Symmetry Layering and Defect Operations

in Elastic Diffusive Cosmology

(Companion E to Paper 3: NJSR Edition)

Igor Grčman

January 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18300199

Repository: github.com/igorgrcman/elastic-diffusive-cosmology

(Public artifacts for this paper are in the edc_papers folder.)

Related Documents:

Neutron Lifetime from 5D Membrane Cosmology (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18262721)

Framework v2.0 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18299085)

Companions:

A: *Effective Lagrangian* (DOI) · B: *WKB Prefactor* (DOI)

C: *5D Reduction* (DOI) · D: *Selection Rules* (DOI)

F: *Proton Junction* (DOI) · G: *Mass Difference* (DOI)

H: *Weak Interactions* (DOI)

Abstract

This companion paper formalizes the symmetry structure and topological operations within Elastic Diffusive Cosmology (EDC). We present a *layered* description of symmetries acting on the 5D manifold $M_5 = M_4 \times S^1_\xi$: kinematic diffeomorphism invariance on the 4D base, and internal $U(1)$ isometry of the compact dimension generating charge/winding conservation. We define three topological process operators—Excitation ($\mathcal{E}$), Relaxation ($\mathcal{R}$), and Merging ($\mathcal{M}$)—that formalize generation transitions, weak decay, and nuclear binding respectively. A conservation ledger for β^- decay demonstrates how topological constraints require a neutral channel, identified in 4D evidence language with the antineutrino.

What this paper does: Provides formal definitions, consistent epistemic tagging, and falsifiability conditions for symmetry and operator structures that the main paper **?** may cite.

What this paper does NOT claim: Full derivation from first principles, replacement of Standard Model phenomenology, or proof of operator dynamics from the 5D action.

Epistemic Tagging Standard

All claims carry explicit tags indicating derivation status:

Tag	Meaning
[Der]	Derived: explicit mathematical derivation from stated postulates
[Dc]	Deduced/Constrained: follows from assumptions with explicit ansatz
[Cal]	Calibrated: parameter fitted to match experimental value
[I]	Identified: pattern matching without full derivation
[P]	Postulated: foundational assumption; not derived
[OPEN]	Open: known gap; future work needed
[BL]	Baseline: external empirical input (CODATA, PDG, SM)

Contents

1 Introduction 3
- 1.1 Purpose of This Document . . . 3
- 1.2 The Two-Sided Reading Rule . . . 3
- 1.3 Relationship to Other EDC Documents . . . 3
- 1.4 Document Structure . . . 3

2 Minimal Geometric Setup 3
- 2.1 The 5D Manifold . . . 4
- 2.2 The Compact Scale Parameter . . . 4
- 2.3 Newton's Constant Reduction . . . 4
- 2.4 Scope and Non-Scope . . . 5

3 Symmetry Layering 5
- 3.1 Kinematic Invariance: Diffeomorphisms of M_4 . . . 5
- 3.2 Internal Isometry: $U(1)$ of the Compact Dimension . . . 5
- 3.3 Winding Number and Charge . . . 5
- 3.4 Layered Structure (Not Direct Product) . . . 6
- 3.5 Summary . . . 6

4 Defect Classification as Layered Structure 6
- 4.1 Defect Invariants . . . 6
- 4.2 Y-Junction Mode Algebra . . . 7
- 4.3 Ring Sector Labels: $\mathbb{Z}_6$ Structure . . . 7
- 4.4 Layered Structure (Not Subgroups) . . . 8
- 4.5 Defect Classification Table . . . 8

5 Topological Process Operators 8
- 5.1 Operator Definitions . . . 8
- 5.2 Operator Properties . . . 9
- 5.3 Formal Requirements . . . 9
- 5.4 Falsifiability Hooks . . . 10
- 5.5 Composition Rules . . . 10

6 β^- Decay Conservation Ledger **10**
6.1 The Ledger Formalism 10
6.2 β^- Decay in EDC Language 10
6.3 Conservation Ledger Table 11
6.4 The Neutral Channel Requirement 11
6.5 Identification with Antineutrino 11
6.6 Why ξ-Wave? 11
6.7 Comparison with Standard Model 12
6.8 Ledger Summary 12

7 Discussion and Roadmap **12**
7.1 What This Paper Has Defined 12
7.2 Research Roadmap: Upgrading Tags 13
7.3 Open Questions 13
7.4 How Paper 3 Will Use This Material 13

Conclusion **14**

A Notation and Conventions **14**
A.1 Manifolds and Coordinates 14
A.2 Groups and Algebras 15
A.3 Defect Invariants 15
A.4 Process Operators 15
A.5 Physical Constants 15
A.6 Epistemic Tags 16

B Claim Registry **16**
B.1 Postulated Claims **[P]** 16
B.2 Deduced/Constrained Claims **[Dc]** 16
B.3 Derived Claims **[Der]** 17
B.4 Identified Claims **[I]** 17
B.5 Calibrated Claims **[Cal]** 17
B.6 Open Problems **[OPEN]** 17
B.7 Dependency Map 17

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of This Document

This companion paper provides formal definitions for the symmetry structures and topological operations used in Elastic Diffusive Cosmology (EDC). It serves as a reference document that the main paper **?** (and subsequent EDC publications) can cite without repeating foundational material.

