply $\chi_{\mathrm{timing}} \propto \sqrt{\dot{P}/P} \propto \tau_c^{-1/2}$. The catalog test now calculates an exact binomial reference interval and counts the objects missed by the historical cutoff. The catalog is a selected population, so this interval describes sampling variability for an idealized population with the same eligibility. A false-positive rate for all neutron stars requires a separate comparison population and selection model. R08

Finally, a reversal of collapse does not itself specify the formation of a white hole or a daughter universe. For a spatially flat **isotropic** FLRW metric choose $c=1$, areal radius $R=a(t)r$ and future radial light rays $dr/dt = \pm 1/a$. Their fractional area expansions for a positive time normalization and the Misner–Sharp compactness are

$$\theta_\pm = \frac{2}{R}(HR\pm 1), \qquad \frac{2GM_{\mathrm{MS}}}{R} = H^2R^2 = 1+\frac{R^2}{4}\theta_+\theta_-. \tag{61}$$

At $H=0$ a finite sphere has opposite expansion signs. Larger spheres can be future trapped in the contracting phase or anti-trapped during expansion. The test reflects the smooth homogeneous trajectories in time and uses only the zero-shear subset. Nonzero shear in the archived model would spoil the assumed spherical geometry. Extending an interior to a black-hole exterior requires matching the induced metric and extrinsic curvature, or specifying a material shell, and tracing null geodesics through the matched solution. A causal connection to a separate asymptotic region is a global statement that no homogeneous turnaround alone settles. R68 R89

28 Numerical outcomes from this revision

28.1 Galaxy-by-galaxy predictions and independent light deflection

Each speed entry is in km/s. The first three numeric columns are medians of within-galaxy RMS errors. The lens column is RMS across 24 late-type radial and mass-bin cells at 50–300 kpc. All model coefficients used for the external samples were fixed using SPARC alone. R28 R73 R74

Model	SPARC, 131	Dwarfs, 17	Unmatched dwarfs, 10	KiDS lensing
Baryons	44.73	20.40	16.82	139.32
Spin-entropy flux	19.82	14.77	13.72	112.48
Shared NFW halo	19.43	14.49	13.50	54.36
Shared Burkert halo	19.32	14.26	13.50	69.87
RAR fitted on training galaxies	13.11	8.94	9.35	23.89
Cored flat-speed law	12.45	8.63	9.38	26.69

The revised equation wins 67 of 131 whole-galaxy comparisons against the refitted RAR. Its median paired change is -0.003 km/s, with a galaxy-resampled 95% interval of -0.67 to +0.68 km/s. Against the shared NFW and Burkert assumptions it wins 100 and 99 times. These restrictions matter. Allowing individual halos their own inferred scales changes the question and the outcome in the earlier radial holdouts.

The dwarf calibration excludes 4 potential training matches and uses 127 training galaxies. Of 26 published dwarf curves, 17 supply the required inputs, giving 706 selected radii. The revised law wins 8 of 17 comparisons against RAR. The median paired change is +0.005 km/s, with a 95% interval of -0.54 to +0.79. The order of the sample medians reverses in the ten objects without any SPARC positional match.

On all 131 training galaxies the revision gives an acceleration scale of 8.81e-11 m/s^2 and a core radius of 1.393 stellar disk scale lengths. The lens release has 158 populated cells across overlapping morphology subsets and mass bins. The median observed-to-predicted excess in squared speed is 1.26 in the primary subset under the stated potential and mass assumptions. Uncertainty in the bin covariance, source mass model and environmental contribution prevents interpreting this ratio as a measured coupling.



Figure 28. Independent dwarf-galaxy velocities and a late-type weak-lensing stack. The shaded region extends beyond the primary scoring range. Error bars in this figure combine the published statistical and systematic magnitudes in quadrature for display.



Figure 29. Measured radio polarization versus rotation before and after controlling for star formation, optical size and total radio emission. Both axes on the right are residuals from the same three-predictor fit.

28.2 Polarization measured independently of the rotation curve

The raw rank correlation between polarized radio flux and rotation speed is 0.778 across 26 systems. After linear control in log space for SFR, optical size and total radio emission, the partial Pearson coefficient is 0.510. The residual-permutation value is 0.0113. Adding polarization changes leave-one-galaxy-out RMS from 0.0835 to 0.0758 dex. The integrated polarization observable carries information about rotation in this selected catalog. A dynamo ordered by galactic motion, cosmic-ray transport or a common driver can produce an association. The three named matches to the held-out SPARC sample are too few to establish a magnetic explanation of the velocity residuals. R80



Figure 30. Numerical energy transfer into the assumed collective mode and energy conservation in a lossless two-mode cavity.

28.3 Field, rotor and superconducting tests

The two-form action equality holds to 3.1e-15 in the strongest normalized discrepancy over 900 configurations. The two-scalar vacuum-force quadrature differs from its closed form by at most 6.7e-16. These are cross-checks of the analytic identities under their stated hypotheses.

The resonant cavity grows at 0.01983 per unit gap time in the early fit, compared with 0.02000 from the fixed-pump calculation. Its spin coordinate reaches 77.28% of initial total energy. Increasing the quartic coefficient from 0.4 to 4 reduces the peak to 25.61%. Detuning the frequency ratio to 1.10 gives a peak fraction of 1.27e-05. The zero-seed trajectory stays at zero. Across all seven closed integrations the largest relative energy error is 3.7e-10.

The structural threshold of the example 45 g rotor is 65.09 rad/s, or 621.5 rpm. Six full rigid-body integrations reproduce small-tilt behavior to a maximum relative disagreement of 3.4e-07 within the selected small-angle window. This benchmark gives a calibration target for the original tabletop question. The specimen, friction and time trace from the motivating observation are unknown.

For the pure linear electromagnetic portal at a range of one Earth radius, the conservative free-fall envelope gives a coupling magnitude below 3.48e-05 in the reduced-Planck normalization. The corresponding added titanium-alloy surface acceleration is below 8.41e-15 times ordinary gravity. The composition-dependent force points inward. Equation (55) considers the separate possibility of an interaction activated specifically by superconducting order. R67 R70 R71

The niobium refit predicts held-out specimens to 2.54 nm. Its rotating-ring slope implies 1.1372 nT at 100 rad/s. The static YBCO test reported a sensitivity of 2e-08 of gravity and the rotating-disk balance had repeatability corresponding to approximately 1e-05. The right panel illustrates how an additional collective mode could have a separate temperature onset in a superconducting phase. None of these laboratory publications reports such a mode as a gravitational signal. R81 R82 R83



Figure 31. Tilt in the fixed-pivot rotor simulation. Small initial departures grow below the classical threshold.



Figure 32. Finite-range scalar coupling envelope calculated from the published differential free-fall summary and material-matched terrestrial charge.



Figure 33. Left, six measured niobium screening depths with errors on both coordinates. Right, a simulated squared spin gap near the superconducting transition for three assumed couplings.

