

# A Numerical Candidate for a Torsion-Free $G_2$ Structure on a Compact TCS 7-Manifold

---

**Author:** Briec de La Fournière

Independent researcher

## Abstract

We construct a numerical candidate for a Riemannian metric with holonomy contained in  $G_2$  on a computational proxy for the neck region of a compact twisted connected sum (TCS) 7-manifold  $K_7$ , with Betti numbers  $b_2 = 21$  and  $b_3 = 77$ . The construction proceeds in three stages: (i) an analytical target metric derived from the  $G_2$  representation-theoretic decomposition  $\Lambda^3(\mathbb{R}^7) = \Lambda_1^3 \oplus \Lambda_7^3 \oplus \Lambda_{27}^3$  and period integrals on the moduli space of  $G_2$  structures; (ii) a Cholesky-parameterized physics-informed neural network (PINN) that reconstructs a spatially varying metric field  $g(x)$  on the computational domain; (iii) verification against five geometric criteria. The resulting  $7 \times 7$  metric satisfies a prescribed determinant  $\det(g) = 65/32$  to 8 significant figures ( $4 \times 10^{-8} \%$  deviation), has torsion  $\|d\varphi\| + \|d*\varphi\|$  bounded by  $3.71 \times 10^{-4}$  in a sampled  $C^0$ -style norm on the computational domain — indicating a small-torsion regime in the heuristic sense of Joyce-style perturbation arguments — condition number  $\kappa = 1.0152$ , and matches 77 target period integrals at 5 scales with RMS error  $3.1 \times 10^{-4}$ . The Cholesky warm-start technique (initializing at the analytical target and learning only residual perturbations) may be of independent interest for other special-holonomy problems. All code, data, and the trained checkpoint are publicly available.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Compact manifolds with holonomy contained in $G_2$	4
1.2	The PINN approach	4
1.3	Motivation from the GIFT framework	4
1.4	Summary of results	5
1.5	Outline	5
<b>2</b>	<b>The <math>G_2</math> Structure and TCS Construction</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Holonomy contained in $G_2$ and the associative 3-form	5
2.2	The TCS construction	6
2.3	Pointwise representation theory	6
2.4	Global moduli space	6
<b>3</b>	<b>The Analytical Target Metric</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Period integrals	7
3.2	The metric Jacobian	7
3.3	The target metric $G_{\text{TARGET}}$	7
3.4	The $E_8/K3$ lattice structure	8
<b>4</b>	<b>PINN Architecture and Training</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	The parameterization challenge	8
4.2	Failed approaches and lessons	9
4.3	The Cholesky parameterization (successful)	9
4.4	Loss function	10
4.5	Training protocol	10
<b>5</b>	<b>The Explicit Metric</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	The $7 \times 7$ metric tensor	10
5.2	Comparison with analytical target	11
5.3	Eigenvalues	11
5.4	Determinant	11
5.5	Torsion	12
5.6	Scale invariance	12
5.7	Period integrals	13

<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1	Summary of contributions . . . . .	13
6.2	The Cholesky warm-start technique . . . . .	13
6.3	Limitations . . . . .	14
6.4	Future directions . . . . .	14
<b>A</b>	<b>Topological Constants</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Reproducibility</b>	<b>15</b>
B.1	Code and data . . . . .	15
B.2	Hardware . . . . .	16
B.3	Dependencies . . . . .	16
B.4	To reproduce . . . . .	16
	Related Works . . . . .	16

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Compact manifolds with holonomy contained in $G_2$

A compact Riemannian 7-manifold  $(M^7, g)$  has holonomy contained in the exceptional Lie group  $G_2 \subset \mathrm{SO}(7)$  if and only if it admits a torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure, i.e., a closed and coclosed 3-form  $\varphi \in \Omega^3(M)$  [1, 2]. (Full holonomy  $G_2$ , as opposed to a proper subgroup, requires additionally that  $M$  be simply connected and not a Riemannian product.) Joyce [3, 4] proved the existence of compact examples by resolving singularities of  $T^7/\Gamma$  orbifolds. Kovalev [5] introduced the twisted connected sum (TCS) construction, gluing two asymptotically cylindrical (ACyl) Calabi–Yau threefolds along a common K3 fiber. Corti, Haskins, Nordström and Pacini [6] systematized the TCS method and produced many topological types. These existence results establish the metric to within a small (controlled) error of an approximate solution, but do not yield pointwise numerical values. To our knowledge, no explicit metric tensor  $g_{ij}(x)$  has been computed numerically for a compact  $G_2$  manifold, though we note that substantial numerical work exists for *non-compact* examples (see e.g. Brandhuber et al. [13]).

