

# Equivariant Spectral Decomposition with Coefficient One

A Universal Tool for Orbifold Spectral Theory

Jixiang Leng

February 2026

## Abstract

Let  $D$  be a self-adjoint operator with compact resolvent on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $G$  be a finite group acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  by unitaries that commute with  $D$ . We prove that for any bounded Borel function  $f$  and any minimal central idempotent  $e_m$  of  $\mathbb{C}[G]$ , the identity  $\mathrm{Tr}(f(D)e_m) = \mathrm{Tr}(f(D_m))$  holds with coefficient exactly 1, where  $D_m = D|_{e_m\mathcal{H}}$ . The proof is three lines of functional calculus, but the result is not trivial: we exhibit an explicit counterexample (a non-isometric  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  action on  $S^1$ ) where the coefficient becomes cutoff-dependent. We then demonstrate five applications where this “coefficient one” identity eliminates ambiguities that would otherwise undermine physical or mathematical conclusions: (i) spectral action sector decomposition on orbifolds, (ii) heat kernel asymptotics and one-loop effective actions, (iii) Casimir energy on orbifold compactifications, (iv) equivariant index theory and generation counting, and (v) band structure in crystallographic point groups. We also discuss obstructions (non-finite groups, continuous spectrum, anti-unitary actions) and a connection to equivariant K-theory via the Baum–Connes assembly map.

## 1 Introduction

A recurring situation in spectral geometry and mathematical physics: an operator  $D$  acts on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , a finite group  $G$  acts by symmetries, and the spectrum decomposes into sectors labeled by the irreducible representations of  $G$ . A spectral quantity — a trace, a zeta value, a heat coefficient, an eta invariant — is computed for each sector. The question arises:

*Does the per-sector quantity depend on the regularization scheme?*

If it does, the decomposition is an artifact; if it does not, it is a geometric invariant. The purpose of this paper is to provide a single, general theorem that settles this question

for all finite isometric group actions, and to demonstrate its reach through a catalog of applications.

The theorem itself is elementary — three steps of functional calculus — and experts in operator algebra may regard it as “well known.” However, we argue that its value lies not in the proof but in the *generality of application*. Like a wrench, the tool is simple; the art is knowing which bolts it fits. We exhibit five such bolts from different areas of mathematics and physics, and one explicit counterexample showing that the result has content: it fails when the isometry condition is violated.

## 2 Setup and Notation

**Definition 2.1** (Spectral triple with finite group action). *Let  $(\mathcal{H}, D)$  be a spectral datum consisting of:*

- A separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ .
- A self-adjoint operator  $D$  with compact resolvent (hence discrete spectrum  $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $|\lambda_n| \rightarrow \infty$ ).

Let  $G$  be a finite group acting on  $\mathcal{H}$  by unitary operators  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$  satisfying the **isometry condition**:

$$\rho(g) D = D \rho(g) \quad \text{for all } g \in G. \quad (1)$$

**Definition 2.2** (Minimal central idempotents). *The group algebra  $\mathbb{C}[G]$  decomposes as a direct sum of matrix algebras, one for each irreducible representation  $\pi_m$  of  $G$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$  where  $r$  is the number of irreducible representations). The **minimal central idempotents** are:*

$$e_m = \frac{\dim \pi_m}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \overline{\chi_m(g)} \rho(g), \quad (2)$$

where  $\chi_m$  is the character of  $\pi_m$ . These satisfy:

$$e_m^2 = e_m, \quad (3)$$

$$e_m e_{m'} = 0 \quad \text{for } m \neq m', \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{r-1} e_m = \mathbf{1}. \quad (5)$$

**Definition 2.3** (Sector Hilbert space and restricted operator). *The  $m$ -th sector Hilbert space is  $\mathcal{H}_m = e_m \mathcal{H}$ . The restricted operator is  $D_m = D|_{\mathcal{H}_m}$ .*

### 3 The Main Theorem

**Theorem 3.1** (Coefficient One). *Let  $(\mathcal{H}, D, G, \rho)$  be as in Definition 2.1, satisfying the isometry condition (1). Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a Borel function such that  $f(D)$  is trace-class<sup>1</sup>. Then for each minimal central idempotent  $e_m$ :*

$$\boxed{\text{Tr}(f(D) e_m) = \text{Tr}(f(D_m))}. \quad (6)$$

In particular, the coefficient of every per-sector spectral quantity (eta invariant, heat coefficient, zeta value) is exactly 1, independent of  $f$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds in three steps.

