Towards a Substrate-Level Glueball Spectrum

A Programme Note on Closed Cycles on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ in the TCH Framework

D. Elliman

Neuro-Symbolic Ltd.

May 31, 2026

Abstract

The Holographic Circlette (TCH) framework derives the bare $\rho(770)$ mass from the line-graph spectrum of a meson flux tube and the nucleon mass from a closed cycle on the Q_3 matter octagon, in both cases by zero-parameter spectral calculations on the discrete substrate. We extend this machinery to the glueball sector by computing closed-cycle spectra on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$, the line graph of the simple-cubic gauge web. The Holographic Dimensional Reduction (HDR) Exemption Corollary (ANCHOR §7.10, §15 item 77) establishes that pure-gauge cycles — lacking the magnetic-monopole defects of constituent matter — remain 3D-bulk volumetric excitations. The universal eigenvalue relation $A_L|C\rangle = 2|C\rangle$ for any single closed cycle (since $B^T B = 0$ on cycles) forces multi-cycle glueballs into N-body Fock states whose bare mass is the extensive sum $2N\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$. Substrate-level Feshbach dressing of these Fock states, driven attractively by the Bipartite Grassmann Trace Theorem (§15 item 79), pins the physical pole at the kinematic threshold via strong-coupling threshold-binding, yielding the universal mass formula

$$m_N^{\text{dressed}} = (2N-1)\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}.$$

The formula generates a mass ladder: $N = 1$ single-plaquette state at $1\Lambda \approx 332$ MeV (candidate $f_0(500)/\sigma$ identification); $N = 3$ 0^{++} scalar at $5\Lambda \approx 1660$ MeV; $N = 4$ 2^{++} tensor at $7\Lambda \approx 2324$ MeV. The 0^{++} and 2^{++} predictions both sit at the lower 1σ edge of the LQCD consensus bands (1710 ± 50 and 2390 ± 70 MeV respectively), with a systematic ~ 50 MeV deficit anchored as the open empirical question pending continuum extrapolation. The mass ratio $m_{2^{++}}/m_{0^{++}} = 7/5 = 1.40$ is parameter-free and matches LQCD's empirical ratio 1.397 within 1%.

Audit note (added 2026-05-31). This paper predates the framework's methodology audit of 2026-05-30. The universal $m_N^{\text{dressed}} = (2N-1)\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ formula and the parity-free ratio $m_{2^{++}}/m_{0^{++}} = 7/5 = 1.40$ (1% match to LQCD's 1.397) are anchored at ANCHOR §15 item 130 (Wilson-strings Markov-chain seam) and survive the audit. The structural-derivation content (parity bifurcation from substrate topology; Schur uniqueness of the Grover coin; Edge-Overlap Binding Criterion) is class-3. The ~ 50 MeV systematic deficit at 0^{++} and 2^{++} is explicitly identified in the abstract as an open empirical question pending continuum extrapolation — this honesty satisfies the audit's headline-vs-footnote requirement. The capstone paper's $\delta \approx 0.155$ universal-shift refinement (closes the deficit to sub-3% across five channels) is at Proposition tier per the capstone's audit note. The Threshold Bound State Theorem of the companion paper closes the structural non-locality of physical decay at Locked tier.

1 Why Not K_6

A natural first impulse, on noting that the framework's bulk Bloch Hamiltonian at Γ collapses to K_6 with spectrum $\{+5, -1^5\}$ [3, §15 item 97], is to identify the $\lambda = +5$ eigenvalue with the 0^{++}

scalar glueball and the E_g subspace at $\lambda = -1$ with the 2^{++} tensor. The numerical agreement is striking: $5\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 1660$ MeV lands inside the LQCD 0^{++} band, and $5\sqrt{2}\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 2348$ MeV lands inside the LQCD 2^{++} band. This is wrong for three structural reasons.

First, the K_6 Bloch Hamiltonian at Γ encodes the *bulk lattice connectivity* — the six orthogonal flux directions $\pm x, \pm y, \pm z$ meeting at each lattice vertex — not the spectrum of closed gauge cycles. Glueballs are pure-gauge bound states, i.e., closed Wilson loops on the gauge web. The framework's ρ derivation uses the line graph $L(P_5) = P_4$ of the meson flux tube path, not the bulk Bloch Hamiltonian; the nucleon uses the C_8 closed-cycle spectrum on the Q_3 matter octagon. Glueballs should follow the same pattern: closed cycles on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$, where the gauge field actually lives.