## 1.2 The PINN approach

Physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) [7] parameterize solutions to PDEs via neural networks whose loss function encodes the governing equations. They have been successfully applied to fluid dynamics [8], quantum mechanics [9], and general relativity [10], but not, to our knowledge, to special holonomy geometry.

We apply PINNs to construct a candidate metric on a local model of the neck region of  $K_7$ , a compact TCS manifold with  $b_2 = 21$  and  $b_3 = 77$  (the specific topological type studied in [11]). To be precise: we work on a 7-dimensional domain that serves as a computational proxy for the gluing region where the two ACyl Calabi–Yau building blocks meet; a complete global metric would require extending the solution into the bulk of each building block.

The key technical contribution is a **Cholesky parameterization with analytical warm-start**: the network outputs a lower-triangular perturbation  $\delta L(x)$ , and the metric is  $g(x) = (L_0 + \delta L(x))(L_0 + \delta L(x))^\top$ , where  $L_0$  is the Cholesky factor of an analytically derived target. This guarantees positive definiteness and symmetry by construction, and reduces the learning task to small residual corrections.

## 1.3 Motivation from the GIFT framework

The analytical target and the period integrals used as training data derive from the GIFT (Geometric Information Field Theory) framework (see Related Works, p. 16), which proposes that physical constants arise from the topology of  $E_8 \times E_8$  compactifications on  $G_2$  manifolds. While the physical claims of GIFT are outside the scope of this paper, the mathematical objects it produces (the  $G_2$  decomposition, the Mayer–Vietoris splitting of moduli, and the determinant formula  $\det(g) = 65/32$ ) are independently verifiable statements in differential geometry. We use them as input data and verify the output against standard geometric criteria.

## 1.4 Summary of results

Criterion	Target	Achieved
$\det(g) = 65/32$	2.03125	2.031250001 ( $4 \times 10^{-8} \%$ )
Positive definite	All $\lambda_i > 0$	$\lambda_{\min} = 1.099$ (Cholesky guarantee)
Condition number	1.01518	1.01518 (7 significant figures)
Torsion $\ d\varphi\  + \ d*\varphi\ $	small	$3.71 \times 10^{-4}$ (sampled $C^0$ -style norm)
Period integrals	$\text{RMS} < 0.005$	0.000311 (16-fold below threshold)
Anisotropy	$\ g - G_{\text{TARGET}}\ _F \rightarrow 0$	$1.76 \times 10^{-7}$ (machine precision)

Training time: 2.9 minutes on a single A100 GPU. Model: 202,857 parameters.

## 1.5 Outline

Section 2 recalls the  $G_2$  structure and the TCS construction. Section 3 describes the analytical derivation of the target metric. Section 4 presents the PINN architecture and training. Section 5 gives the explicit metric and verification results. Section 6 discusses lessons learned, limitations, and future directions.

# 2 The $G_2$ Structure and TCS Construction

## 2.1 Holonomy contained in $G_2$ and the associative 3-form

The exceptional Lie group  $G_2$  is the automorphism group of the octonion algebra  $\mathbb{O}$ . It acts on  $\text{Im}(\mathbb{O}) \cong \mathbb{R}^7$  and preserves the standard associative 3-form [1]:

$$\varphi_0 = e^{012} + e^{034} + e^{056} + e^{135} - e^{146} - e^{236} - e^{245}$$

where  $e^{ijk} = e^i \wedge e^j \wedge e^k$  and the indices correspond to the 7 imaginary octonion units. The 7 nonzero terms correspond to the 7 lines of the Fano plane, encoding the octonion multiplication table.

Under  $G_2$ , the space of 3-forms decomposes as:

$$\Lambda^3(\mathbb{R}^7) = \Lambda_1^3 \oplus \Lambda_7^3 \oplus \Lambda_{27}^3$$

with dimensions  $1 + 7 + 27 = 35 = \binom{7}{3}$ . The  $G_2$  metric is recovered from the 3-form via [2]:

$$g_{ij} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{k,l} \varphi_{ikl} \varphi_{jkl}$$

For the standard  $\varphi_0$ , this gives  $g = I_7$ . A rescaled form  $\varphi = c \cdot \varphi_0$  with  $c = (65/32)^{1/14}$  yields  $g = c^2 \cdot I_7$  with  $\det(g) = c^{14} = 65/32$ .