The content here does *not* claim to derive new physics. Rather, it organizes and formalizes structures that arise naturally from the EDC framework, assigns consistent epistemic tags, and identifies falsifiability conditions.

1.2 The Two-Sided Reading Rule

Throughout this document, we maintain a strict distinction between two levels of description:

- **5D cause** (geometric mechanism): Statements about the topology, geometry, and dynamics of defects in the 5D manifold M_5.
- **4D evidence** (observable prediction): Statements about quantities measurable in our 4D spacetime—masses, charges, decay rates, cross-sections.

The 5D cause is the *proposal*; the 4D evidence is the *test*. Neither side alone constitutes a complete claim. For example:

> *5D cause*: "The β^- decay corresponds to a $\mathbb{Z}_6$ sector shift in the Y-junction configuration."
> *4D evidence*: "The neutron lifetime and decay products match SM predictions."

1.3 Relationship to Other EDC Documents

This paper assumes familiarity with:

1. **EDC Framework Reference** (v2.0): Defines the 5D manifold, action, and defect taxonomy.
2. **Paper 3**: Uses the operators and ledger defined here for neutron physics.

We do not duplicate content from the Framework Reference; instead, we cite it and build upon its definitions.

1.4 Document Structure

1. **Section 2**: Minimal geometric setup (manifold, parameters)
2. **Section 3**: Symmetry layering (kinematic + internal)
3. **Section 4**: Defect classification as layered structure
4. **Section 5**: Topological process operators ($\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{M}$)
5. **Section 6**: β^- decay conservation ledger
6. **Section 7**: Discussion and research roadmap

2 Minimal Geometric Setup

This section establishes the geometric foundation required for defining symmetries and operators. We state only what is needed; full details are in the EDC Framework Reference.

2.1 The 5D Manifold

Postulate 1 (5D Product Structure **[P]**)**.** *The EDC spacetime is a 5-dimensional manifold with product topology:*

$$M_5 = M_4 \times S^1_\xi \tag{1}$$

where M_4 is a 4-dimensional Lorentzian manifold (our observable spacetime) and S^1_ξ is a compact circle of circumference $L_\xi = 2\pi R_\xi$.

The coordinate on S^1_ξ is denoted $\xi \in [0, L_\xi)$ with periodic identification. This structure follows the Kaluza-Klein paradigm **??**.

2.2 The Compact Scale Parameter

Definition 2.1 (Compact Dimension Scale)**.** *The length scale L_ξ (equivalently, radius $R_\xi = L_\xi/2\pi$) characterizes the size of the compact dimension. This is a fundamental parameter of the theory.*

Remark 2.1 (Historical Identification with Compton Wavelength **[Cal]**/**[P]**). In early EDC literature, the compact scale was sometimes identified with the electron Compton wavelength:

$$L_\xi \sim \bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)} = \frac{\hbar}{m_e c} \approx 3.86 \times 10^{-13}\,\mathrm{m} \tag{2}$$

This identification is **not derived** from first principles. It is either:

- **[Cal]**: Calibrated to match observed physics (e.g., requiring α formula to work), or
- **[P]**: Postulated as a foundational assumption linking 5D geometry to particle scales.

The derivation of L_ξ from 5D dynamics remains **[OPEN]**.

Remark 2.2 (Correction Note: Canonical Scale Separation). The EDC Framework Reference (v2.0) establishes a *different* canonical scale hierarchy:

$$R_\xi \sim 10^{-18}\,\mathrm{m} \qquad \text{(membrane/weak-KK scale) [Dc]} \tag{3}$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)} \sim 3.86 \times 10^{-13}\,\mathrm{m} \qquad \text{(reduced Compton wavelength) [BL]} \tag{4}$$

These are **distinct scales** separated by five orders of magnitude. The identification $L_\xi \sim \bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$ in Eq. (2) is a *historical calibration* that conflates the kinematic Compton scale with the dynamical compactification radius. The formula $\alpha = r_e/\bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$ is standard QED **[BL]**; it should **not** be written as $\alpha = r_e/R_\xi$. This paper uses the earlier convention for continuity with prior work; see the Framework Reference for the corrected treatment.

2.3 Newton's Constant Reduction

Theorem 2.2 (4D Newton Constant **[Dc]**)**.** *Standard Kaluza-Klein dimensional reduction gives:*

$$G_4 = \frac{G_5}{2\pi R_\xi} = \frac{G_5}{L_\xi} \tag{5}$$

where G_5 is the 5D gravitational coupling.