**Step 1:  $f(D)$  commutes with  $e_m$ .**

Since  $G$  acts by isometries,  $\rho(g)D = D\rho(g)$  for all  $g \in G$ . By the functional calculus for self-adjoint operators, for any bounded Borel function  $f$ :

$$\rho(g) f(D) = f(D) \rho(g) \quad \text{for all } g \in G. \quad (7)$$

*Proof of (7):* Let  $D = \int \lambda dE(\lambda)$  be the spectral decomposition, so  $f(D) = \int f(\lambda) dE(\lambda)$ . Since  $\rho(g)$  commutes with  $D$ , it commutes with every spectral projection  $E(B)$  for Borel sets  $B \subset \mathbb{R}$  (standard result: see [4], Theorem VIII.5). Therefore  $\rho(g)$  commutes with  $\int f(\lambda) dE(\lambda) = f(D)$ .

Since  $e_m$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear combination of the  $\rho(g)$  (equation (2)), it follows that:

$$[f(D), e_m] = 0. \quad (8)$$

**Step 2: The trace decomposes.**

Since  $e_m$  is a projection ( $e_m^2 = e_m$ ) and commutes with  $f(D)$ , the operator  $f(D) e_m = e_m f(D) e_m$  acts on  $\mathcal{H}_m = e_m \mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\{|\psi_n^{(m)}\rangle\}$  be an orthonormal eigenbasis of  $D_m$  in  $\mathcal{H}_m$  with eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_n^{(m)}\}$ . Then:

$$\text{Tr}(f(D) e_m) = \sum_n \langle \psi_n^{(m)} | f(D) e_m | \psi_n^{(m)} \rangle \quad (9)$$

$$= \sum_n \langle \psi_n^{(m)} | f(D) | \psi_n^{(m)} \rangle \quad (\text{since } e_m | \psi_n^{(m)} \rangle = | \psi_n^{(m)} \rangle) \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_n f(\lambda_n^{(m)}) \quad (\text{since } | \psi_n^{(m)} \rangle \text{ is an eigenstate of } D) \quad (11)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(f(D_m)). \quad (12)$$

**Step 3: The coefficient is 1.**

Equation (12) shows  $\text{Tr}(f(D) e_m) = \text{Tr}(f(D_m))$  with coefficient exactly 1, for any trace-class  $f(D)$ . No normalization, no  $f$ -dependent prefactor.  $\square$   $\square$

---

<sup>1</sup>This holds for heat kernels  $f(x) = e^{-tx^2}$ , resolvents  $f(x) = (x^2 + m^2)^{-s}$  with  $\text{Re}(s)$  sufficiently large, smooth cutoffs with sufficient decay, and more generally any  $f$  for which  $\sum_n |f(\lambda_n)| < \infty$ . The eta function case  $f(x) = \text{sign}(x)|x|^{-s}$  is handled by analytic continuation.

## 4 Why the Result Is Not Trivial: A Counterexample

One might suspect that Theorem 3.1 is vacuous — that “the coefficient is always 1” regardless of assumptions. We show this is false: when the isometry condition (1) is violated, the coefficient becomes  $f$ -dependent.

**Example 4.1** (Non-isometric  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  action on  $S^1$ ). Let  $\mathcal{H} = L^2(S^1)$  with the standard Dirac operator  $D_0 = -i d/d\theta$ , spectrum  $\{n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Let  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  act by the reflection  $\theta \mapsto -\theta$ , which is an isometry of the round  $S^1$ . In this case,  $[\rho(\sigma), D_0] = 0$  and Theorem 3.1 applies: all spectral quantities decompose with coefficient 1.

Now deform the metric: let  $D_\epsilon = -i h(\theta)^{-1} d/d\theta$  where  $h(\theta) = 1 + \epsilon \cos \theta$  ( $|\epsilon| < 1$ ). The reflection  $\theta \mapsto -\theta$  preserves  $h$  (since  $h(-\theta) = h(\theta)$ ), so it is still an isometry and  $[\rho(\sigma), D_\epsilon] = 0$ . Theorem 3.1 still applies.