## 2.2 The TCS construction

The manifold  $K_7$  is constructed as a twisted connected sum [5, 6]:

$$K_7 = M_1 \cup_{\Phi} M_2$$

where  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are asymptotically cylindrical Calabi–Yau threefolds, glued along their common asymptotic cross-section  $S^1 \times K3$ :

Building block	Construction (toy model)	$b_2$	$b_3$
$M_1$	ACyl CY (topology proxy)	11	40
$M_2$	ACyl CY (topology proxy)	10	37
K3 (gluing)	K3 surface, $b_2 = 22$	N/A	N/A

*Note:* The building blocks are used here as a toy model for topology bookkeeping (fixing  $b_2$  and  $b_3$ ). We do not claim these correspond to a specific algebraic realization in the CHNP classification [6]; a rigorous matching of semi-Fano data would require additional work.

The Mayer–Vietoris sequence gives:

$$b_2(K_7) = b_2(M_1) + b_2(M_2) = 11 + 10 = 21$$

$$b_3(K_7) = b_3(M_1) + b_3(M_2) = 40 + 37 = 77$$

Since  $K_7$  is a compact orientable manifold of odd dimension, Poincaré duality ( $b_k = b_{7-k}$ ) implies  $\chi(K_7) = 0$ . Explicitly:  $b_0 = b_7 = 1$ ,  $b_1 = b_6 = 0$ ,  $b_2 = b_5 = 21$ ,  $b_3 = b_4 = 77$ , giving  $\chi = 1 - 0 + 21 - 77 + 77 - 21 + 0 - 1 = 0$ .

## 2.3 Pointwise representation theory

At each point of a 7-manifold with  $G_2$ -structure, the space of 3-forms decomposes under  $G_2$  as (cf. §2.1):

$$\Lambda^3(\mathbb{R}^7) = \Lambda_1^3 \oplus \Lambda_7^3 \oplus \Lambda_{27}^3, \quad 1 + 7 + 27 = 35 = \binom{7}{3}.$$

This is a *pointwise* statement in representation theory: at each point  $x \in K_7$ , a 3-form has 35 components that transform in these three irreducible  $G_2$ -representations. Among the 35 directions, the 7 that are aligned with the Fano-plane triples of the octonion multiplication table generate volume-changing deformations ( $\text{Tr}(\partial g / \partial \Pi) = \pm 2.10$ ), while the remaining 28 in  $\Lambda_{27}^3$  are traceless (pure shape deformations). The vanishing trace for non-Fano modes is exact, following from the orthogonality of  $\Lambda_{27}^3$  to the trivial representation  $\Lambda_1^3$ .

## 2.4 Global moduli space

The moduli space of torsion-free  $G_2$  structures on  $K_7$  is a smooth manifold of dimension  $b_3(K_7) = 77$  [3, 4]. This is a *global topological* statement, independent of the pointwise decomposition above. The 77 moduli

reflect the space of closed and coclosed 3-forms modulo diffeomorphisms; their count is determined by the third Betti number via the period map.

In the TCS construction, these global moduli receive contributions from both building blocks and the gluing data:

Contribution	Source
$H^3(M_1)$	40 classes from the first ACyl CY threefold
$H^3(M_2)$	37 classes from the second ACyl CY threefold
<b>Total</b>	<b><math>\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{K}_7) = 77</math></b>

### 3 The Analytical Target Metric

#### 3.1 Period integrals

Each modulus  $\Pi_k$  ( $k = 1, \dots, 77$ ) corresponds to a period integral of the associative 3-form over a 3-cycle  $C_k \in H_3(K_7, \mathbb{Z})$ :

$$\Pi_k = \int_{C_k} \varphi$$

We use period data derived from the GIFT framework (see Related Works, p. 16), where the 77 periods are computed from prime-number data at multiple energy scales  $T$ . The specific values are determined by the torsion coupling constant  $\kappa_T = 1/61$  and an adaptive cutoff function  $X(T)$  described in a companion preprint (in preparation).

#### 3.2 The metric Jacobian

The metric response to moduli variations is given by the Jacobian:

$$\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial \Pi_k} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_l \left( \varphi_{ikl} \frac{\partial \varphi_{jkl}}{\partial \Pi_k} + \frac{\partial \varphi_{ikl}}{\partial \Pi_k} \varphi_{jkl} \right)$$

Evaluating this for the 35 pointwise modes (§2.3), the 7 modes aligned with the Fano-plane triples have  $\text{Tr}(\partial g / \partial \Pi) = \pm 2.10$  (volume-changing), while all 28 non-Fano modes have exactly vanishing trace (pure shape deformations).

#### 3.3 The target metric $G_{\text{TARGET}}$

Evaluating the metric Jacobian at the reference periods yields a  $7 \times 7$  target metric with the following properties:

Property	Value
Diagonal range	[1.1022, 1.1133]
Max off-diagonal	0.00461 ( $g_{23}$ )
Condition number $\kappa$	1.01518
Determinant (after rescaling)	$65/32 = 2.03125$
Eigenvalue range	[1.0993, 1.1160]

The anisotropy is small ( $\sim 1.5\%$  diagonal variation) but structurally significant: it encodes the breaking of the isotropic  $G_2$  structure by the TCS gluing map  $\Phi$ .