Remark 2.3 (Epistemic Status). Equation (5) is standard KK theory, not unique to EDC. It is tagged **[Dc]** because:

- The reduction formula is mathematically derived (given the product ansatz).
- The value of G_5 is **not** derived within EDC; it remains **[OPEN]**.

Thus, while the *form* of Eq. (5) is derived, the *numerical prediction* for G_4 requires knowing G_5.

2.4 Scope and Non-Scope

Scope & Non-Scope: Geometric Setup

This section DOES:
- Define the product manifold structure $M_5 = M_4 \times S^1_\xi$
- Introduce the compact scale L_ξ as a parameter
- State the KK reduction formula for G_4
- Clearly tag the $L_\xi \sim \bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$ identification as **[Cal]**/**[P]**

This section does NOT:
- Derive L_ξ from 5D dynamics
- Derive G_5 from EDC first principles
- Claim the geometry is unique or fully constrained

3 Symmetry Layering

The symmetries of the EDC manifold naturally organize into *layers*: kinematic invariances of the base spacetime, and internal isometries of the compact dimension. We describe these as a layered structure rather than claiming a single unified symmetry group.

3.1 Kinematic Invariance: Diffeomorphisms of M_4

Definition 3.1 (4D Diffeomorphism Invariance **[Dc]**). *The theory is invariant under the diffeomorphism group of the 4D base manifold:*

$$\mathrm{Diff}(M_4) = \{\phi : M_4 \to M_4 \mid \phi \text{ is a smooth bijection with smooth inverse}\} \tag{6}$$

This is the standard general covariance of general relativity, inherited by the 4D effective theory.

Remark 3.1. This invariance is **[Dc]** (not **[Der]**) because it is *assumed* as part of the geometric framework, not derived from a more fundamental principle within EDC.

3.2 Internal Isometry: $U(1)$ of the Compact Dimension

Definition 3.2 (Compact Isometry Group **[Dc]**). *The isometry group of the circle S^1_ξ is:*

$$\mathrm{Isom}(S^1_\xi) \cong U(1) \tag{7}$$

generated by rigid translations $\xi \mapsto \xi + \epsilon$ (continuous) and the reflection $\xi \mapsto -\xi$ (discrete). The continuous part $U(1)$ corresponds to shifts around the circle.

3.3 Winding Number and Charge

Theorem 3.3 (Winding-Charge Correspondence **[Dc]**). *In Kaluza-Klein theory, the winding number W of a field configuration around S^1_ξ corresponds to electric charge:*

$$Q = W = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_\gamma d\xi \tag{8}$$

where γ is a closed loop around the defect in the ξ direction.

Remark 3.2 (Epistemic Status). The correspondence $Q = W$ is:

- **[Dc]** within EDC: It follows from the KK ansatz and the identification of the $U(1)$ gauge field with electromagnetism.
- The *normalization* (charge in units of e) requires matching to experiment, hence involves **[Cal]** elements.

3.4 Layered Structure (Not Direct Product)

Remark 3.3 (Caution on Group Structure **[P]**). It is tempting to write a "global symmetry group" as:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{EDC}} \stackrel{?}{=} \text{Diff}(M_4) \times U(1)_\xi \tag{9}$$

However, this is **not rigorously established**. The actual symmetry structure is more subtle:

1. $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ acts on the base; $U(1)_\xi$ acts on the fiber.
2. The product structure of M_5 induces a *semi-direct* or *fiber bundle* relationship, not a simple direct product.
3. Matter fields (defects) transform under both, but the coupling is nontrivial.

We therefore describe the symmetries as a **layered structure**:

Layer	**Symmetry**	**Physical Role**
Kinematic (base)	$\text{Diff}(M_4)$	General covariance, gravity
Internal (fiber)	$\text{Isom}(S^1_\xi) \cong U(1)$	Charge conservation, EM

3.5 Summary

The symmetry content of the EDC manifold is organized as:

$$\boxed{\text{Symmetry Layers}: \quad \underbrace{\text{Diff}(M_4)}_{\text{kinematic}} \quad \oplus \quad \underbrace{\text{Isom}(S^1_\xi)}_{\text{internal}}} \tag{10}$$

The "$\oplus$" notation indicates layering, not algebraic direct sum. The precise mathematical structure (principal bundle, gauge group action) is left for future formalization **[OPEN]**.

4 Defect Classification as Layered Structure

Particles in EDC are topological defects in the 5D brane. Different defect types carry different invariants. We organize these invariants into a layered classification scheme.

4.1 Defect Invariants

Definition 4.1 (Defect State Vector)**.** *A defect configuration is characterized by a tuple of invariants:*

$$\mathcal{D} = (W, Q, \mathcal{C}, s) \tag{11}$$

where:

- $W \in \mathbb{Z}$ *or* $\mathbb{Z}/3$*: Total winding number*
- $Q \in \mathbb{Z}$ *(in units of* $e/3$*): Electric charge*
- $\mathcal{C} \in \{-, r, g, b\}$*: Color index ("$-$" for colorless)*
- $s \in \mathbb{Z}_6$*: Sector label on the transverse ring*

4.2 Y-Junction Mode Algebra

The Y-junction (three-arm configuration) supports oscillation modes that generate an algebraic structure.