28.4 Two neutron stars tested with the same stress parameter

PSR J0437 contributes 218,553 joint posterior samples. The median and central 68% span are 1.418 (1.381–1.454) solar masses and 11.36 (10.73–12.30) km. The sampled mass–radius correlation is 0.261. The median dimensionless rotation scale, computed as angular frequency squared times radius cubed divided by GM, is 0.009. R75 R76

PSR J0740 contributes 379,669 joint posterior samples. The median and central 68% span are 2.073 (2.004–2.142) solar masses and 12.49 (11.61–13.76) km. The sampled mass–radius correlation is 0.272. The median dimensionless rotation scale, computed as angular frequency squared times radius cubed divided by GM, is 0.033. R75 R76

Of 42 EOS/contact cases, 25 have admissible first branches over part of the tested mass range. The best shared primary overlap is the MPA1 core model with a −1% energy contribution at the reference density. Its fractions are 0.474 and 0.281, with product 0.133. The strongest zero-contact comparator is MPA1 with fractions 0.199 and 0.371, with product 0.074. The negative contact improves agreement with J0437 and worsens it with J0740 individually. It leads among these fixed curves over all nine width/offset choices. Prior-weighted relativistic inference and additional stars would be required to infer such a term in nature.

28.5 Counterexamples in the remaining branches

The historical cutoff exceeds one in 5 of 22 confirmed McGill sources with eligible timing. The exact binomial reference interval on that 22.7% fraction is 7.8%–45.4%. Seventeen catalogued magnetars lie at or below the proposed necessary condition. Changing the cutoff after inspecting these stars cannot restore its original interpretation. R08

The Delft raw archive yields 245 accepted Bell trials from 4,746 candidate records. We recover 196 wins and S = 2.4225 ± 0.2038. The one-sided local-null tail is 0.03917 with the published random-input allowance. Under the additional identical Werner-visibility model, the fitted visibility is 0.849 with exact-binomial transformed 95% interval 0.691–0.985. A model of observer-



Figure 34. Highest-density 68% and 95% joint mass–radius regions estimated from the two released posteriors. Curves illustrate the spread across static EOS choices.

induced collapse needs to predict an outcome distribution conditional on a measurable intervention. These data verify a known quantum result. R88

Across 18 worldtubes in three isotropic backgrounds, none of the finite spheres is trapped at the instant of the bounce. 8 become future trapped in the contracting part of the simulated time window. The null-expansion identity agrees to 3.6e-16 in scaled units. A bouncing scale factor alone cannot certify a white-hole exterior or a daughter universe.

29 Validation plan and decision criteria

The research question to carry forward is whether measured spin or spin correlations cause a residual that survives known electromagnetic, nuclear, gravitational and instrumental effects. The most constrained formulation starts with one operator or response law, one physical system, and one predeclared observable. A cross-scale model must produce several observables from shared coefficients and observable scale-matching functions. The tests below use that requirement to assign actual risk to competing branches.

29.1 Experiment and analysis specifications

Claim or observable	Matched control and data	Decision criterion
Extra local magnetic dipole	Species, charge and state matched against QED and hadronic moments, with independent fine-structure or lattice inputs.	Fit a signed new coefficient in a declared scheme. A replicated residual with correct operator dependence is needed. Limits are conditional on the operator basis.
Scalar mode onset (9)–(12)	Canonical scalar/photon, fixed magnetic topology, calibrated dimensions, independent f_Φ, m_0 or ξ if accessible.	Lower eigenvalue crosses zero in the predicted mode, angular or gap scaling, and finite-domain threshold. Require the same coefficient in propagation and onset.
Standing-wave spin response (34), (43)	Equal-energy polarization and spin reversal, randomized order, signed readout, independently measured losses and spurious material resonances.	Signed overlap obeys the predicted spin parity and polarization dependence. Fit the gain band only after bounding joint spin and polarization backgrounds.
Induced force and curvature (35)–(40)	Independently matched charge for source and probe, conventional electromagnetic controls, recorded height, material and orientation, and a reference body.	Static acceleration follows the prespecified sign, magnitude and range from shared coefficients. A curvature claim also needs a tidal or light-deflection observable.
Shared spin mode (44)	Vacuum or independently characterized medium, frequency and range measured in the same regime.	The inferred mediator range and gap satisfy $2\pi L_s f_{\mathrm{gap}} = c$ for the canonical vacuum action. A medium shift requires its own calculated dispersion.
Rotation, chirality, clock or inertia	Reversal factorial, matched inertial mass and spin composition, clock sensitivities or torque null channels.	A reproducible prespecified parity contrast and its amplitude bound, after measured environmental regressors.
Spin coherence or state reduction	Bell/Ramsey sequence with field/exposure windows and process noise calibrated.	Rate and basis dependence agree with the specified dynamical map. Compare to noise and use raw outcomes to check marginals.

Claim or observable	Matched control and data	Decision criterion
Pulsar–magnetar threshold	Timing, independent field proxy, exposure and event-era data, source-disjoint validation.	Calibrated out-of-sample incremental likelihood above age, dipole and activity. Hard legacy class split already fails fixed counts.
Flares and glitches	Superfluid, torque and magnetoelastic timing, calibrated event exposures and contemporaneous field geometry.	Separate likelihoods per event family and a measurable dependence on the declared instability variable.
Magnetar polarimetry	QED, atmosphere, plasma and instrument transfer at the same phase and energy.	Joint Stokes likelihood for a single predicted residual over multiple sources or epochs.
New compact remnant stress	Shared GR and ESFD EOS, mass, angular momentum and topology, plus convergence-tested 3+1 data.	Stable, resolvable shift in equilibrium, oscillation, collapse or waveform mapped to a separately estimated field and spin.
Compact-merger precursor	Arrival correction, independent detectors, live time, response matrices and matched off-source windows.	Population fluence/incidence or polarization bound with trials included and injection recovery. Positive candidate requires timed, replicated signal.
Galactic excess gravity	SPARC and new disjoint magnetic maps with baryons, stars, and lensing samples.	Same normalization predicts $V(r)$ and gravitational slip/lensing on disjoint galaxies. Fixed per-galaxy scale fitting supplies a shape comparison.
Cluster, CMB or cosmic structure	Joint lensing and baryon templates, BAO, CMB TT/TE/EE and growth, common selection support.	A consistent perturbation cosmology fits background, structure and lensing over redshift with shared parameters.
QGP or CERN residual	Standard Model amplitude/transport, background, detector full response and correlated fitting.	Operator-specific spectrum or angular direction, tested at fixed pairing and cuts in independent or withheld data.

Claim or observable	Matched control and data	Decision criterion
Spin–torsion bounce	Covariant connection variation, microphysical equation of state, realistic shear and global geometry.	A stable bounce below computed validity scales and a predeclared external or cosmological observable.
Earth, vacuum devices, or field-observer	Matched environmental, energy and momentum channels, independent measurement and replicable protocol.	A predictive, dimensioned effect above the relevant baseline. Without a physical map the archive supplies a conjecture or proposal.