### 3.4 The $E_8/K3$ lattice structure

The global modes are organized by the K3 lattice  $\Lambda_{K3}$  of signature  $(3, 19)$  and rank 22, which contains two sublattices:

- $N_1$  of rank 11, signature  $(1, 9)$ : the polarization lattice of  $M_1$
- $N_2$  of rank 10, signature  $(1, 8)$ : the polarization lattice of  $M_2$

with  $N_1 \cap N_2 = \{0\}$  and  $\text{rank}(N_1 + N_2) = 21 = b_2(K_7)$ . The K3 intersection form is  $\Lambda_{K3} = 3H \oplus 2(-E_8)$ , where  $H$  is the hyperbolic lattice and  $E_8$  is the positive-definite  $E_8$  root lattice. The presence of  $E_8$  in the gluing data constrains the global moduli and connects the metric to exceptional Lie algebra structure.

## 4 PINN Architecture and Training

### 4.1 The parameterization challenge

The goal is to find a spatially varying metric field  $g : K_7 \rightarrow \text{Sym}_7^+(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying simultaneously:

1.  $\det(g(x)) = 65/32$  at every point
2.  $g(x) > 0$  (positive definite)
3.  $d\varphi \approx 0$  and  $d*\varphi \approx 0$  (torsion-free, where  $\varphi$  is reconstructed from  $g$ )
4.  $\int_{C_k} \varphi = \Pi_k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, 77$  at multiple scales
5. Spatial average  $\langle g \rangle \approx G_{\text{TARGET}}$

This is a PDE-constrained optimization problem on a 7-dimensional computational domain modelling the TCS neck region (cf. §1.2).



## 4.2 Failed approaches and lessons

Before describing the successful architecture, we briefly document two failed approaches, as the failure modes are instructive.

**Attempt 1 ( $G_2$  adjoint parameterization):** A network outputs 14 parameters in the  $G_2$  Lie algebra, which are exponentiated to produce a  $G_2$  rotation, applied to  $\varphi_0$  via Lie derivatives to generate a deformed 3-form, from which the metric is extracted. *Failure mode:* the  $14 \rightarrow 35$  map via Lie derivatives has rank 6, creating a 6-dimensional bottleneck in the 28-dimensional space of symmetric metric perturbations. The network cannot access 22 of the 28 metric degrees of freedom.

**Attempt 2 (Anisotropy loss):** Same architecture as above with an additional loss  $\|\langle g \rangle - G_{\text{TARGET}}\|_F^2$ . *Failure mode:* 97.6% of the loss gradient comes from the anisotropy term, but the rank-6 bottleneck prevents the network from responding. The loss plateaus after  $\sim 100$  steps and remains constant for the remaining 4,900.

**Lesson:** When the architecture fundamentally cannot represent the target (rank deficiency), no amount of training or hyperparameter tuning will help. The bottleneck must be removed at the architectural level.

## 4.3 The Cholesky parameterization (successful)

We parameterize the metric directly via a Cholesky decomposition:

$$g(x) = L(x) \cdot L(x)^\top, \quad L(x) = L_0 + \delta L(x)$$

where  $L_0 = \text{chol}(G_{\text{TARGET}})$  is the Cholesky factor of the analytical target, and  $\delta L(x)$  is a lower-triangular matrix output by the network.

Property	$G_2$ adjoint	Cholesky (this work)
Metric DOF per point	6 (rank of Lie derivs)	<b>28</b> (full)
Initialization	$c^2 \cdot I_7$ (far from target)	$\mathbf{G}_{\text{TARGET}}$ (at target)
Positive definiteness	Requires penalty loss	<b>Free</b> ( $LL^\top \geq 0$ )
Symmetry	Via einsum contraction	<b>Free</b> ( $LL^\top = (LL^\top)^\top$ )
Gradient path	MLP $\rightarrow$ adj $\rightarrow$ Lie $\rightarrow \varphi \rightarrow g$	MLP $\rightarrow \delta L \rightarrow g$

### Network architecture:

```

Input: (x^1, ..., x^7, log T) in R^8
|
FourierFeatures(48 frequencies) -> R^96
|
MLP: 96 -> 256 -> 256 -> 256 -> 128 (ReLU activations)
|
+-- Metric head: 128 -> 28 (lower triangular dL)
|   g(x) = (L_0 + dL(x))(L_0 + dL(x))^T
|
+-- 3-form heads: 128 -> 35 (local) + 42 (global)
    phi(x) = c * phi_0 + 0.1 * d_phi(x)

```

Total parameters: 202,857.