Theorem 4.2 (Y-Junction Mode Algebra **[Dc]**). *The modes of a Y-junction configuration form an 8-dimensional space with structure:*

$$\mathcal{A}_Y \sim \mathfrak{su}(3) \tag{12}$$

consisting of:

- *6 "exchange modes": oscillations that swap amplitude between pairs of arms*
- *2 "diagonal modes": oscillations that preserve arm identity but modulate relative phases*

Remark 4.1 (Epistemic Status). The identification $\mathcal{A}_Y \sim \mathfrak{su}(3)$ is **[Dc]**:

- The mode counting (8 = 6 + 2) follows from junction geometry.
- The Lie algebra structure (commutators) requires explicit calculation from the 5D action.
- Full proof that $[\cdot,\cdot]$ closes on $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ is partially shown in the Framework Reference (Thm. 5.3–5.5) but relies on the Steiner angle assumption.

We write "$\sim$" rather than "$=$" to indicate structural similarity, not proven isomorphism.

4.3 Ring Sector Labels: $\mathbb{Z}_6$ Structure

The transverse ring in junction configurations admits discrete symmetry.

Theorem 4.3 ($\mathbb{Z}_6$ Sector Decomposition **[Der]**). *The symmetry of the transverse ring configuration space factors as:*

$$\mathbb{Z}_6 = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \tag{13}$$

where:

- $\mathbb{Z}_3$*: Cyclic permutation of the three Y-junction arms*
- $\mathbb{Z}_2$*: Matter-antimatter conjugation (reflection symmetry)*

Remark 4.2 (Sector Labels and Nucleons). The six sectors $s \in \{0,1,2,3,4,5\}$ correspond to stable configurations:

Sector s	**Angle** θ	**Interpretation**
0	0°	Proton ground state
1	60°	Neutron ground state
2	120°	(Unstable / transition)
3	180°	Antiproton ground state
4	240°	Antineutron ground state
5	300°	(Unstable / transition)

The proton occupies $s = 0$; the neutron occupies $s = 1$. A $\mathbb{Z}_6$ step ($s \to s+1$) corresponds to a topological transition.

4.4 Layered Structure (Not Subgroups)

Remark 4.3 (On Group Containment **[P]**). It is **not claimed** that $SU(3)$ and $\mathbb{Z}_6$ are subgroups of a single global symmetry group. Rather, they represent:

- $\mathcal{A}_Y \sim \mathfrak{su}(3)$: *Local* mode algebra at junctions (dynamical degrees of freedom)
- $\mathbb{Z}_6$: *Global* sector labels (topological vacuum structure)

These structures are **coupled** (a $\mathbb{Z}_6$ transition involves mode excitation), but the precise relationship is:

$$(\text{Sector shift in } \mathbb{Z}_6) \longleftrightarrow (\text{Mode excitation in } \mathcal{A}_Y) \tag{14}$$

The mathematical formalization of this coupling remains **[OPEN]**.

4.5 Defect Classification Table

Table 1: Defect types and their invariants

Particle	W	Q	$\mathcal{C}$	s	**Tag**
Electron (e^-)	-1	-1	–	—	**[I]**
Proton (p)	$+1$	$+1$	–	0	**[I]**
Neutron (n)	$+1$	0	–	1	**[I]**
Up quark (u)	$+2/3$	$+2/3$	r, g, b	—	**[Der]**
Down quark (d)	$-1/3$	$-1/3$	r, g, b	—	**[Der]**

Remark 4.4. The electron, proton, and neutron identifications are **[I]** (pattern matching between EDC defect types and SM particles). The quark winding numbers are **[Der]** from charge constraints (see Framework Reference, Thm. 4.4).

5 Topological Process Operators

We define three formal operators representing topological processes that change defect configurations. These operators act on the invariant tuple $(W, Q, \mathcal{C}, s)$ and encode fundamental physical processes.

5.1 Operator Definitions

Definition 5.1 (Excitation Operator $\mathcal{E}$ **[Dc]**/**[P]**)**.** *The* ***excitation operator*** $\mathcal{E}_n$ *raises a defect to a higher mode along* S^1_ξ*:*

$$\mathcal{E}_n : \mathcal{D}(n_0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(n_0 + n) \tag{15}$$

where n_0 *is the initial mode number and* $n \geq 1$ *is the excitation level.*

Invariants:

- Preserved*:* W*,* Q*,* $\mathcal{C}$*,* s
- Changed*: Internal mode number* n*; mass increases*

Physical interpretation*: Generation transitions (e.g.,* $e \to \mu \to \tau$*).*

Definition 5.2 (Relaxation Operator $\mathcal{R}$ **[Dc]**/**[P]**). *The* ***relaxation operator*** $\mathcal{R}$ *shifts the sector label by one unit in* $\mathbb{Z}_6$*:*

$$\mathcal{R} : (W, Q, \mathcal{C}, s) \longrightarrow (W', Q', \mathcal{C}', s + 1 \mod 6) \tag{16}$$

with compensating changes in W, Q, $\mathcal{C}$ to satisfy conservation laws.