29.2 Statistical and numerical standards

Define the scientific unit before fitting. Repeated radii within a galaxy and repeated flares within an active region are correlated. Resample at the galaxy, source, or interval-block level as appropriate. A positive comparison against a flat null tests explanatory variation. To test an incremental spin mechanism, use a state-of-the-art baseline plus the measured spin predictor with equivalent access to inputs. For detection-like data, retain upper limits, exposure and selection efficiency. A measured effective field with geometry uncertainty is a latent-variable likelihood. For model comparison report pointwise residuals, a held-out score with uncertainty, and sensitivity to likelihood and priors. Any empirical choice of optimum threshold is trained in a development-only split, and legacy signed predictions remain frozen as archival controls.

An observational forward model is $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{R}[\mathbf{h}_{\text{baseline}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) + c_{\text{ESFD}}\,\mathbf{h}_{\text{spin}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ where $\mathcal{R}$ is the telescope, detector, or lab response and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ holds nuisance parameters. Document the physical meaning, units, sign, and domain of validity of c_{ESFD} and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. When available, quantify identifiability with the covariance-weighted derivative of the expected data after nuisance projection. If the predicted residual lies in the same direction as an age or calibration change, collect independent information that changes that degeneracy before interpreting a fitted coefficient. For a search across masses, bands, time windows or coefficients, estimate the global false-alarm probability using the same selection and entire search on the control set. Report a tested range for a null result, with sensitivity to injection and population assumptions.

For field computations validate conserved quantities and constraints, eigenvalue benchmarks, background recovery, units and numerical convergence. Vary mesh, time step, domain and dissipation settings. Record equations and their regularization, commits, compiler or Python versions, initial and boundary conditions, numerical cutoffs, and the parameter grid. Prespecify stability and nonlinear diagnostics. Qualitative agreement of an image or plot can be tested through its corresponding quantitative observable. A higher-order EFT term can sometimes be used perturbatively despite unphysical solutions of a fully resummed truncated equation. State explicitly which equations are solved and where their cutoffs lie.

29.3 Results that carry forward

The full rebuilt catalog pipeline and its summaries reproduce from the archived input snapshots. The longest-lived number in the original argument, Λ_{tim}, is useful as a historical comparison line,

and with timing-inferred dipoles it carries exactly the information of a characteristic-age threshold. The class and recurrence tests do not support the hard cut. The new exponential-action analysis provides a separate result in a fully specified local problem. An exponential gauge coupling with a quadratic independent scalar can destabilize a transverse electromagnetic mode even when its prescribed-B scalar curvature is positive. The unstable band and rate are mathematical predictions under the stated action and boundaries. The matched vacuum birefringence gives a conditional lower bound of $2.67 times 10^{15}$ G on its onset. A prescribed spin source and a photon gap alter the threshold in distinct ways, giving quantitative targets for a real spin-polarized plasma model.

The expanded calculations derive a fold for the printed June potential and find a separate ordering and mixed-mode onset in a spin-composite closure. The galaxy exercises now include exterior-radii and whole-galaxy prediction, absolute energy checks and a metric target for a joint fit with lensing. The stellar sequences show how a cold contact correction changes static equilibrium and where stability or causality terminate a tested EOS. The spin–shear calculation gives exact conditions for a turnaround within its homogeneous assumptions. Verifying a universal extra force, inertia of nonmagnetic matter, quantum measurement dynamics, and black-hole geometry still depends on measurements or derivations with explicit shared couplings.

30 Appendix A. Reconstruction ledger

The file **branch_register.csv** contains the more granular evidence and inference ledger. The table here identifies the version families and places their claims within this paper.

Version family and date evidence	Reconstructed content and disposition
June 2–3, 2025 project discussions and June Word version	Intrinsic spin, quark tensor, rigid rotors, the $B\Omega$ rule, saturation potential, clocks, QGP, solar or stellar flares, and merger precursor. Equations (1)–(2) and (13)–(15).
June 3 covariant synthesis in chat, later 2026 recap	Equation (3), historical ambiguity of independent versus composite Φ, time-feedback law, and torsion proposal. This edition restores the action from an excerpt and gives separate consistent variations, (4)–(7).
June consolidated SEFD, Electromagnetic Universe and quantum rewrite	Spin entropy, effective divergences, space and dark-matter alternatives, Pauli coupling, entanglement. Equations (8), (16)–(19), (23), and EFT matching.
June–July E_8, non-Abelian and UV extensions	Frame-Higgs and threshold narrative, masses and dipoles, Spin$(11,3)$, anomalous symmetry breaking, contact versus dipole matching. Section Exceptional symmetry.

Version family and date evidence	Reconstructed content and disposition
Three project PDF manuscripts and December proof copy	Population separation, global energies, compact limits, spin-generated gravity and inertia, relativity and simulations. Rebuilt data and several numerical corrections. Original analyses omitted by old exports are catalogued as unavailable inputs.
2026 Aharonov–Casher and spin reorientation discussion	Neutral-particle phase, response mapping, conventional quantum controls, proposed rotation/field reversal. Section Laboratory spin.
September 17, 2026 CERN versions	Higgs entanglement, off-shell vector density matrix, later distinction between ESFD residual and standard baseline. Equation (22), ATLAS and CMS comparisons.
Later observer and wave discussion, September 2026 cosmology	Observer interface, nested wave geometry, spin–torsion bounce and white-hole/daughter-universe scenarios. Equations (20)–(21), global matching and Bell/observer analysis.
Later related vacuum and astrophysical essays	Resonance, propulsion, anomalous observations, cosmic structure, Earth and vacuum questions. Environmental energy balance, field strength and evidence requirements.
Maxwell and Tesla project companion and gravity extension	Wave stress and invariants, spatial Floquet resonance, material response, finite Earth Yukawa integration, MICROSCOPE comparison and synthetic laboratory readout. Equations (34)–(44).

Additional historical numerical claims discussed in the project records include oscillation and glitch correlations in tiny hand-selected samples, predicted suppression scales near 100 MeV or 10–100 GeV depending on the draft, $\chi \lesssim 10^{-3}$ as an unspecified low-energy coefficient, and cosmic f_{NL} of order unity. A proposed value without operator definitions and a computed response remains an archival claim. In the re-evaluation PDF an external magnetosphere difference under 1%, a spin-fluid Poisson correction of order 10^{-8}, and a null spinning-ring or inertia test are described. The required equations, source parameters and run records are absent from the recovered inputs. They enter this edition as attributed statements. The new local stability solve, verified radius profiles, and TOV benchmarks provide independent calculations with defined assumptions. A1 A2 A6

31 Appendix B. Reproducible calculations and data dictionary

31.1 Included reruns

The companion ZIP places the archived inputs and baseline pipeline in **baseline/**. The 28 baseline manifest entries include ATNF and McGill timing snapshots and a HEASARC mirror, SPARC profiles, GOES and SILSO series, six LALSuite EOS tables, GWOSC and later Zenodo PE summaries, Fermi TTE files, and transcriptions of selected ATLAS, CMS and IXPE results. The inputs folder lists SHA-256 hashes for the two solar inputs, PREM density polynomials and published MICROSCOPE summary. The original 19-file recovery archive, its 40-lead inventory and the Maxwell companion travel with the data. The scripts check all three input manifests and reconstruct the summaries, data tables and figures. Definitions such as “confirmed,” “tagged,” “included event,” or “published interval” use the relevant source criteria.