But consider instead the non-isometric action  $\theta \mapsto \theta + \pi$  (translation by half-period) with the same deformed metric  $h(\theta) = 1 + \epsilon \cos \theta$ . Since  $h(\theta + \pi) = 1 - \epsilon \cos \theta \neq h(\theta)$  for  $\epsilon \neq 0$ , this action does not preserve the metric. Therefore  $[\rho(\sigma), D_\epsilon] \neq 0$ , and:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(f(D_\epsilon) e_{\text{even}}) \neq \mathrm{Tr}(f((D_\epsilon)_{\text{even}})) \quad \text{for generic } f. \quad (13)$$

Explicitly: the eigenvalues of  $D_\epsilon$  are  $\mu_n = n + \epsilon c_n + O(\epsilon^2)$  where the perturbation coefficients  $c_n$  depend on the parity of  $n$  asymmetrically. The even-sector trace  $\sum_{n \text{ even}} f(\mu_n)$  differs from  $\mathrm{Tr}(f(D_\epsilon) e_{\text{even}})$  by  $O(\epsilon)$  corrections whose sign and magnitude depend on  $f$ . The “coefficient” is no longer 1 but a function of the cutoff.

**Remark 4.2** (The isometry condition has teeth). The counterexample shows that Theorem 3.1 is genuinely a theorem about isometric group actions. The word “isometry” cannot be weakened to “diffeomorphism,” “conformal map,” or “homeomorphism.” The wrench fits only isometric bolts.

## 5 Application 1: Spectral Action on Orbifolds

**Corollary 5.1** (Cutoff independence of sector corrections). In the Connes–Chamseddine spectral action [1, 2], the bosonic action on a Riemannian orbifold  $M/G$  is  $S = \mathrm{Tr}(f(D/\Lambda))$  where  $f$  is a cutoff function and  $\Lambda$  a scale. The sector decomposition

$$S = \sum_{m=0}^{r-1} S_m, \quad S_m = \mathrm{Tr}(f(D_m/\Lambda)), \quad (14)$$

holds with coefficient 1 per sector, independent of the choice of  $f$ .

This is the original motivation for the theorem. Applied to  $S^5/\mathbb{Z}_3$ : the three  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  sectors  $(\chi_0, \chi_1, \chi_2)$  contribute their respective eta invariants  $\eta_D(\chi_m)$  to the Yukawa coupling phase with coefficient exactly 1, regardless of whether  $f$  is a sharp cutoff, a smooth Schwartz function, or a heat kernel. This eliminates a potential source of scheme dependence in the derivation of the Koide phase  $\delta = 2\pi/3 + 2/9$  from the spectral geometry of  $S^5/\mathbb{Z}_3$  [9].

**Remark 5.2.** The Seeley–DeWitt expansion  $\text{Tr}(f(D/\Lambda)) \sim \sum_k f_k \Lambda^{d-k} a_k(D)$  involves “moments”  $f_k = \int_0^\infty f(u) u^{k/2-1} du$  that do depend on  $f$ . The theorem does not say these moments are universal — it says the sector decomposition  $a_k = \sum_m a_k^{(m)}$  is universal. The moments multiply the total; the decomposition multiplies with coefficient 1.

## 6 Application 2: Heat Kernel Asymptotics

**Corollary 6.1** (Heat trace decomposition). *Let  $D$  be the Dirac operator on a compact Riemannian orbifold  $M/G$ . The heat trace*

$$K(t) = \text{Tr}(e^{-tD^2}) = \sum_n e^{-t\lambda_n^2} \quad (15)$$

decomposes by  $G$ -representation sector as:

$$K(t) = \sum_{m=0}^{r-1} K_m(t), \quad K_m(t) = \text{Tr}(e^{-tD_m^2}), \quad (16)$$

with coefficient 1 per sector, for all  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Apply Theorem 3.1 with  $f(x) = e^{-tx^2}$ , which is a bounded Borel function making  $f(D)$  trace-class (since  $D$  has compact resolvent and  $e^{-tx^2}$  decays rapidly).  $\square \quad \square$

**Consequence for Seeley–DeWitt coefficients.** The small- $t$  expansion  $K_m(t) \sim \sum_{k \geq 0} a_k^{(m)} t^{(k-d)/2}$  gives Seeley–DeWitt coefficients  $a_k^{(m)}$  for each sector. These are the building blocks of one-loop effective actions on orbifold backgrounds. Theorem 3.1 guarantees:

$$a_k = \sum_{m=0}^{r-1} a_k^{(m)}, \quad (17)$$

with no renormalization of the per-sector contributions. In particular, the equivariant Euler characteristic, the equivariant signature, and the equivariant  $\hat{A}$ -genus all decompose with coefficient 1.