Invariants:

- Preserved*: Total winding (with emitted particles), total charge*
- Changed*: Sector s; quark content; particle identity*

Physical interpretation*: Weak decay processes (e.g., β^-: neutron $\to$ proton).*

Definition 5.3 (Merging Operator $\mathcal{M}$ **[P]**). *The* ***merging operator*** $\mathcal{M}$ *combines two defects into a bound configuration:*

$$\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{D}_1 \otimes \mathcal{D}_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{bound} \tag{17}$$

Invariants:

- Preserved*: Total W, total Q*
- Changed*: Configuration space geometry; binding energy released*

Physical interpretation*: Nuclear binding ("merged Inflow").*

5.2 Operator Properties

Table 2: Summary of process operators

Operator	Action	Preserved	Changed	Tag
$\mathcal{E}_n$	Raise mode by n	$W, Q, \mathcal{C}, s$	Mode n, mass	**[Dc]**/**[P]**
$\mathcal{R}$	Shift sector $s \to s+1$	Total W, total Q	s, quark IDs	**[Dc]**/**[P]**
$\mathcal{M}$	Merge two defects	Total W, total Q	Geometry, E_{bind}	**[P]**

5.3 Formal Requirements

For each operator, we state the mathematical requirements that a full derivation must satisfy:

1. $\mathcal{E}$ **(Excitation)**:
   - Must follow from the spectrum of the S^1_ξ Laplacian acting on defect wavefunctions.
   - The mass increase formula $m_n = m_0 \cdot f(n, \alpha)$ must be derived from the 5D action.
   - Current status: The lepton mass formulas (m_μ/m_e, m_τ/m_μ) are **[I]**, not **[Der]**.
2. $\mathcal{R}$ **(Relaxation)**:
   - Must follow from the $\mathbb{Z}_6$ potential landscape $V(\theta)$ and tunneling/transition dynamics.
   - The rate formula must connect to observed weak decay rates.
   - Current status: The mechanism is **[P]**; the $\mathbb{Z}_6$ potential form is **[Dc]**.
3. $\mathcal{M}$ **(Merging)**:
   - Must follow from the "merged Inflow" geometry where defect configuration spaces overlap.
   - The binding energy formula must be derived from surface area reduction.
   - Current status: Entirely **[P]**; no quantitative formula exists.

5.4 Falsifiability Hooks

Each operator interpretation makes implicit predictions that could falsify it:

Falsifiability Conditions

$\mathcal{E}$ **(Excitation)**:
- If a fourth generation lepton is discovered, the "SU(3) saturation" argument fails.
- If $m_\tau/m_\mu \neq 16\pi/3$ to better than 1%, the geometric interpretation is falsified.

$\mathcal{R}$ **(Relaxation)**:
- If β^- decay products violate the $\mathbb{Z}_6$ step pattern (e.g., direct $n \to \bar{p}$), the operator is falsified.
- If neutron lifetime deviates from the topological barrier prediction (once derived), the mechanism fails.

$\mathcal{M}$ **(Merging)**:
- If nuclear binding energies show no correlation with configuration space surface area reduction, the mechanism is falsified.
- If light nuclei binding energies cannot be fit with a universal "Inflow overlap" parameter, the model fails.

5.5 Composition Rules

Remark 5.1 (Operator Algebra **[OPEN]**). The composition of operators (e.g., $\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{R}$) is not yet formalized. Questions include:

- Do operators commute? (Likely not: $\mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{E} \neq \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{R}$)
- Is there a group structure? (Unlikely for $\mathcal{M}$ due to irreversibility of binding)
- How do selection rules emerge? (From symmetry constraints on compositions)

This remains **[OPEN]** for future work.

6 β^- Decay Conservation Ledger

This section presents the β^- decay process ($n \to p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$) in EDC language, using a conservation ledger to track topological invariants.

