

CTMT Axis and Hessian Boundary Constant α : Minimal-Assumption Pipeline on PTB 3D Coil Data

Rada Matěj

Email: MatejRada@email.cz

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 License.

Abstract

We implement a measurement-first CTMT pipeline to (i) estimate the coil axis and (ii) compute the Hessian boundary constant α from the Fisher axis block, using only admissibility principles (no PDEs or global field models). Synthetic data are generated directly from traceable PTB coil parameters. Three stages are documented: (I) an early baseline (no retiming), (II) a phase-retimed evaluation, and (III) the final rigidity-boundary evaluation (5° cone). We report per-window axis accuracy, α stability, wobble invariance, unit-invariant conditioning, and Fisher rank in fully inlined tables. We also provide an order-of-magnitude benchmark against CODATA relative uncertainties (context only).

1 Data and Provenance

PTB 3D coil parameters. Coil constants (k_x, k_y, k_z) and inter-axis misalignment (millidegrees), with compensated local background $\lesssim 20$ nT, are taken from Rott et al. (2022). Synthetic center-field data at 1 mT are generated via

$$K = R \operatorname{diag}(k_x, k_y, k_z),$$

and split into 12 windows for stability checks. ¹

2 CTMT Pipeline (Minimal Assumptions)

Repair and Admission

- **Unit-invariant conditioning.** Conditioning is evaluated on diagonally normalized Fisher, κ_{norm} .
- **Robust covariance.** Per-window channel scales are estimated by a MAD proxy; Fisher uses $C = \sigma^2 I$ for scalar projection noise.
- **Phase retiming (static surrogate).** Each analytic channel is rotated so its mean is real-positive (removing constant phase retardation; the static analogue of stream retiming).

Kernel and α

Hilbert-space vector kernel with nuisance amplitude and phase:

$$z = (A \mathbf{u}) a e^{i\phi}, \quad \text{observables: } (\Re z, \Im z).$$

Fisher is $F = J^T C^{-1} J$ (centered finite differences). The 2×2 axis block F_{axis} yields eigenvalues $\lambda_\perp \leq \lambda_\parallel$ and

$$\alpha_{\text{ratio}} = \frac{\lambda_\perp}{\lambda_\parallel}, \quad \alpha_{\text{cone}} = \arctan \sqrt{\lambda_\perp / \lambda_\parallel}.$$

¹N. Rott, J. Lüdke, R. Ketzler, M. Albrecht, F. Weickert, *J. Sens. Sens. Syst.* 11 (2022) 211–218.

Axis Estimation

With axis-focused excitation (cone), the admitted estimator is the mean-field direction,

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\overline{\Re A}}{\|\overline{\Re A}\|},$$

no PDEs or global model required.

3 Stage I — Baseline (No Retiming, Center Evaluation)

Axis Accuracy

Mean absolute angular error across 12 windows: **0.57°** (std. 0.35°).

Table 1: Stage I: per-window axis error (degrees).

Window	Axis Error (deg)
0	0.453 76
1	0.445 65
2	0.547 26
3	0.445 27
4	1.609 28
5	0.311 48
6	0.555 36
7	0.442 51
8	0.662 05
9	0.535 50
10	0.610 74
11	0.226 07

Hessian Boundary Constant α

median $\alpha_{\text{ratio}} = 0.802$, IQR = 0.098, median $\alpha_{\text{cone}} = 41.84^\circ$, IQR = 1.76°,
wobble drift (0.2°): 1.4×10^{-3} .

Table 2: Stage I: per-window α (with wobble) and κ_{norm} .

Window	α_{ratio}	α_{cone} (deg)	α_{ratio} (wobble)	α_{cone} (wobble, deg)	κ_{norm}
0	0.806 87	41.932 10	0.808 27	41.956 75	1.015 85
1	0.861 16	42.860 88	0.862 63	42.885 31	1.098 40
2	0.755 43	40.995 74	0.756 78	41.021 10	1.008 63
3	0.921 66	43.831 87	0.923 04	43.853 14	1.062 51
4	0.835 28	42.425 33	0.836 92	42.453 23	1.197 85
5	0.837 58	42.464 49	0.838 93	42.487 60	1.106 88
6	0.704 93	40.016 90	0.706 17	40.041 68	1.151 59
7	0.796 70	41.751 42	0.797 98	41.774 24	1.233 25
8	0.935 10	44.038 99	0.936 85	44.065 71	1.066 30
9	0.747 51	40.846 20	0.748 71	40.869 05	1.043 95
10	0.737 93	40.663 55	0.739 42	40.692 14	1.013 37
11	0.736 70	40.639 93	0.737 96	40.664 18	1.191 58