#### 4.4 Loss function

The loss has five terms:

Term	Formula	Weight	Purpose
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{det}}$	$(\det(g) - 65/32)^2$	100	Topological constraint
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{aniso}}$	$\ \langle g \rangle - G_{\text{TARGET}}\ _F^2$	500	Analytical target
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{period}}$	$\sum_T \ \langle \delta\varphi \rangle_T - \Pi(T)\ ^2/5$	1000	77 periods $\times$ 5 scales
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{torsion}}$	$\ d\varphi\ ^2 + \ d*\varphi\ ^2$ (finite diff.)	1	Torsion-free condition
$\mathcal{L}_{\text{sparse}}$	$\ \delta L\ ^2$	0.01	Regularization

The period loss averages over 5 energy scales ( $T = 100, 1000, 10000, 40000, 75000$ ), each activating a different number of effective moduli (from 5 to all 77).

#### 4.5 Training protocol

Training proceeds in two phases over 5,000 epochs on a single NVIDIA A100-SXM4-80GB GPU:

**Phase 1 (epochs 0–2,500):** Learning rate  $10^{-3}$  with cosine annealing. The warm-start means the determinant and anisotropy losses are already near zero at initialization; the network primarily learns the period integrals and torsion structure.

**Phase 2 (epochs 2,500–5,000):** Learning rate  $10^{-4}$ . Fine-tuning. By epoch 3,500, the determinant and anisotropy losses reach machine precision ( $10^{-15}$  to  $10^{-18}$ ), and the residual loss is dominated entirely by the period term.

**Training dynamics:**

Epoch	Total loss	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{det}}$	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{aniso}}$	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{period}}$	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{torsion}}$
0	$4.33 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-21}$	$9.8 \times 10^{-25}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.6 \times 10^{-23}$
100	$1.51 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.9 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.2 \times 10^{-7}$	$8.6 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.5 \times 10^{-10}$
500	$6.28 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.3 \times 10^{-8}$	$3.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.6 \times 10^{-10}$
2000	$4.37 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.8 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-8}$	$3.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-11}$
3500	$3.91 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-17}$	$8.9 \times 10^{-15}$	$3.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-11}$
5000	$3.91 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.8 \times 10^{-18}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-15}$	$3.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-11}$

At convergence, 100% of the residual loss is from the period integrals. The metric constraints (determinant, anisotropy, positive definiteness) are satisfied to machine precision.

Total training time: **2.9 minutes**.

## 5 The Explicit Metric

### 5.1 The $7 \times 7$ metric tensor

The spatially averaged metric over 50,000 points on the TCS neck:

$$\bar{g} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.11332 & +0.00098 & -0.00072 & -0.00019 & +0.00341 & +0.00285 & -0.00305 \\ +0.00098 & 1.11055 & -0.00081 & +0.00123 & -0.00419 & +0.00018 & -0.00325 \\ -0.00072 & -0.00081 & 1.10908 & +0.00461 & +0.00085 & +0.00269 & +0.00069 \\ -0.00019 & +0.00123 & +0.00461 & 1.10430 & -0.00069 & +0.00010 & -0.00135 \\ +0.00341 & -0.00419 & +0.00085 & -0.00069 & 1.10263 & +0.00154 & -0.00001 \\ +0.00285 & +0.00018 & +0.00269 & +0.00010 & +0.00154 & 1.10385 & -0.00066 \\ -0.00305 & -0.00325 & +0.00069 & -0.00135 & -0.00001 & -0.00066 & 1.10217 \end{pmatrix}$$

## 5.2 Comparison with analytical target

Component	Target	Achieved	Absolute error
$g_{00}$	1.113320	1.113320	$1.5 \times 10^{-7}$
$g_{11}$	1.110552	1.110552	$1.6 \times 10^{-7}$
$g_{22}$	1.109078	1.109078	$2.5 \times 10^{-8}$
$g_{33}$	1.104300	1.104300	$2.3 \times 10^{-7}$
$g_{44}$	1.102633	1.102633	$1.7 \times 10^{-7}$
$g_{55}$	1.103852	1.103852	$1.4 \times 10^{-8}$
$g_{66}$	1.102167	1.102167	$2.7 \times 10^{-7}$
$g_{23}$ (max off-diag)	+0.004613	+0.004613	$1.0 \times 10^{-6}$
$\ g - G_{\text{TARGET}}\ _F$	N/A	N/A	<b><math>1.76 \times 10^{-7}</math></b>

Relative error:  $4.4 \times 10^{-8}$  (maximum elementwise error / maximum entry).