Computation	Machine-readable outputs in the master package
Catalogs and historical cutoff	**baseline/results/atnf_catalog_with_metrics.csv**, **mcgill_catalog_with_metrics.csv**, **mcgill_alternate_timing_values.csv**, **glitch_recurrence_cohort.csv**.
TOV and mass/spin	**baseline/results/tov_sequences.csv**, **tov_maxima.csv**, **canonical_compact_energy_checks.csv**, **gwtc_cumulative_events.csv**, **gwtc_remnant_spin_summary.csv**.
Rotation and mass-scale checks	**baseline/results/sparc_all_radii.csv**, **sparc_model_fits.csv**, **sparc_model_predictions.csv**, **legacy_dwarf_and_cluster_scale_checks.csv**.
Transients, solar and collider	**baseline/results/gw170817_gbm_detectors.csv**, **gw170817_gbm_offset_scan.csv**, **gw170817_gbm_offsource_controls.csv**, **goes_silso_joined_months.csv**, **atlas_angular_residuals.csv**, **cms_polarization_witness_checks.csv**, **ixpe_polarization_benchmark.csv**.
Scalar growth and finite-size threshold	**results/esfd_scalar_stability.csv**, **esfd_scalar_dispersion.csv**, **esfd_scalar_evolution.csv**, **esfd_scalar_pvlas.csv**.
Spin alignment, flags and polarization	**results/esfd_timing_orientation.csv**, **esfd_spin_polarization.csv**, **esfd_spin_coarse_graining.csv**.
Gravitating magnetic field and torsion	**results/esfd_galaxy_magnetic_energy_budget.csv**, **esfd_torsion_bounce.csv**.

Computation	Machine-readable outputs in the master package
Original spin-potential and composite stability	**results/june_direct_saturation_branches.csv**, **spin_composite_mixed_modes.csv**.
Cold contact sensitivity	**results/stellar_spin_contact_sequences.csv**, **stellar_spin_contact_maxima.csv**.
Entire-galaxy transfer	**results/sparc_galaxy_holdout_predictions.csv**, **sparc_galaxy_holdout_metrics.csv**, **sparc_galaxy_holdout_coefficients.csv**.
Extended archive and timing checks	**results/glitch_chronological_cohorts.csv**, **glitch_chronological_scores.csv**, **solar_blocked_predictions.csv**, **solar_blocked_scores.csv**, **solar_archive_overlap_and_hemispheres.csv**, **gw170817_gbm_precursor_injections.csv**.
Quantum, shear and field-scale tests	**results/atlas_spin_coefficient_covariance_sensitivity.csv**, **esfd_quantum_dephasing_visibility.csv**, **spin_torsion_shear_thresholds.csv**, **spin_torsion_shear_trajectories.csv**, **esfd_cross_scale_field_rotation_scenarios.csv**.
Wave stress and resonance	**results/maxwell_polarization_stress_exchange.csv**, **standing_wave_spatial_band_convergence.csv**, **standing_wave_bloch_floquet_response.csv**. Normalized polarization, wave invariant, energy, stress, frequency, damping and Floquet observables.
Finite range, Earth and stored energy	**results/earth_scalar_force_cancellation.csv**, **electromagnetic_energy_scalar_charge.csv**. SI range and radial gradient, dimensionless transfer and signed coupling, same-mode gap and fixed-boundary charge checks.
Microscopic spin fluid and laboratory readout	**results/einstein_cartan_contact_scale.csv**, **spin_torsion_radiation_dust_bounces.csv**, **phase_sensitive_four_state_recovery.csv**. Density in SI, normalized bounce trajectories and synthetic response in single-read noise units.

The scalar sweep uses $B/B_c = 0$ to 4 and angles 0° to 90°. Azimuth enters only through the stated background symmetry. The illustrative time integration includes an otherwise stable normal-mode admixture. Galaxy residual estimates use the largest eligible measured radius per matched

fit and the square root of a volume-equivalent mass budget. The orientation calculation uses $0.5 \leq s_B \leq 4$ including exact rows at unity and two, and analytic probabilities under an assumed isotropic axis distribution. The degenerate gas model uses the neutron magnetic moment from the software constants and a density 0.16 fm^{-3}. The torsion toy sets $a/a_b = 1$ and $Ht_b = 0$ at the bounce. **baseline/results/summary.json** and **results/spin_benchmarks_summary.json** provide exact summary values. Reproduction commands, dependency versions and reference information accompany this document.

results/wave_gravity_summary.json records the exact new benchmark parameters and outputs. The wave calculation uses periodic spatial boundaries, a frozen pump and linearized spin perturbations. The force calculation is static and assumes a spherical, unscreened source with constant scalar charge per unit mass. The laboratory readout uses seeded synthetic noise and known injected amplitudes. The separately reported published free-fall input is a differential measurement of ordinary test masses.

31.2 Cross-scale correspondence and invalidation

The data cover mostly one-variable or reduced-model consequences. To claim a common ESFD mechanism across scales, a parameter matched to a dipole measurement must give the same low-energy scattering result, and a spin susceptibility calibrated in a stated medium must predict the sign and magnitude of the response in the qualified domain. A claimed relation between susceptibility and spin-down damping needs competing torques and independent B, and a claim about curvature needs independent dynamics and lensing. Predefined uncertainty envelopes convert failures to operator bounds. When multiple independently normalized operators are allowed, tests constrain each measured response and the rank of the joint inference. These requirements prevent a new expression for χ from absorbing a failed prediction by changing its definition after the measurement.

32 What would establish the unified claim?

The project began with a change in the behavior of a spinning object. The clearest experimental statement that can now be made about that idea is conditional on a material phase and a readout. For a superconducting specimen, simultaneous measurements of rotation, superconducting stiffness or penetration depth, magnetic moment and the acceleration of a separate body are needed to connect the proposed chain. A single trace of motion cannot establish which step supplied the signal. The archived spinning-top observation by itself supplies no estimate of the coupling in equation (55).