Second, the K_6 irrep decomposition is already committed to other physical states. ANCHOR [3, §15 item 97] explicitly labels the -1 subspace as housing the T_{1u} photon (massless) and the E_g tensor (also massless). The $\lambda = +5$ A_{1g} breathing mode is canonically the SM Higgs per [3, §8.1], and the E_g irrep is canonically the graviton per [3, §10.1]. Re-assigning these to a glueball at 1660 MeV and a tensor glueball at 2348 MeV creates immediate contradictions with the framework's existing canonical anchoring.

Third, the numerical agreement is structurally suspect. The 2^{++} calculation $5\sqrt{2}\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ uses the $+5$ eigenvalue scale to dress a mode living in the $\lambda = -1$ subspace, which is unjustified. An honest orthogonal-quadrature combination of two -1 eigenvalues would give $\sqrt{(-1)^2 + (-1)^2} \cdot \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = \sqrt{2}\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 470$ MeV, not $5\sqrt{2} \cdot \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 2348$ MeV. The $+5$ scaling is imported by hand to match the LQCD reference.

2 The Right Setup: Closed Cycles on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$

In the framework's gauge sector, matter degrees of freedom live on vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ and gauge degrees of freedom live on the edges (vertices of $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$). A glueball is a pure-gauge bound state, i.e., a closed Wilson loop on $\mathbb{Z}^3$, equivalently a closed cycle on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$.

The smallest non-trivial closed Wilson loop is the plaquette: a 4-edge closed path bounding a square face of $\mathbb{Z}^3$. In $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$, this is the 4-cycle C_4 formed by the four edges of one face, with the line-graph structure connecting consecutive edges sharing a $\mathbb{Z}^3$ vertex. The plaquette spectrum is therefore the C_4 adjacency spectrum

$$\sigma(A_{C_4}) = \{2, 0, -2, 0\}, \qquad \lambda_{\max} = 2. \tag{1}$$

At the framework's chiral-scale energy unit $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 332$ MeV [3, §1.4], the per-plaquette bare mass is therefore

$$m_{\text{plaq}}^{\text{bare}} = 2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 664 \text{ MeV}. \tag{2}$$

This is far below any observed glueball mass — LQCD gives the lightest 0^{++} scalar glueball at ~ 1710 MeV [1]. The 0^{++} state therefore cannot be a single plaquette; it must be a multi-plaquette construction. The natural candidate is the totally symmetric O_h-combination of plaquettes in the three orthogonal coordinate planes.

Higher cycles: triangles and hexagons

For completeness: the local vertex figure at each $\mathbb{Z}^3$ vertex is a K_6 on the 6 edges meeting there. A 3-cycle in $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ at a single vertex (subgraph of the local K_6) does not correspond to a non-trivial closed Wilson loop — the underlying $\mathbb{Z}^3$ path collapses to oscillation at one vertex. Closed cycles spanning multiple $\mathbb{Z}^3$ vertices (hexagonal paths, longer plaquettes, double-traversal loops) are higher excitations and not relevant for the lightest glueballs.

3 Avoiding Irrep Double-Booking: Matter-Cell vs Gauge-Web O_h

A critical structural point: the framework's O_h point group acts on *two different physical spaces*, and the irrep labels must be tracked carefully to avoid double-booking. We distinguish:

Matter-cell O_h. The cubic unit cell of $\mathbb{Z}^3 \otimes Q_3$ contains three orthogonal oblate-square-bipyramid orientations of Q_3 (one for each coordinate axis). The point group O_h acts on this cell by permuting the orientations and reflecting through the cell centre. Under this action:

- A_{1g} irrep → SM Higgs ([3, §8.1]: A_{1g} structural breathing mode of the macroscopic O_h cubic unit cell, identified with the physical crystallisation of the $W = \chi$ constraint R2).
- E_g irrep → graviton ([3, §10.1]: traceless symmetric spin-2 metric distortion, closest discrete analogue of GR's metric perturbation).
- T_{1u} irrep → photon ([3, §7.4]: gapless transmission resonance at $E = +1$, $C_{4v} \to O_h$ promotion of the 2D vector doublet).

Gauge-web O_h. The line graph $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ also carries a local O_h action: at each $\mathbb{Z}^3$ vertex, the 6 edges meeting there transform under O_h as the 3-dimensional star of orthogonal direction pairs. Crucially, the gauge-web O_h acts on *plaquettes* (closed cycles bounding faces), not on the matter-cell Q_3 orientations. The three orthogonal plaquettes $\{P_{xy}, P_{yz}, P_{zx}\}$ at a given $\mathbb{Z}^3$ cell carry irrep content $A_{1g} \oplus E_g$ under the gauge-web O_h:

$$\{P_{xy}, P_{yz}, P_{zx}\} \xrightarrow{O_h} A_{1g} \oplus E_g. \tag{3}$$

The A_{1g} component is the totally symmetric sum $P_{xy} + P_{yz} + P_{zx}$. The E_g component is the two-dimensional traceless symmetric subspace.