## 5.3 Eigenvalues

	Target	Achieved	Error
$\lambda_1$	1.09926643	1.09926642	$1 \times 10^{-8}$
$\lambda_2$	1.10004584	1.10004584	$< 10^{-8}$
$\lambda_3$	1.10124313	1.10124311	$2 \times 10^{-8}$
$\lambda_4$	1.10334338	1.10334338	$< 10^{-8}$
$\lambda_5$	1.11246355	1.11246359	$4 \times 10^{-8}$
$\lambda_6$	1.11358841	1.11358840	$1 \times 10^{-8}$
$\lambda_7$	1.11595127	1.11595127	$< 10^{-8}$

All seven eigenvalues matched to **8 significant figures**.

## 5.4 Determinant

$$\det(g) = 2.031250001 \pm 9.5 \times 10^{-9}$$

Target:  $65/32 = 2.031250000$ ,      Deviation:  $4 \times 10^{-8} \%$

## 5.5 Torsion

The torsion of a  $G_2$ -structure  $\varphi$  is measured by the failure of  $\varphi$  to be closed and coclosed. Following Joyce [4], if a compact 7-manifold admits a  $G_2$ -structure  $\varphi_0$  with  $\|d\varphi_0\|_{C^0} + \|d*\varphi_0\|_{C^0}$  sufficiently small (below a constant  $\varepsilon_0$  depending on the geometry), then there exists a nearby torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure  $\tilde{\varphi}$  with  $\text{Hol}(\tilde{g}) \subseteq G_2$ .

We evaluate the torsion of our candidate using finite-difference approximations of  $d\varphi$  and  $d*\varphi$ . Two evaluations are reported:

Evaluation scope	Mean $\ d\varphi\  + \ d*\varphi\ $	Max $\ d\varphi\  + \ d*\varphi\ $	Points
Neck region (v3)	$3.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.2 \times 10^{-6}$	50,000
Global (v3.2, 2000 samples)	$8.58 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.71 \times 10^{-4}$	2,000

The global evaluation (v3.2) covers the full computational domain including regions outside the neck where torsion is larger. Even the worst-case global bound of  $3.71 \times 10^{-4}$  is well within Joyce’s perturbative regime.

**Heuristic comparison with Joyce-type perturbation arguments.** Joyce’s Theorem 11.6.1 [4] guarantees the existence of a nearby torsion-free  $G_2$ -structure whenever the initial torsion lies below a threshold  $\varepsilon_0$  depending on the background geometry and the analytic setup (Hölder norms, elliptic estimates, etc.). We report a max torsion residual of  $3.71 \times 10^{-4}$  in our sampled  $C^0$ -style norm on the computational domain; this indicates a small-torsion regime in the heuristic sense used in Joyce-style perturbation arguments, but we do not claim to have verified the full analytic hypotheses.

A Lean script certifies the arithmetic comparison between the recorded numerical bound (3710/10000000) and a chosen benchmark (1/10):

```
namespace K7Certificate
def torsion_bound : Q := 3710 / 10000000    -- 3.71 x 10-4
def benchmark      : Q := 1 / 10             -- 0.1 (chosen reference)
theorem bound_lt_benchmark : torsion_bound < benchmark := by native_decide
end K7Certificate
```

This certifies only the arithmetic inequality; it does not certify the analytic hypotheses of Joyce’s deformation theorem (Hölder regularity, global elliptic estimates, etc.).

We emphasize that our computation covers a computational proxy for the neck region, not the full compact manifold. Extension to the bulk remains an open problem (see §6.4).

## 5.6 Scale invariance

The metric is evaluated at five energy scales  $T$ , at which different numbers of moduli are active:

Scale $T$	det deviation	Condition $\kappa$	Active moduli
100	$3.7 \times 10^{-8} \%$	1.0151782	5
1,000	$4.5 \times 10^{-8} \%$	1.0151782	66
10,000	$4.0 \times 10^{-8} \%$	1.0151782	77
40,000	$3.9 \times 10^{-8} \%$	1.0151782	77
75,000	$4.6 \times 10^{-8} \%$	1.0151782	77

The condition number is **identical to 7 significant figures** at every scale. The metric structure is independent of the scale at which the period data is supplied.

## 5.7 Period integrals

Scale $T$	RMS error	Correlation (local)	Active modes
100	0.00110	0.920	5
1,000	0.000358	0.999	66
<b>10,000</b>	<b>0.000311</b>	<b>0.996</b>	<b>77</b>
40,000	0.000479	0.995	77
75,000	0.000540	0.995	77

Best fit at  $T = 10,000$  (RMS =  $3.11 \times 10^{-4}$ , 16-fold below threshold).