6.1 The Ledger Formalism

Definition 6.1 (Conservation Ledger)**.** *A* ***conservation ledger*** *is a bookkeeping table that tracks the values of conserved quantities before and after a topological transition. For each quantity X, we require:*

$$\sum_{\text{initial}} X_i = \sum_{\text{final}} X_f \tag{18}$$

6.2 β^- Decay in EDC Language

In EDC, the neutron and proton are Y-junction defects at different $\mathbb{Z}_6$ sector positions. The β^- decay corresponds to the relaxation operator $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\mathcal{R} : n(s=1) \longrightarrow p(s=0) + e^- + (\text{neutral channel}) \tag{19}$$

Table 3: β^- decay conservation ledger

	Before	After			Balance
Quantity	Neutron	Proton	Electron	Neutral	Check
Winding W	$+1$	$+1$	-1	0	$+1 = +1 - 1 + 0$ ✓
Charge Q	0	$+1$	-1	0	$0 = +1 - 1 + 0$ ✓
Sector s	1	0	—	—	$\Delta s = -1$
Baryon # B	$+1$	$+1$	0	0	$+1 = +1$ ✓
Lepton # L	0	0	$+1$	-1	$0 = 0 + 1 - 1$ ✓

6.3 Conservation Ledger Table

6.4 The Neutral Channel Requirement

Theorem 6.2 (Neutral Channel Constraint **[Dc]**)**.** *For the conservation ledger to balance, the β^- decay* ***must*** *produce a neutral channel with:*

$$W_{neutral} = 0, \quad Q_{neutral} = 0, \quad L_{neutral} = -1 \tag{20}$$

This is a topological constraint, independent of dynamics.

Proof. From the ledger (Table 3):

$$W_{\text{neutral}} = W_n - W_p - W_e = 1 - 1 - (-1) - W_{\text{neutral}} \Rightarrow W_{\text{neutral}} = 0 \tag{21}$$

$$Q_{\text{neutral}} = Q_n - Q_p - Q_e = 0 - 1 - (-1) = 0 \tag{22}$$

$$L_{\text{neutral}} = L_n - L_p - L_e = 0 - 0 - 1 = -1 \tag{23}$$

These are necessary conditions for ledger closure. □

Remark 6.1 (Epistemic Status). The *requirement* for a neutral channel is **[Dc]**: it follows logically from conservation laws applied to the ledger. No dynamics or specific mechanism is invoked—only book-keeping.

6.5 Identification with Antineutrino

Postulate 2 (ξ-Wave Identification **[P]**)**.** *The neutral channel required by the ledger is realized in EDC as a* ***ξ-wave****: a propagating excitation in the compact dimension S^1_ξ, rather than a frozen topological defect.*

In 4D evidence language, this ξ-wave is ***identified*** *with the electron antineutrino $\bar{\nu}_e$.*

Remark 6.2 (Two-Sided Reading).

- **5D cause**: The neutral channel is a ξ-wave (propagating mode, not localized defect).
- **4D evidence**: The neutral channel is identified with $\bar{\nu}_e$ (weak interaction phenomenology).

The identification ξ-wave $\leftrightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$ is **[P]**, not derived from the 5D action.

6.6 Why ξ-Wave?

The ξ-wave hypothesis (Postulate 2) is motivated by:

1. **Neutrality**: A wave in S^1_ξ carries no net winding ($W = 0$) and no charge ($Q = 0$).

2. **Near-masslessness**: Unlike frozen defects (which have mass from configuration space volume), waves have energy $E = \hbar\omega$ with no rest mass contribution from topology.

3. **Weak interaction**: Waves do not create "holes" in the brane like frozen defects do, explaining small interaction cross-sections.

4. **Lepton number**: The $L = -1$ assignment follows from the *direction* of propagation or phase winding of the wave.

These are **plausibility arguments**, not derivations. The full dynamics of ξ-waves remains **[OPEN]**.

6.7 Comparison with Standard Model

Baseline Comparison [BL]

In the Standard Model **?**, β^- decay is mediated by W^- boson exchange:

$$n \to p + W^- \to p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

The conservation laws (charge, baryon number, lepton number) are identical to the EDC ledger. The difference is:

- **SM**: Decay mediated by gauge boson; neutrino is a fundamental fermion.
- **EDC**: Decay is topological relaxation; neutrino is a ξ-wave excitation.

Both frameworks predict the same final state and conservation laws. The distinction lies in the underlying mechanism.

6.8 Ledger Summary

The β^- decay ledger demonstrates:

1. **[Dc]** The *need* for a neutral channel follows from topological conservation laws.

2. **[P]** The *identification* of this channel with a ξ-wave (and hence $\bar{\nu}_e$) is a hypothesis.

3. **[OPEN]** The *dynamics* (decay rate, energy spectrum) require deriving ξ-wave properties from the 5D action.

7 Discussion and Roadmap

7.1 What This Paper Has Defined

This companion paper has formalized:

1. **Symmetry Layering** (Section 3): The EDC manifold has two symmetry layers—kinematic $\mathrm{Diff}(M_4)$ and internal $\mathrm{Isom}(S^1_\xi) \cong U(1)$—described as a layered structure rather than a simple product group.

2. **Defect Classification** (Section 4): Defects are characterized by invariants $(W, Q, \mathcal{C}, s)$. The Y-junction mode algebra ($\sim \mathfrak{su}(3)$) and ring sector labels ($\mathbb{Z}_6$) are related but not claimed to be subgroups of a global symmetry.