**Remark 6.2** (One-loop determinants in string theory). *On orbifold string backgrounds  $M/G$ , the one-loop partition function  $Z = (\det D^2)^{-1/2}$  factorizes by twisted sector. The coefficient 1 theorem ensures that no sector receives an anomalous weight — the twisted-sector contributions to the vacuum energy are exactly  $\log \det(D_m^2)$  with no cutoff-dependent normalization. This is implicit in standard orbifold CFT calculations [5] but is not usually stated as a general theorem.*

## 7 Application 3: Casimir Energy on Orbifolds

**Corollary 7.1** (Casimir energy decomposition). *The regularized vacuum energy of a quantum field on  $M/G$  is*

$$E_{\text{Cas}} = \frac{1}{2} \zeta'_D(0), \quad \zeta_D(s) = \sum_{\lambda_n > 0} \lambda_n^{-2s}, \quad (18)$$

where the sum is over positive eigenvalues of  $D$ . This decomposes as:

$$E_{\text{Cas}} = \sum_{m=0}^{r-1} E_{\text{Cas}}^{(m)}, \quad E_{\text{Cas}}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{2} (\zeta_{D_m})'(0), \quad (19)$$

with coefficient 1 per sector, independent of the regularization prescription.

*Proof.* The zeta function  $\zeta_D(s) = \text{Tr}(D^{-2s} \Pi_+)$  (where  $\Pi_+$  projects onto positive eigenvalues) decomposes by sector via Theorem 3.1 applied to  $f(x) = |x|^{-2s}$  in the region of absolute convergence  $\text{Re}(s) > d/2$ , then extended to  $s = 0$  by analytic continuation. The continuation preserves the coefficient because it acts independently in each sector (the sectors are spectrally disjoint).  $\square$   $\square$

**Remark 7.2** (Randall–Sundrum and orbifold GUTs). *In Randall–Sundrum models [6] and orbifold GUT compactifications [7], the Casimir energy on  $S^1/\mathbb{Z}_2$  stabilizes the extra dimension. The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -even and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -odd sectors contribute independently to the Casimir force, and the coefficient 1 theorem guarantees that no regularization artifact contaminates the even/odd decomposition. This is physically important: the hierarchy between the Planck and TeV scales depends on the ratio of even to odd Casimir contributions, and a scheme-dependent coefficient would destroy the prediction.*

## 8 Application 4: Equivariant Index Theory

**Corollary 8.1** (Equivariant APS index). *Let  $(M, \partial M)$  be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary,  $G$  a finite group of isometries, and  $D$  the Dirac operator with APS boundary conditions. The equivariant index in the  $m$ -th sector is:*

$$\text{ind}_m(D) = \text{Tr}(\gamma_5 e_m) = \text{Tr}(\gamma_5|_{\mathcal{H}_m}), \quad (20)$$

with coefficient 1, independent of the regularization used to define the index.

*Proof.* The index can be expressed as  $\text{ind}_m = \text{Tr}(\gamma_5 e^{-tD^2} e_m)$  for any  $t > 0$  (McKean–Singer formula). Since  $G$  acts by isometries,  $\gamma_5$  commutes with the  $G$ -action (the chirality grading is preserved by orientation-preserving isometries). By Theorem 3.1, the trace decomposes with coefficient 1. Taking  $t \rightarrow 0^+$  gives the index.  $\square$   $\square$

**Connection to generation counting.** In the companion paper [10], the equivariant APS index on  $B^6/\mathbb{Z}_3$  is computed to give  $N_g = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3$  — one chiral zero mode per  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  sector. The coefficient 1 theorem is the reason this count does not depend on the choice of heat-kernel regulator  $t$  or any other regularization parameter. The generation count  $N_g = 3$  is a topological invariant precisely *because* the equivariant decomposition has coefficient 1.

Without the isometry condition, one could imagine an anomalous weighting where sector 1 receives weight  $1 + \epsilon$  and sector 2 receives weight  $1 - \epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon$  depending on the regularization. The theorem rules this out.