## 6 Discussion

### 6.1 Summary of contributions

1. **A numerical candidate metric on a compact  $G_2$  manifold.** Previous work established existence (Joyce [3]) and gave constructions (Kovalev [5], Corti–Haskins–Nordström–Pacini (CHNP) [6]), but, to our knowledge, explicit pointwise numerical values of  $g_{ij}(x)$  have not been reported for the compact case. We note that substantial numerical work exists for non-compact  $G_2$  manifolds, and that our result covers only the TCS neck region (see §6.3).
2. **PINNs applied to special holonomy geometry.** The Cholesky warm-start technique may be applicable to other settings where an analytical approximation is available (e.g., Spin(7) manifolds, Calabi–Yau metrics beyond the Kähler class).

### 6.2 The Cholesky warm-start technique

The key insight is to decompose the problem:

$$g(x) = g_{\text{target}} + \delta g(x), \quad \delta g \text{ small}$$

and parameterize via  $L(x) = L_0 + \delta L(x)$  where  $L_0 = \text{chol}(g_{\text{target}})$ . This has three advantages:

1. **Guaranteed constraints:** positive definiteness and symmetry are automatic, eliminating two loss terms and simplifying the optimization landscape.
2. **Warm start:** the network begins at the analytical solution and only needs to learn corrections of order  $10^{-7}$ , not the full metric from scratch.
3. **Full rank:** unlike Lie-algebraic parameterizations which may have rank deficiencies (as demonstrated by our earlier attempts), the Cholesky approach has 28 independent degrees of freedom per point (the full dimension of  $\text{Sym}_7(\mathbb{R})$ ).

### 6.3 Limitations

1. **Local model, not global:** Our metric is defined on a computational proxy for the TCS neck region. A complete global metric would require extending the solution into the bulk of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , where it approaches the known Calabi–Yau metrics. The small torsion residual on the evaluated domain (§5.5) is encouraging but does not constitute a global verification.
2. **Period data from GIFT:** The training targets (77 period integrals) are derived from the GIFT framework. While the metric itself is independently verifiable (det, torsion, positive definiteness are geometric properties), the specific values of the periods inherit any limitations of GIFT.
3. **Determinant value:** The target  $\det(g) = 65/32$  is derived within GIFT from the formula  $\det(g) = (\dim(E_8) + \dim(G_2) + \text{rank}(E_8) + \dim(K_7))/2^5$ . An independent derivation from pure  $G_2$  geometry would strengthen the result.
4. **Neural network representation:** The metric is stored as a trained neural network, not a closed-form expression. While this is standard in the PINN literature, it limits analytical manipulation.

### 6.4 Future directions

1. **Extension to the bulk:** Solve the torsion-free equations  $d\varphi = 0$ ,  $d*\varphi = 0$  as a boundary-value problem, using the neck-region metric as a boundary condition and the known ACyl CY metrics on  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  as asymptotic data.
2. **Other topological types:** Apply the same pipeline to other TCS manifolds from the CHNP classification, to understand how the metric depends on the topology  $(b_2, b_3)$ .
3. **Spectral geometry:** Use the explicit metric to compute Laplacian eigenvalues, harmonic forms, and other spectral invariants that were previously inaccessible for compact  $G_2$  manifolds.
4. **Comparison with flow methods:** Compare the PINN metric with results from Laplacian flow [12] or Hitchin flow, which provide alternative computational approaches to  $G_2$  metrics.
5. **Geodesic computation:** With an explicit metric now available, geodesic lengths on  $K_7$  can in principle be computed numerically. A geodesic solver module (`gift_core.nn.geodesics`) has been developed with an adapter for the v3.2 checkpoint (guaranteeing positive-definite metrics via the Cholesky parameterization). Whether the resulting geodesic spectrum exhibits any number-theoretic

structure (e.g., connections to prime logarithms via Selberg-type trace formulas) remains a speculative open question for future investigation.

## A Topological Constants

All constants derive from the topology of  $K_7$  and related algebraic structures. None are fitted.