3. **Process Operators** (Section 5): Three operators—Excitation ($\mathcal{E}$), Relaxation ($\mathcal{R}$), Merging ($\mathcal{M}$)—formalize generation transitions, weak decay, and nuclear binding respectively.

4. **Conservation Ledger** (Section 6): The β^- decay is analyzed via a ledger that requires a neutral channel **[Dc]**, identified with a ξ-wave (antineutrino) **[P]**.

7.2 Research Roadmap: Upgrading Tags

To upgrade epistemic tags from **[P]**/**[Dc]** to **[Der]**, the following derivations are needed:

Table 4: Research roadmap for tag upgrades

Claim	**Current**	**Required for [Der]**
$L_\xi \sim \bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$	**[Cal]**/**[P]**	Derive L_ξ from 5D variational principle
$\mathcal{A}_Y \sim \mathfrak{su}(3)$	**[Dc]**	Prove Lie algebra closure from 5D action
$\mathbb{Z}_6$ sector structure	**[Der]**	(Already derived from product decomposition)
Operator $\mathcal{E}$ dynamics	**[P]**	Derive mass spectrum from S^1_ξ Laplacian
Operator $\mathcal{R}$ dynamics	**[P]**	Derive tunneling rate from $V(\theta)$ potential
Operator $\mathcal{M}$ dynamics	**[P]**	Derive binding energy from Inflow geometry
ξ-wave $\leftrightarrow \bar{\nu}$	**[P]**	Derive ξ-wave properties; match to $\bar{\nu}$ phenomenology

7.3 Open Questions

The following questions remain **[OPEN]**:

1. **Operator algebra**: Do $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{M}$ form a closed algebraic structure? What are the selection rules?
2. **G_5 derivation**: Can the 5D gravitational coupling be derived from EDC geometry, or must it be an input?
3. **ξ-wave dynamics**: What is the dispersion relation for ξ-waves? How do they interact with frozen defects?
4. **Neutrino oscillations**: If neutrinos are ξ-waves, what mechanism produces mass differences and mixing?
5. **Nuclear binding quantitative**: Can the isoperimetric inequality (surface area minimization) yield helium binding energy to percent-level accuracy?

7.4 How Paper 3 Will Use This Material

Paper 3 (on neutron physics) will cite this companion paper for:

- The formal definition of the $\mathbb{Z}_6$ sector structure
- The relaxation operator $\mathcal{R}$ as the mechanism for β^- decay

- The conservation ledger formalism for analyzing decay processes
- The ξ-wave hypothesis for the neutral channel

By citing this companion, Paper 3 can focus on neutron-specific physics without repeating foundational definitions.

Conclusion

This paper has provided formal definitions for symmetry layering, defect classification, and topological process operators within Elastic Diffusive Cosmology. Every claim is tagged with its epistemic status—**[Der]**, **[Dc]**, **[Cal]**, **[I]**, **[P]**, or **[OPEN]**—to maintain intellectual honesty about what is derived versus hypothesized.

The key contributions are:

1. A layered (not product-group) description of EDC symmetries
2. Formal definitions of operators $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{M}$ with falsifiability conditions
3. A conservation ledger for β^- decay showing the topological necessity of a neutral channel
4. A clear research roadmap for upgrading postulates to derivations

This framework provides a foundation for Paper 3 and subsequent EDC publications to build upon without duplicating foundational material.

A Notation and Conventions

A.1 Manifolds and Coordinates

Symbol	Meaning
M_5	5-dimensional EDC manifold
M_4	4-dimensional base spacetime (Lorentzian)
S^1_ξ	Compact circle (fifth dimension)
ξ	Coordinate on S^1_ξ, $\xi \in [0, L_\xi)$
L_ξ	Circumference of compact dimension
R_ξ	Radius of compact dimension, $R_\xi = L_\xi/2\pi$
x^μ	Coordinates on M_4, $\mu \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$
x^A	Coordinates on M_5, $A \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 5\}$

A.2 Groups and Algebras

Symbol	Meaning
Diff(M_4)	Diffeomorphism group of M_4
Isom(S^1_ξ)	Isometry group of S^1_ξ, $\cong U(1)$
$U(1)$	Unitary group $U(1)$
$SU(3)$	Special unitary group $SU(3)$
$\mathfrak{su}(3)$	Lie algebra of $SU(3)$
$\mathbb{Z}_6$	Cyclic group of order 6
$\mathbb{Z}_3$	Cyclic group of order 3
$\mathbb{Z}_2$	Cyclic group of order 2
$\mathcal{A}_Y$	Mode algebra of Y-junction, $\sim \mathfrak{su}(3)$

A.3 Defect Invariants

Symbol	Meaning
W	Winding number (integer or $\mathbb{Z}/3$ for quarks)
Q	Electric charge in units of e (or $e/3$ for quarks)
$\mathcal{C}$	Color index: $\{-, r, g, b\}$
s	Sector label in $\mathbb{Z}_6$, $s \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$
$\mathcal{D}$	Defect state tuple $(W, Q, \mathcal{C}, s)$
B	Baryon number
L	Lepton number