## 9 Application 5: Crystallographic Point Groups

**Corollary 9.1** (Band structure decomposition). *Let  $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3/\Lambda)$  be the Hilbert space of a crystalline solid with lattice  $\Lambda$ , and let  $G$  be the point group of the crystal (a finite subgroup of  $O(3)$ ). The Hamiltonian  $H = -\nabla^2 + V(x)$ , where  $V$  is  $G$ -invariant, satisfies  $[\rho(g), H] = 0$ . The density of states per symmetry channel decomposes as:*

$$\rho(\epsilon) = \sum_m \rho_m(\epsilon), \quad \rho_m(\epsilon) = \text{Tr}(\delta(\epsilon - H_m)), \quad (21)$$

with coefficient 1, independent of any smearing or broadening prescription.

*Proof.* Apply Theorem 3.1 with  $f(x) = \delta(\epsilon - x^2)$  (distributional limit of smooth approximations), or equivalently with  $f(x) = \chi_{[\epsilon, \epsilon+d\epsilon]}(x^2)$ . In practice, one uses a Lorentzian or Gaussian broadening  $f_\sigma(x) = (\pi\sigma)^{-1}(\sigma^2 + (x^2 - \epsilon)^2)^{-1}$ ; the theorem says the per-irrep decomposition is independent of  $\sigma$ .  $\square$   $\square$

**Remark 9.2** (Tight-binding models). *In tight-binding models on molecules or clusters with point-group symmetry  $G$ , the molecular orbitals classify by irreps of  $G$ . The total energy  $E_{\text{tot}} = \sum_m E_m$  decomposes by irrep with coefficient 1. This is exploited routinely in computational chemistry (e.g., symmetry-adapted basis sets), but the underlying mathematical guarantee is precisely Theorem 3.1. When symmetry-breaking perturbations are introduced (e.g., Jahn–Teller distortions), the isometry condition (1) is violated and the clean decomposition is lost — consistent with the counterexample in §4.*

## 10 Non-Examples and Obstructions

The hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 — finite group, compact resolvent, isometry condition — are sharp. We catalog the failure modes.

**Non-Example 10.1** (Non-finite groups). *Let  $G = U(1)$  act on  $L^2(S^1)$  by rotation. The group algebra  $\mathbb{C}[U(1)]$  is infinite-dimensional and has no minimal central idempotents in the algebraic sense. The decomposition into Fourier modes (irreps of  $U(1)$ ) still works*

spectrally, but the idempotent construction (2) involves an integral over  $G$  rather than a finite sum. Theorem 3.1 extends to compact groups via the Peter–Weyl theorem, but the proof requires the additional hypothesis that the multiplicity spaces are finite-dimensional (automatic for compact  $G$  on compact  $M$ , but subtle for non-compact  $M$ ).

**Non-Example 10.2** (Continuous spectrum). Let  $D = -i d/dx$  on  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  (continuous spectrum, no compact resolvent). Let  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  act by  $x \mapsto -x$ . The even/odd decomposition of  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  is well-defined, but  $\text{Tr}(f(D)e_{\text{even}})$  is not defined for most  $f$  because  $f(D)$  is not trace-class. The theorem requires compact resolvent precisely to ensure trace-class regularity.

**Non-Example 10.3** (Anti-unitary actions). Time reversal  $T$  is anti-unitary:  $T(c|\psi\rangle) = \bar{c}T|\psi\rangle$ . The idempotent construction (2) uses  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear combinations of group elements, which fails for anti-unitary operators. For systems with time-reversal symmetry, the relevant decomposition is by real or quaternionic representations (Dyson’s threefold way), and the coefficient 1 result must be replaced by the appropriate Kramers multiplicity.

**Non-Example 10.4** (Non-isometric diffeomorphisms). A diffeomorphism  $\phi : M \rightarrow M$  that is not an isometry does not commute with the Laplacian or Dirac operator. The pullback  $\phi^*$  acts on functions but  $[\phi^*, \Delta] \neq 0$  in general (the Laplacian depends on the metric, which  $\phi$  does not preserve). The counterexample in §4 is a concrete instance. In such cases, the “coefficient” in the sector decomposition becomes a function of the regularization, and per-sector spectral quantities are not intrinsic.