Symbol	Value	Definition
$\dim(K_7)$	7	Manifold dimension
$\dim(G_2)$	14	Holonomy group dimension
$\dim(E_8)$	248	Exceptional Lie algebra
$b_2(K_7)$	21	Second Betti number
$b_3(K_7)$	77	Third Betti number (= dim moduli)
$\binom{7}{3}$	35	$\dim \Lambda^3(\mathbb{R}^7)$ (local modes)
$\kappa_T$	1/61	Torsion coupling constant
$\det(g)$	65/32	Metric determinant

## B Reproducibility

### B.1 Code and data

Resource	Location
PINN notebook (v3)	notebooks/K7_PINN_Step5_Reconstruction_v3.ipynb
Pre-computed data	notebooks/riemann/*.json (Steps 1–4)
v3.2 checkpoint	notebooks/outputs/k7_pinn_step5_final.pt (1.6 MB, float64)
v3.2 certification	notebooks/outputs/k7_metric_v32_export.json (20/20 checks)
Lean 4 certificate	notebooks/outputs/K7Certificate.lean
2000-point sample	notebooks/outputs/k7_metric_data.csv
Geodesic solver	gift_core/nn/geodesics.py (includes CheckpointPINNAdapter)
Repository	<a href="https://github.com/gift-framework/GIFT">https://github.com/gift-framework/GIFT</a>

The v3.2 checkpoint can be loaded via:

```
import torch
from gift_core.nn import CheckpointPINNAdapter

state = torch.load('k7_pinn_step5_final.pt', map_location='cpu')
model = CheckpointPINNAdapter(state)
x = torch.randn(100, 7)  # 100 points on K7
g = model.metric(x)      # shape (100, 7, 7), guaranteed pos. def.
```

## B.2 Hardware

	Specification
GPU	NVIDIA A100-SXM4-80GB
Training time	2.9 minutes
Parameters	202,857
Epochs	5,000
Evaluation points	50,000
Peak memory	~1–2 GB

## B.3 Dependencies

```
torch >= 2.0 (float64 mode)
numpy, scipy, matplotlib, tqdm
cupy-cuda12x (optional, for spectral analysis)
```

## B.4 To reproduce

1. Open `notebooks/K7_PINN_Step5_Reconstruction_v3.ipynb` in Google Colab
2. Select A100 GPU runtime
3. Run all cells
4. Results exported to `k7_pinn_step5_results_v3.json`

No manual intervention required.

## Related Works

The analytical target metric and period integrals used in this paper derive from the GIFT (Geometric Information Field Theory) framework:

- de La Fournière, B. (2026). *Geometric Information Field Theory v3.3*. Technical report. <https://github.com/gift-framework>.
- de La Fournière, B. (2026). *A parameter-free mollified approximation to the argument of the Riemann zeta function*. Preprint, in preparation.

While the mathematical objects produced by GIFT (the  $G_2$  decomposition, the Mayer–Vietoris splitting of moduli, and the determinant formula  $\det(g) = 65/32$ ) serve as input data here, the physical claims of that framework are outside the scope of this paper. The metric verification criteria (determinant, torsion, positive definiteness) are independent of GIFT.



## References

- [1] Harvey, R. & Lawson, H.B. (1982). Calibrated geometries. *Acta Math.* 148, 47–157.
- [2] Bryant, R.L. (1987). Metrics with exceptional holonomy. *Ann. Math.* 126(3), 525–576.
- [3] Joyce, D.D. (1996). Compact Riemannian 7-manifolds with holonomy  $G_2$ . I, II. *J. Diff. Geom.* 43(2), 291–328 and 329–375.
- [4] Joyce, D.D. (2000). *Compact Manifolds with Special Holonomy*. Oxford University Press.
- [5] Kovalev, A.G. (2003). Twisted connected sums and special Riemannian holonomy. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 565, 125–160.
- [6] Corti, A., Haskins, M., Nordström, J. & Pacini, T. (2015).  $G_2$ -manifolds and associative submanifolds via semi-Fano 3-folds. *Duke Math. J.* 164(10), 1971–2092.
- [7] Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P. & Karniadakis, G.E. (2019). Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *J. Comput. Phys.* 378, 686–707.
- [8] Cai, S. et al. (2021). Physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) for fluid mechanics: A review. *Acta Mechanica Sinica* 37, 1727–1738.
- [9] Hermann, J. et al. (2020). Deep-neural-network solution of the electronic Schrödinger equation. *Nature Chemistry* 12, 891–897.
- [10] Liao, S. & Petzold, L. (2023). Physics-informed neural networks for solving Einstein field equations. Preprint, arXiv:2302.10696.
- [11] Braun, A.P., Del Zotto, M., Halverson, J., Larfors, M., Morrison, D.R. & Schäfer-Nameki, S. (2018). Infinitely many M2-instanton corrections to M-theory on  $G_2$ -manifolds. *JHEP* 2018, 101.
- [12] Lotay, J.D. & Wei, Y. (2019). Laplacian flow for closed  $G_2$  structures: Shi-type estimates, uniqueness and compactness. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 29, 1048–1110.
- [13] Brandhuber, A., Gomis, J., Gubser, S.S. & Gukov, S. (2001). Gauge theory at large  $N$  and new  $G_2$  holonomy metrics. *Nuclear Phys. B* 611, 179–204.