Reply re: D3 paper and the (S) condition

Jonathan Washburn

February 3, 2026

Short answer. Yes, we can replace (S) with a physics-motivated constraint that selects $D = 3$ without invoking $N = 45$. The cleanest option is a *spinor/gauge-structure constraint*: require the existence of 2-component complex spinors together with a non-abelian, simple spin group for rotations. This uniquely selects $D = 3$ because $\mathrm{Cl}_3 \cong M_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \cong \mathrm{SU}(2)$, while $D = 2$ is abelian and $D = 4$ gives $\mathrm{Spin}(4) \cong \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{SU}(2)$. This is first-principles physics (fermions and non-abelian gauge structure) and avoids any appearance of numerology.

Alternative short reply (if we keep S). We could solve this, however, if we prove that $N = 45$ emerges from RG axioms or if it can be measured from data with error bars. In that case (S) is no longer a numerological input but a grounded parameter.

Option A (replace S by a spinor constraint). Add a third constraint (call it (C)) such as:

> *(C) Spinor structure.* The spatial dimension must admit 2-component complex spinors and a non-abelian simple rotation cover $\mathrm{Spin}(D)$ so that spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ matter and a minimal non-abelian gauge structure can exist.

Then cite the standard Clifford-algebra classification:

$$\mathrm{Cl}_1 \cong \mathbb{C}, \quad \mathrm{Cl}_2 \cong \mathbb{H}, \quad \mathrm{Cl}_3 \cong M_2(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{Cl}_4 \cong M_2(\mathbb{H}),$$

so the unique dimension supporting 2-component complex spinors with $\mathrm{Spin}(D)$ simple and non-abelian is $D = 3$. This makes the triad (T/K/C) fully independent and removes $N = 45$ from the main body.

Option B (keep S but de-numerologize). If we keep (S), I agree with your suggested remark and would strengthen it slightly to emphasize independence from the specific value of N:

Remark 1 (Role of N in the synchronization constraint)**.** *Fix any odd N. Then for all $D \in \mathbb{N}$,* $\gcd(2^D, N) = 1$ *and therefore* $\mathrm{lcm}(2^D, N) = N \cdot 2^D$*. Hence, for any admissible lower bound $D \geq D_{\min}$ (e.g. $D_{\min} = 3$ from independent constraints), the unique minimizer of* $\mathrm{lcm}(2^D, N)$ *is always the boundary value $D = D_{\min}$. Thus $D = 3$ is selected* independently of N*; the choice $N = 45$ only sets the synchronization period (e.g.* $360 = 45 \cdot 8$*) and should be read as a phenomenological input, not a dimension selector.*

This wording makes (S) an efficiency tie-breaker rather than a physical selector.

If you want a first-principles origin for $N = 45$ (optional). Within Recognition Science, there is a clean interpretation of 45 as a triangular number $T(9) = 1 + 2 + \cdots + 9$ tied to a closed 8-tick cycle plus closure (fence-post principle), i.e. cumulative phase accumulation over one full register traversal. If we mention this at all, it should be explicitly labeled as RS-specific motivation or as a phenomenological parameter with error bars, not as a derived constant in this paper.

Recommendation. If the goal is to avoid any appearance of numerology, I recommend Option A (replace S by the spinor/gauge-structure constraint) and keep the $N = 45$ material only as an optional RS-specific remark or in an appendix.