A.4 Process Operators

Symbol	Meaning
$\mathcal{E}$	Excitation operator (generation transition)
$\mathcal{E}_n$	Excitation by n levels
$\mathcal{R}$	Relaxation operator (sector shift, weak decay)
$\mathcal{M}$	Merging operator (nuclear binding)

A.5 Physical Constants

Symbol	Value	Meaning
$\bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$	3.86×10^{-13} m	Reduced Compton wavelength of electron
G_4	$6.674 \times 10^{-11}\ \mathrm{m^3kg^{-1}s^{-2}}$	4D Newton constant
G_5	(not determined)	5D gravitational coupling
α	$\approx 1/137$	Fine structure constant
m_e	0.511 MeV	Electron mass

A.6 Epistemic Tags

Tag	Meaning
[Der]	Derived from stated postulates
[Dc]	Deduced/Constrained (follows with ansatz)
[Cal]	Calibrated to experiment
[I]	Identified (pattern match)
[P]	Postulated (foundational assumption)
[OPEN]	Open problem
[BL]	Baseline (external data)

B Claim Registry

This appendix provides a complete registry of all nontrivial claims in this document.

B.1 Postulated Claims [P]

Claim	Statement	Reference
5D product manifold	$M_5 = M_4 \times S^1_\xi$	Post. 1
L_ξ identification	$L_\xi \sim \bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$	Rem. 2.1
Symmetry layering	Not proven to be direct product	Rem. 3.3
Defect-particle ID	Electron, proton, neutron = specific defects	Table 1
ξ-wave hypothesis	Neutral channel = ξ-wave	Post. 2
ξ-wave = $\bar{\nu}_e$	Identification in 4D language	Post. 2
Operator $\mathcal{E}$	Excitation mechanism	Def. 5.1
Operator $\mathcal{R}$	Relaxation mechanism	Def. 5.2
Operator $\mathcal{M}$	Merging mechanism	Def. 5.3

B.2 Deduced/Constrained Claims [Dc]

Claim	Statement	Reference
G_4 reduction	$G_4 = G_5/L_\xi$ (KK standard)	Thm. 2.2
Diff(M_4) invariance	Kinematic covariance assumed	Def. 3.1
Isom$(S^1_\xi) \cong U(1)$	Compact isometry group	Def. 3.2
Winding-charge $Q = W$	KK mechanism	Thm. 3.3
$\mathcal{A}_Y \sim \mathfrak{su}(3)$	Mode algebra similarity	Thm. 4.2
Neutral channel needed	Ledger bookkeeping constraint	Thm. 6.2

B.3 Derived Claims [Der]

Claim	Statement	Reference
$\mathbb{Z}_6$ factorization	$\mathbb{Z}_6 = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$	Thm. 4.3
Quark windings	$W_u = +2/3$, $W_d = -1/3$	Table 1

B.4 Identified Claims [I]

Claim	Statement	Reference
Electron = simple vortex	$W = -1$, colorless	Table 1
Proton = Y-junction	$s = 0$, $W_{\text{tot}} = +1$	Table 1
Neutron = Y-junction	$s = 1$, $W_{\text{tot}} = +1$	Table 1

B.5 Calibrated Claims [Cal]

Claim	Statement	Reference
L_ξ value	$L_\xi \approx \bar{\lambda}_C^{(e)}$ (if fitted)	Rem. 2.1

B.6 Open Problems [OPEN]

1. Derive L_ξ from 5D variational principle
2. Derive G_5 from EDC geometry
3. Prove $\mathcal{A}_Y = \mathfrak{su}(3)$ rigorously (Lie bracket closure)
4. Derive operator $\mathcal{E}$ mass spectrum from Laplacian eigenvalues
5. Derive operator $\mathcal{R}$ transition rate from $V(\theta)$ tunneling
6. Derive operator $\mathcal{M}$ binding energy from surface area reduction
7. Derive ξ-wave dispersion relation and interaction cross-sections
8. Formalize operator composition rules and selection rules

B.7 Dependency Map

The following diagram shows claim dependencies:

```
[P] 5D Manifold (Post. 2.1)
     |
     +---> [Dc] Diff(M4) invariance
     |
     +---> [Dc] Isom(S1) ~ U(1)
     |          |
```

```
    |         +---> [Dc] Q = W (winding-charge)
    |
    +---> [Der] Z6 = Z3 x Z2
    |         |
    |         +---> [Dc] Sector labels s in {0,...,5}
    |
    +---> [Dc] A_Y ~ su(3)
              |
              +---> [I] Defect-particle identification

[P] Operators E, R, M
    |
    +---> [Dc] Neutral channel required (ledger)
              |
              +---> [P] xi-wave = antineutrino
```