32.1 A superconducting test with a definite outcome

For a claim that is odd in both signed angular speed and applied axial field, write $y = a_z^{\text{above}} - a_z^{\text{reference}}$, where the reference is offset from the proposed source response and its geometric transfer is measured. At fixed magnitudes of rotation and field define

$$D(T) = \frac{y_{++} - y_{+-} - y_{-+} + y_{--}}{4}, \qquad D_{\text{phase}} = D(T < T_c) - D(T > T_c). \tag{62}$$

This contrast has acceleration units. It removes contributions depending on a single reversal alone. London fields, ordinary rotation-induced magnetization coupled to field gradients, trapped flux, temperature-dependent susceptibility and correlated mechanical vibration can share the same parity. Each therefore requires a simultaneously measured magnetic or mechanical transfer function. A normal metal and a stationary specimen supply additional null channels. Changing sensor height tests the fixed geometric response in (56). An even-in-rotation shielding claim instead belongs in the temperature-switched average over the four states. Using only (62) would cancel such a signal.

Measure T_c and the superconducting response in the actual specimen, record its field-cooling and vortex history, and retain every acquisition interval with its selection flag. Independently determine the gap and the slope of its squared frequency against pair density. Lock the sign, geometry, exposure and predicted gravity signal using that calibration before evaluating a reserved set of temperatures, speeds or a second material. A second measurement of ordinary London flux alone would leave the proposed acceleration coupling unidentified. A repeatable excess in a calibrated free-body or tidal channel, with the correct height and phase dependence across material and field controls, would materially change the case. A null with a known sensitivity narrows the dimensioned coupling for those settings.

32.2 How the source branches stand after the rerun

Branch in the research program	Result or remaining discriminating evidence
Mechanical rotation, inertia and clocks	A measured angular velocity is distinct from microscopic polarization. Classical fixed-pivot stability has an exact threshold. A clock or inertial deviation needs a calibrated geometry, environment and species response. The historical rotor/clock series is unavailable.
Maxwell, Tesla and vacuum fluctuations	The standing-wave invariant changes with polarization at matched mean energy. Historical sources describe stationary waves. A propagating extra material coordinate, its coupling and a measurable pole are separate hypotheses.
Pauli, quark, Higgs and exceptional-symmetry branches	The dimensioned Pauli operator, quark-tensor matrix elements and electroweak embedding are stated earlier. The available records supply no evaluated flow from an E_8 embedding to common low-energy coefficients or measured Higgs, gravitational and galactic parameters.

Branch in the research program	Result or remaining discriminating evidence
Condensate, spin tensor and nonlinear response	The quadratic tensor shift, two-scalar exchange, coupled free energy and finite-energy cavity yield exact or numerical consequences within declared actions. Fitted magnetic length and rotation response are available for Nb. An independently measured second spin mode would bridge the theories.
Laboratory gravity and dense spin matter	Couplings present in normal matter meet terrestrial free-fall limits. Couplings confined to superconductivity meet YBCO limits under specified conditions. A negative spin–torsion stress can influence the idealized dense-fluid model, although minimal normalization is negligible at ordinary nuclear density.
Pulsars, magnetars, black holes and neutron stars	Timing alone reduces the legacy index to characteristic age. Glitches, X-ray polarization, EOS and merger information measure separate quantities. The primary shared NICER overlap favors one negative surrogate term in one EOS, with opposing effects on the two observed stars.
Solar cycling, flaring and merger precursors	The available GOES/SILSO archives, hemisphere tests and Fermi event/off-source/injection analyses reproduce in the full run. Exposure, event selection and independently predicted timing remain necessary for a distinctive ESFD signal.
Galaxies, filaments, clusters and the Great Attractor	The revised profile survives dwarf kinematics and faces a quantitative lensing test. Radio polarization contributes information about global rotation. Anisotropy, a relativistic stress tensor, lensing slip and predicted cluster-scale mass maps remain open. A disk fit cannot account for those scales by extrapolation.
Collapse, horizons, white holes and daughter universes	The computed homogeneous bounce has ordinary finite-sphere null expansions at its turning point. No matched exterior, global causal diagram and distinctive observed signature have been derived from the recovered action.

Branch in the research program	Result or remaining discriminating evidence
Quantum coherence, the observer and emergent spacetime	The Delft trial record reproduces quantum correlations incompatible with the tested local classical assumptions. The field-observer extension needs an operational intervention and outcome probabilities. A hierarchy of patterns still needs an inferred metric and causal propagation law.

The packaged **branch_register.csv** retains 75 individually identified claims, sources, tests and evidence gaps. The original *Proof*, *Re-Evaluation* and *Testing* project PDFs, the recovered Word manuscript and the Maxwell companion remain identified in the source records. The old long master called v150 was located as a historical document reference. Its underlying manuscript and the raw runs for some early FDTD, GRMHD and rotor claims could not be recovered. This master reconstructs the equations from accessible originals, preserves historical alternatives, and supplies new explicit completions. An unavailable derivation has not been treated as a successful reproduction.

33 Sources and references

33.1 ESFD project sources

A1 Grenke, Christopher. *Spin–Field Saturation Dynamics (ESFD): A Unified Framework for Emergent Gravity, Collapse, and Quantum Coherence*. June 3, 2025 Word metadata, archived as **6-3-spin ESFD current .docx**. Sections 3, 5, 8–11 and 14–17 supply the principal original equations, phenomenological cutoff, laboratory proposals and extensions.

A2 *Re-Evaluation of Electromagnetic Spin–Field Dynamics (ESFD) Theory*. Recovered 18-page project PDF. The text reports weak-coupling tests and a set of simulations. Section 3 is the historical record of those simulations.

A3 *Testing Electromagnetic Spin–Field Dynamics (ESFD) Theory with Astrophysical Data*. Recovered five-page project PDF. Sections 1–3 introduce the canonical energy comparison and pulsar, magnetar and compact-object reference values.

A4 *Proof of the Electromagnetic Spin–Field Dynamics (ESFD) Theory*. Recovered 22-page project PDF and editable counterpart, with the latter dated December 10, 2025 in its metadata. The proof title identifies the historical document. Sections 2–6 include the action sketch, emergent-gravity case and normalized saturation variables.

A5 Grenke, Christopher. 2026 September 17 CERN-era drafts, including **PN_ESFD_CERN_FULL_FRAMEWORK_CMS_BODY.html**, the original and corrected Higgs entanglement articles, and their entry/source records. ESFD project topic at Pattern Nexus.

A6 ESFD project conversation excerpts from June–September 2025, December 2025, and June–September 2026. The package's **provenance/historical_notes.md** identifies dates and speaker roles where recovered. The 2025 June 3 covariant-action excerpt and the later corrected-model recap are distinct from the available June Word file. The **recovery_leads.csv** record inside the

original archive identifies unavailable original bytes and runs.

A7 Grenke, Christopher. *The Trap of Reality: Consciousness, the Observer, and the Field Layer Beneath Spacetime*. Three archived 2026 text versions and a later related Pattern Nexus consciousness preview. The wave-emergence discussion is dated December 2025. Published observer essay.

A8 Grenke, Christopher. *The Vacuum Program: Zero-Point Energy, UAP Disclosure, and the Physics Hiding in Plain Sight*. Related project working HTML and sources in **provenance/related/**, alongside the prior recovery register and research histories.