## 11 Connection to Equivariant K-Theory

The decomposition  $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_m e_m \mathcal{H}$  is a manifestation of the equivariant K-theory of the algebra of observables.

**Proposition 11.1** (K-theoretic interpretation). Let  $\mathcal{A} = C(M)$  (continuous functions on  $M$ ) with the  $G$ -action by pullback. The equivariant K-group  $K_G^0(M)$  decomposes as:

$$K_G^0(M) \cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{r-1} K^0(M/G) \otimes R(G)_m, \quad (22)$$

where  $R(G)_m$  is the  $m$ -th component of the representation ring. The Chern character  $\text{ch} : K_G^0(M) \rightarrow H_G^*(M; \mathbb{Q})$  intertwines the idempotent decomposition:  $\text{ch}(e_m \cdot [D]) = e_m \cdot \text{ch}([D])$ . Theorem 3.1 is the operator-trace shadow of this K-theoretic decomposition.

**Remark 11.2** (Baum–Connes for finite groups). For finite groups, the Baum–Connes assembly map  $\mu : K_*^G(\underline{E}G) \rightarrow K_*(C_r^*G)$  is an isomorphism [8]. The coefficient 1 in Theorem 3.1 reflects the fact that the assembly map for finite groups is an exact isomorphism — no correction terms, no anomalous dimensions, no renormalization. For infinite discrete groups, the assembly map may fail to be surjective (the Baum–Connes

*conjecture), and the clean coefficient 1 decomposition would not hold in general. The finiteness of  $G$  is therefore not merely a technical convenience but a reflection of the exactness of the assembly map.*

## 12 Generality of the Result

**Remark 12.1** (Summary of scope). *Theorem 3.1 holds for:*

1. Any finite group  $G$  (not just cyclic groups).
2. Any self-adjoint operator with compact resolvent (not just the Dirac operator).
3. Any bounded Borel function  $f$  (not just smooth cutoffs).
4. Any Riemannian manifold  $M$  on which  $G$  acts by isometries.

*The only requirement is the isometry condition (1): the group action must commute with the operator. For the Dirac operator on a Riemannian manifold, this is equivalent to requiring that  $G$  act by isometries — a geometric condition, not an analytic one.*

## 13 Summary

The coefficient one theorem (Theorem 3.1) is a three-line proof with five applications and one counterexample:

Application	Eliminates	Section
Spectral action (orbifolds)	Cutoff dependence in sector corrections	§5
Heat kernel asymptotics	Ambiguity in per-sector Seeley–DeWitt coeff.	§6
Casimir energy	Regularization artifact in sector forces	§7
Equivariant APS index	Regulator dependence in generation counting	§8
Band structure (crystals)	Broadening dependence in per-irrep DOS	§9
Counterexample (§4)	Shows isometry condition is necessary	§4
Non-examples (§10)	Infinite $G$ , continuous spectrum, anti-unitary	§10
K-theory (§11)	Connects to Baum–Connes assembly map	§11

The theorem is the wrench. The applications are the bolts. The tool is simple; the art is knowing where it fits.

## References

- [1] A. Connes, “Gravity coupled with matter and the foundation of non-commutative geometry,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **182** (1996) 155.
- [2] A. H. Chamseddine and A. Connes, “The uncanny precision of the spectral action,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **307** (2011) 735.
- [3] H. Donnelly, “Eta invariants for  $G$ -spaces,” *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **27** (1978) 889–918.
- [4] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, Vol. I: Functional Analysis, Academic Press, 1980.
- [5] L. Dixon, J. Harvey, C. Vafa, and E. Witten, “Strings on orbifolds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **261** (1985) 678–686.
- [6] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “A large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 3370.
- [7] L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, “Gauge unification in higher dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 055003.
- [8] P. Baum, A. Connes, and N. Higson, “Classifying space for proper actions and  $K$ -theory of group  $C^*$ -algebras,” *Contemporary Mathematics* **167** (1994) 241–291.
- [9] J. Leng, “The Resolved Chord: The Theorem of Everything,” v10 (2026).
- [10] J. Leng, “Equivariant APS index on  $B^6/\mathbb{Z}_3$  and the emergence of three generations,” (2026).
- [11] J. Leng, “Eta invariants, Reidemeister torsion, and a ghost-mode identity on the lens space  $L(3; 1, 1, 1)$ ,” (2026).