4 Stage II/III — Phase-Retimed, 5° Rigidity-Boundary (Final)

Axis Accuracy (retimed)

Mean absolute angular error across 12 windows: **0.30°** (std. 0.11°).

Table 3: Stage II/III: per-window axis error (degrees).

Window	Axis Error (deg)
0	0.370 104
1	0.198 866
2	0.268 313
3	0.112 322
4	0.286 401
5	0.233 843
6	0.355 686
7	0.199 983
8	0.327 371
9	0.287 220
10	0.382 768
11	0.552 700

Hessian Boundary Constant α (retimed, boundary)

median $\alpha_{\text{ratio}} = 0.864$, IQR = 0.096, median $\alpha_{\text{cone}} = 42.91^\circ$, IQR = 1.58° ,
wobble drift (0.2°): 6.07×10^{-3} ; full Fisher **rank** = **4**; κ_{norm} bounded in all windows.

Table 4: Stage II/III: per-window α (with wobble) and κ_{norm} .

Window	α_{ratio}	α_{cone} (deg)	α_{ratio} (wobble)	α_{cone} (wobble, deg)	κ_{norm}
0	0.758 584	41.054 796	0.764 369	41.162 612	1.240 54
1	0.861 450	42.865 737	0.867 597	42.967 306	1.094 40
2	0.922 888	43.850 851	0.929 121	43.947 196	1.066 28
3	0.771 890	41.301 657	0.778 397	41.420 923	1.295 32
4	0.930 041	43.961 360	0.935 390	44.043 452	1.068 10
5	0.879 676	43.164 910	0.885 375	43.257 218	1.075 03
6	0.977 785	44.678 216	0.985 000	44.783 513	1.003 40
7	0.830 578	42.344 811	0.836 604	42.447 920	1.151 96
8	0.911 569	43.674 253	0.917 798	43.771 701	1.074 16
9	0.783 482	41.513 500	0.789 085	41.614 841	1.167 06
10	0.832 529	42.378 279	0.838 563	42.481 299	1.200 40
11	0.867 188	42.960 571	0.873 202	43.059 325	1.067 82

5 Cross-Stage Comparison (Improvement)

Table 5: Summary of improvements across stages.

Metric	Stage I	Stage II/III	Notes
Axis error (mean)	0.57°	0.30°	Phase retiming & boundary excitation
α_{ratio} median	0.802	0.864	Boundary evaluation (5° cone)
α_{ratio} spread	~9.3%	~7.9%	Robust C , κ_{norm} bounded
Wobble drift (0.2°)	1.4×10^{-3}	6.1×10^{-3}	At boundary (flatter)
Fisher rank	3	4	Enriched (axis+amp+phase)

6 CODATA Yardstick (Order-of-Magnitude Only)

For context (not equivalence), CODATA 2022 reports $\alpha_{\text{FS}} = 7.297\,352\,5643(11) \times 10^{-3}$ with relative standard uncertainty 1.6×10^{-10} . Our present relative spread on the Hessian boundary constant is $\sim 7.9 \times 10^{-2}$, i.e. ~ 8 orders looser—expected before a full CTMT loop on live streams with causal retiming and fixed-point admission. ²

Notes on Next Increments

To tighten α further in live pipelines: (i) enforce monotone coherence time τ via lag scans (retiming), (ii) maintain robust channel-wise C , (iii) verify stacking admissibility on any kernel enrichment, and (iv) evaluate at the rigidity boundary with an axis-focused cone.

References

- N. Rott et al., *J. Sens. Sens. Syst.* 11 (2022) 211–218.
- NIST CODATA 2022 recommended values.
- CTMT methodology: Fisher rigidity, admissibility gates, coherence diagnostics.

²NIST/CODATA (2024): CODATA 2022 recommended values, wall summary and fine-structure α page.