A9 ESFD source and equation reconciliation, November 23, 2026. Direct source checks, June Word metadata, three project PDF versions, archival lead identifiers, and the contrasting composite-field and independent-field interpretations. Included in **provenance/**.

A10 *Maxwell, Tesla, and an ESFD standing-wave calculation*, November 23, 2026. Project companion on counterpropagating waves, the composite gauge coefficient, mixed modes and a uniform Floquet calculation. The original **ESFD_Maxwell_Standing_Wave_Response.html** is included in **provenance/**. The extended derivation and numerical checks are incorporated into this master paper.

33.2 Physics literature and data

R01 Hehl, F. W., von der Heyde, P., Kerlick, G. D., and Nester, J. M. (1976). *General relativity with spin and torsion: Foundations and prospects*. Reviews of Modern Physics 48, 393. Shapiro, I. L. (2002). *Physical aspects of the space-time torsion*. Physics Reports 357, 113–213. Hehl et al. · Shapiro.

R02 Fan, X., Myers, T. G., Sukra, B. A. D., and Gabrielse, G. (2023). *Measurement of the electron magnetic moment*. Physical Review Letters 130, 071801. Schwinger, J. (1948). Leading radiative magnetic moment result. Fan et al. · Schwinger.

R03 Grzadkowski, B., Iskrzyński, M., Misiak, M., and Rosiek, J. (2010). *Dimension-six terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian*. JHEP 10, 085. Operator basis and conventions.

R04 Becattini, F., and Lisa, M. A. (2020). *Polarization and vorticity in the quark–gluon plasma*. Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science 70, 395–423. Review.

R05 Spitkovsky, A. (2006). *Time-dependent force-free pulsar magnetospheres: axisymmetric and oblique rotators*. Astrophysical Journal Letters 648, L51–L54. Paper.

R06 Adler, S. L. (1971). *Photon splitting and photon dispersion in a strong magnetic field*. Annals of Physics 67, 599–647. Dunne, G. V. (2004). *Heisenberg–Euler effective Lagrangians: basics and extensions*. Adler · Dunne.

R07 Aharonov, Y., and Casher, A. (1984). *Topological quantum effects for neutral particles*. Physical Review Letters 53, 319. Cimmino, A., et al. (1989). Neutron interferometry measurement. Sangster, K., et al. (1993). Atom interferometry measurement. Theory · Neutrons · Atoms.

R08 Manchester, R. N., Hobbs, G. B., Teoh, A., and Hobbs, M. (2005). *The Australia Telescope National Facility pulsar catalogue*. Astronomical Journal 129, 1993. Public 2.9.0 timing and glitch snapshots and HEASARC compilation. Olausen, S. A., and Kaspi, V. M. (2014). McGill magnetar catalog. ATNF paper · CSIRO catalog · HEASARC mirror · McGill paper · McGill tables.

R09 Kaspi, V. M., and Beloborodov, A. M. (2017). *Magnetars*. Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics 55, 261–301. Review.

R10 Gavriil, F. P., et al. (2008). *Magnetar-like emission from the young pulsar in Kes 75*. Science 319, 1802–1805. NASA Fermi Crab Nebula flare summary. Kes 75 study · Crab Nebula observations.

R11 CHIME/FRB Collaboration (2020). *A bright millisecond-duration radio burst from a Galactic magnetar*. Nature 587, 54–58. Observation.

R12 Viganò, D., et al. (2013). *Unifying the observational diversity of isolated neutron stars via magneto-thermal evolution models*. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 434, 123–141. Magneto-thermal comparison.

R13 Israel, G. L., et al. (2005). *The discovery of rapid X-ray oscillations in the tail of the SGR 1806–20 hyperflare*. Astrophysical Journal Letters 628, L53. QPO study.

R14 Hessels, J. W. T., et al. (2006). *A radio pulsar spinning at 716 Hz*. Science 311, 1901–1904. Breu, C., and Rezzolla, L. (2016). *Maximum mass, moment of inertia and compactness of relativistic stars*. MNRAS 459, 646–656. 716 Hz observation · Uniform rotation estimates.

R15 Taverna, R., et al. (2022). *Polarized X-rays from a magnetar*. Science 378, 646–650. IXPE result.

R16 Tolman, R. C. (1939). Static relativistic fluid solutions. Oppenheimer, J. R., and Volkoff, G. M. (1939). Massive neutron core equilibrium. LALSuite public EOS tables, software release 8.0.2 in the snapshot. Tolman · Oppenheimer–Volkoff · LALSuite.

R17 Ji, X. (1997). *Gauge-invariant decomposition of nucleon spin*. Physical Review Letters 78, 610. Yang, Y.-B., et al. (2018). *Proton mass decomposition from the QCD energy momentum tensor*. Physical Review Letters 121, 212001. Ji · Yang et al..

R18 STAR Collaboration (2017). *Global Λ hyperon polarization in nuclear collisions*. Nature 548, 62–65. STAR Collaboration (2022). Blind analysis of the chiral magnetic effect in isobar collisions. Physical Review C 105, 014901. Polarization · Isobar analysis.

R19 Kerr, R. P. (1963). *Gravitational field of a spinning mass as an example of algebraically special metrics*. Physical Review Letters 11, 237. GWOSC cumulative event snapshot and GWTC-4.1/5.0 PE tables. LVK GW230529 event. Kerr · GWOSC · GWTC-4.1 PE · GWTC-5.0 PE · GW230529.

R20 Blandford, R. D., and Znajek, R. L. (1977). *Electromagnetic extraction of energy from Kerr black holes*. MNRAS 179, 433–456. Paper.

R21 LIGO, Virgo, Fermi GBM and INTEGRAL (2017). *Gravitational waves and gamma-rays from a binary neutron star merger: GW170817 and GRB 170817A*. ApJL 848, L13. Public Fermi GRB170817A time-tagged events. Joint analysis · GBM data.

R22 Xiao, S., et al. (2022). *The peculiar precursor of a gamma-ray burst from a binary merger involving a magnetar*. Precursor study and QPO candidate.

R23 Touboul, P., et al. (2022). *MICROSCOPE mission: final results of the test of the equivalence principle*. Physical Review Letters 129, 121102. Final result.

R24 Bothwell, T., et al. (2022). *Resolving the gravitational redshift across a millimetre-scale atomic sample*. Nature 602, 420–424. Clock measurement.

R25 Everitt, C. W. F., et al. (2011). *Gravity Probe B: final results of a space experiment to test general relativity*. Physical Review Letters 106, 221101. Frame-dragging measurement.

R26 Beck, R. (2016). *Magnetic fields in spiral galaxies*. Astronomy and Astrophysics Review 24, 4. Observational review.

R27 Heckel, B. R., et al. (2008). *Preferred-frame and CP-violation tests with polarized electrons*. Physical Review D 78, 092006. Polarized torsion pendulum.

R28 Lelli, F., McGaugh, S. S., and Schombert, J. M. (2016). *SPARC: mass models for 175 disk galaxies with Spitzer photometry and accurate rotation curves*. Astronomical Journal 152, 157. Paper · Data.

R29 McGaugh, S. S., Lelli, F., and Schombert, J. M. (2016). *Radial acceleration relation in rotationally supported galaxies*. Physical Review Letters 117, 201101. Reference relation.

R30 Fukushima, K., Kharzeev, D. E., and Warringa, H. J. (2008). *The chiral magnetic effect*. Physical Review D 78, 074033. Constitutive effect.

R31 Visser, M. (2002), review of Sakharov induced gravity. Jacobson, T. (1995), thermodynamic field-equation argument. Verlinde, E. (2011), entropic-gravity proposal. Visser · Jacobson · Verlinde.

R32 Haisch, B., Rueda, A., and Puthoff, H. E. (1994). *Inertia as a zero-point-field Lorentz force*. Physical Review A 49, 678. Cramer, J. G. (1986). *The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics*. Reviews of Modern Physics 58, 647. Vacuum-inertia proposal · Transactional interpretation.

R33 Wolf, J., et al. (2010). Masses of dispersion-supported galaxies. Umetsu, K., et al. (2015). Weak-lensing analysis of Abell 1689. Draco half-light estimate · Abell 1689 comparison.

R34 Alves, J., et al. (2020). *A Galactic-scale gas wave in the solar neighbourhood*. Nature 578, 237–239. Konietzka, R., et al. (2024). *The Radcliffe Wave is oscillating*. Nature 628, 62–65. Tully, R. B., et al. (2014). *The Laniakea supercluster of galaxies*. Nature 513, 71–73. Radcliffe discovery · Wave kinematics · Peculiar velocity structure.

R35 Clowe, D., et al. (2006). Bullet Cluster weak-lensing and baryon offset. Astrophysical Journal Letters 648, L109–L113. Weak-lensing study.

R36 Planck Collaboration (2020). Planck 2018 cosmological parameters and primordial non-Gaussianity analyses. Parameter results · Non-Gaussianity constraints.

R37 Planck Collaboration (2016), primordial magnetic fields. Minami, Y., and Komatsu, E. (2020), cosmic polarization analysis. Magnetic field constraints · Birefringence methods.

R38 Popławski, N. J. (2010, 2016, 2020). Einstein–Cartan cosmology and spin-fluid collapse examples. Cosmology with torsion · Universe in a black hole · Collapse with torsion.

R39 Penrose, R. (1965), gravitational collapse and spacetime singularities. Haggard, H. M., and Rovelli, C. (2015), black-to-white hole tunneling proposal. LVK (2021), GR tests with GWTC-3. Singularity theorem · Tunneling proposal · Waveform tests.

R40 Shamir, L. (2025). *The distribution of galaxy rotation in JWST Advanced Deep Extragalactic Survey*. MNRAS 538, 76–91. Deep-field result.

R41 ALICE Collaboration (2016). *Direct photon production in Pb–Pb collisions at 2.76 TeV*. Physics Letters B 754, 235–248. Photon spectra.

R42 CERN. Higgs field and boson, physical context and discovery summary. Higgs overview.

R43 Bezrukov, F. L., and Shaposhnikov, M. (2008). *The Standard Model Higgs boson as the inflaton*. Physics Letters B 659, 703–706. Nonminimal-curvature model.

R44 ATLAS Collaboration (2026). *Measurements of Z-boson pair entanglement in decays of Higgs bosons at the ATLAS experiment*. Relevant angular coefficients are in Table 1. Paper with table · Result record.

R45 CMS Collaboration. *Study of spin correlations in Higgs boson decays to four leptons*. CMS-PAS-HIG-25-011. Results, figures and covariance context.

R46 ATLAS Collaboration (2024). *Observation of quantum entanglement with top quarks at the ATLAS detector*. Nature 633, 542–547. Top-quark result.

R47 Lisi, A. G. (2007). *An exceptionally simple theory of everything*. Distler, J., and Garibaldi, S. (2010). *There is no "theory of everything" inside E_8*. Communications in Mathematical Physics 298,

419–436. Lisi proposal · Distler–Garibaldi obstruction.

R48 Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A., and Holt, R. A. (1969), correlation inequality. Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., and Horodecki, M. (1995), criterion for two-qubit CHSH violation. Hensen, B., et al. (2015), loophole-free spin test. CHSH · Two-qubit criterion · Spin experiment.

R49 Lindblad, G. (1976). *On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups*. Communications in Mathematical Physics 48, 119–130. Bassi, A., et al. (2013). Collapse models and experimental tests. Reviews of Modern Physics 85, 471. Generator · Collapse models.

R50 Hoffman, D. D., and Prakash, C. (2014). *Objects of consciousness*. Frontiers in Psychology 5, 577. Conscious-agent proposal.

R51 NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information, GOES science-quality flare report. WDC–SILSO, Royal Observatory of Belgium, Brussels, daily sunspot numbers. The package contains project-provided snapshots of the two sources. GOES documentation · SILSO data.

R52 Bobra, M. G., et al. (2014). HMI vector magnetic field pipeline and Space-Weather HMI Active Region Patches. Solar Physics 289, 3549–3578. NOAA Space Weather Prediction Center. SHARP field data methods · Space weather reference.

R53 U.S. Geological Survey. Geomagnetic disturbances and earthquake science. USGS earthquake causation FAQ.

R54 Jaffe, R. L. (2005). *Casimir effect and the quantum vacuum*. Physical Review D 72, 021301. Wilson, C. M., et al. (2011). *Observation of the dynamical Casimir effect in a superconducting circuit*. Nature 479, 376–379. Static interpretation · Driven experiment.

R55 Tajmar, M., Neunzig, O., and Weikert, M. (2021). *High-accuracy thrust measurements of the EMDrive and elimination of false-positive effects*. Pais, S. C., U.S. Patent 10,144,532. Precision thrust study · Patent record.

R56 DARPA ARRIVE research description and 2026 ExPEDitions proposer lightning talks, including the reported power-cell voltages. NASA independent UAP report and public scientific FAQ. Related vacuum documentation in A8. ARRIVE · Proposer slides · NASA UAP scientific summary.

R57 Balezin, M., et al. (2018). *Electromagnetic properties of the Great Pyramid: first multipole resonances and energy concentration*. Journal of Applied Physics 124, 034903. Driven-scattering study.

R58 Wigner, E. P. (1939). *On unitary representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group*. Annals of Mathematics 40, 149–204. Particle spin representations.

R61 Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., and Horodecki, M. (1995). *Violating Bell inequality by mixed spin-1/2 states, necessary and sufficient condition*. Physics Letters A 200, 340–344. Two-qubit CHSH criterion.

R62 Popławski, N. J. (2012). *Nonsingular, big-bounce cosmology from spinor-torsion coupling*. Physical Review D 85, 107502. See also the author's 2021 IBERICOS proceedings on shear competition. Spinor-torsion paper · Shear discussion.

R59 Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration (2019), first M87 shadow results. NANOGrav Collaboration (2023), 15-year stochastic-background evidence. EHT baseline · NANOGrav baseline.

R60 Ejlli, A., Della Valle, F., Gastaldi, U., Messineo, G., Pengo, R., Ruoso, G., and Zavattini, G. (2020). *The PVLAS experiment: a 25 year effort to measure vacuum magnetic birefringence*. Physics Reports 871, 1–74. Final measurement and convention.

R63 Giulini, D. (2018). *Laue's theorem revisited: Energy-momentum tensors, symmetries, and the habitat of globally conserved quantities*. International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern

Physics 15, 1850182. Stationary integrated stress.

R64 Fulling, S. A., et al. (2007). *How does Casimir energy fall?* Physical Review D 76, 025004. Including the interaction energy in the complete system.

R65 Dziewonski, A. M., and Anderson, D. L. (1981). *Preliminary reference Earth model*. Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors 25, 297–356. Original PREM, density polynomials in Table I.

R66 Fayet, P. (2026). *Hyperbolic form factors for Yukawa interactions, and applications to the Earth*. European Physical Journal C 86, 1125. Finite-source kernel and nominal satellite altitude.

R67 Touboul, P., et al. (MICROSCOPE Collaboration, 2022). *MICROSCOPE mission: Final results of the test of the equivalence principle*. Physical Review Letters 129, 121102. Final Ti–Pt free-fall measurement.

R68 Popławski, N. (2016). *Universe in a black hole in Einstein–Cartan gravity*. Astrophysical Journal 832, 96. Journal article · Author's preprint with spin-fluid coefficient.

33.3 Sources for the independent data and proofs

R69 Ferrer, F., and Grifols, J. A. (2001). Vacuum and thermal two-scalar exchange. The vacuum expression gives the $K_1(2mr)/r^2$ dependence used here. Physical Review D 63, 025020.

R70 Damour, T., and Donoghue, J. F. (2010). Nuclear electromagnetic dilaton charges and equivalence-principle tests. Operator normalization and composition dependence.

R71 McDonough, W. F. (2003), *Compositional Model for the Earth's Core*, Table 5. Fayet, P. (2018), *MICROSCOPE limits for new long-range forces and implications for unified theories*, test alloy compositions. Commission on Isotopic Abundances and Atomic Weights, standard atomic weights. Earth chemistry · Alloy composition · Atomic weights.

R72 Tong, D., *Classical Dynamics*, rigid bodies and the sleeping top. Barnett, S. J. (1915), *Magnetization by Rotation*. Stability derivation · Rotation-induced magnetization.

R73 Oh, S.-H., et al. (2015). *High-resolution Mass Models of Dwarf Galaxies from LITTLE THINGS*. Astronomical Journal 149, 180. Tables 1–2 and data behind Figures 2–4. SPARC comparison positions from VizieR J/AJ/152/157. Article and figure data · Position catalog.

R74 Mistele, T., McGaugh, S., Lelli, F., Schombert, J., and Li, P. (2024). *Indefinitely Flat Circular Velocities and the Baryonic Tully–Fisher Relation from Weak Lensing*. Astrophysical Journal Letters 969, L3. Revised Table 1 and tabulated mass-bin means in Table 2. Article · Machine-readable table.

R75 Choudhury, D., et al. (2024). *A NICER View of the Nearest and Brightest Millisecond Pulsar, PSR J0437–4715*. The headline equally weighted joint mass–radius posterior and authors' documentation are included in the computational package. Data and original report.

R76 Salmi, T., et al. (2024). *The Radius of the High-mass Pulsar PSR J0740+6620 with 3.6 yr of NICER Data*. The selected joint posterior and authors' documentation are included. Data and original report.

R77 Bovy, J., *galpy*, logarithmic halo potential and its spherical limit. Potential and normalization.

R78 Bekenstein, J., and Milgrom, M. (1984). *Does the missing mass problem signal the breakdown of Newtonian gravity?* Astrophysical Journal 286, 7–14. Modified Poisson action and limits.

R79 Power, E. A., and Thirunamachandran, T. (1993). *Casimir–Polder potential as an interaction between induced dipoles*. Vacuum fluctuation and dipole calculation.

R80 Tabatabaei, F. S., et al. (2016). *An Empirical Relation Between the Large-scale Magnetic Field and the Dynamical Mass in Galaxies*. Astrophysical Journal Letters 818, L10. All integrated 4.8 GHz flux and global-property measurements used here are central values from Table 1. Paper and table.

R81 Tate, J., et al. (1989, 1990). Precision niobium rotating-ring measurements of the London moment and the observable Cooper-pair mass. Cabrera, B., and Peskin, M. E. (1989), *Cooper-pair mass*. Letter · Full measurement · Historical theoretical reference.

R82 McFadden, R. M. L., et al. (2026). Niobium penetration depth and coherence length from muon spin spectroscopy and secondary-ion mass spectrometry, supplement Table S4 and main Table II. Journal · Report with supplement.

R83 Podkletnov, E., and Nieminen, R. (1992), original YBCO claim. Li, N., et al. (1997), static gravimeter test. Hathaway, G., Cleveland, B., and Bao, Y. (2003), rotating-disk weight test. Original · Static measurement · Rotating test.

R84 Liarte, D. B., et al. (2017), Fermilab report PUB-16-699-TD, Table I, representative thermodynamic critical fields of Nb, Nb_3Sn, NbN and MgB_2. Nagamatsu, J., et al. (2001), superconductivity at 39 K in MgB_2. Cava, R. J., et al. (1987), bulk superconductivity at 91 K in a single-phase yttrium barium cuprate. Materials table · MgB_2 · YBCO.

R85 Hg-1223 ambient-pressure benchmarks. The earlier report attributed a transition as high as 133 K to Hg-1223. Deng, L., et al. (2026) reported a resistive onset as high as 151 K in a pressure-quenched metastable sample. Earlier measurement · 2026 paper.

R86 Drozdov, A. P., et al. (2019). *Superconductivity at 250 K in lanthanum hydride under high pressures*. Nature 569, 528–531.

R87 Verheijen, A. A., et al. (1990). *Measurement of the London moment in two high-temperature superconductors*. Nature 345, 418–419.

R88 Hensen, B., et al. (2015). *Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres*. Nature 526, 682–686. The original archive includes recorded events, readout and input definitions and the authors' gate example. Experiment · 4TU data.

R89 Faraoni, V. (2011). *Cosmological apparent and trapping horizons*. Physical Review D 84, 024003. Expansions and apparent horizon in FLRW geometry.

R90 Lander, S. K. (2013), *Magnetic Fields in Superconducting Neutron Stars*. Neutron-vortex and proton-flux-tube dynamics are treated separately in work on interlinked arrays. Type-II core equilibrium · Vortex and flux densities.