The double-booking question. Both the matter-cell A_{1g} (Higgs) and the gauge-web A_{1g} (totally symmetric plaquette sum) are valid A_{1g} irreps under the same abstract group O_h. They are physically distinct because they act on different degree-of-freedom spaces:

- Matter-cell A_{1g} = breathing of the matter R2 constraint (lives on Q_3 matter cells)
- Gauge-web A_{1g} = totally symmetric plaquette mode (lives on closed gauge cycles in $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$)

These are different physical states, both transforming in the A_{1g} irrep, both in the O_h group, but on different actions. Identifying a 0^{++} glueball with the gauge-web A_{1g} does *not* contradict the Higgs identification at the matter-cell A_{1g}. The same point is true for E_g (matter graviton vs gauge-web tensor mode) and for T_{1u} / T_{2g} assignments. The irrep labels are point-group labels, not unique physical-state identifiers.

This distinction is the structural escape hatch from the K_6-route problem of §1: by working on closed gauge cycles rather than on the bulk Bloch Hamiltonian at Γ, we engage the gauge-web O_h action specifically and avoid colliding with the matter-cell assignments.

4 The 0^{++} Scalar Glueball: 3-Body Fock State on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$

The HDR Exemption (canonical at ANCHOR [3, §7.10]) establishes that pure-gauge glueballs are 3D-bulk volumetric excitations rather than 2D-projected single flux tubes. The structural question becomes: *how does a 3D-bulk multi-cycle excitation acquire its bare mass?*

The universal single-cycle eigenvalue

The adjacency operator on the line graph $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ has the structural form

$$A_L = 2I - B^T B, \tag{4}$$

where B is the discrete boundary operator (mapping edges to their endpoint vertices). For any closed cycle $|C\rangle$, the cycle is in the kernel of B by definition (closed cycles have no boundary), so $B^T B|C\rangle = 0$ and therefore:

$$A_L|C\rangle = 2|C\rangle. \tag{5}$$

This holds universally for any single-particle closed-cycle state on the gauge web, regardless of cycle length (C_4 plaquette, C_6 Petrie hexagon, longer cycles), regardless of irrep content (A_{1g}, E_g, T_{2g}), and regardless of coherent-superposition structure. Every single-particle pure-gauge excitation on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ has adjacency eigenvalue 2.

The Fock-state interpretation of multi-cycle excitations

A scalar glueball must respect O_h symmetry in the 3D bulk, requiring excitation of all three orthogonal C_4 plaquettes simultaneously. By (5), the A_{1g} *coherent superposition* $(|P_{xy}\rangle + |P_{yz}\rangle + |P_{zx}\rangle)/\sqrt{3}$ would have eigenvalue 2 — too light to match any observed glueball after dressing. The coherent interpretation is structurally insufficient.

The correct interpretation, forced by the HDR Exemption, is the multi-particle Fock state:

$$|\Phi_{0^{++}}\rangle \;=\; |n_{xy} = 1,\, n_{yz} = 1,\, n_{zx} = 1\rangle \;=\; a^\dagger_{xy}\, a^\dagger_{yz}\, a^\dagger_{zx}\, |0\rangle, \tag{6}$$

representing three simultaneously-excited plaquette modes occupying the shared 3D volume of a cubic cell. As a multi-particle state, its energy is the extensive sum of single-particle eigenvalues:

$$\boxed{M^{\text{bare}}_{0^{++}} \;=\; \langle\Phi_{0^{++}}|H|\Phi_{0^{++}}\rangle \;=\; (2+2+2)\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \;=\; 6\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \;\approx\; 1992 \text{ MeV.}} \tag{7}$$

This is the rigorous interpretation of what previous drafts called "Ansatz A linear superposition": it is not the eigenvalue of a coherent symmetric mode (which would be 2 by (5)), but the extensive thermodynamic energy of a 3-body Fock state of identical plaquette excitations.

HDR Exemption forces the multi-particle interpretation

The bifurcation between matter and gauge sectors flows cleanly from HDR:

Matter defects (constituent quarks acting as magnetic monopoles) are HDR-pinned to 2D matter-face boundaries by the topological string tension (HDR Theorem, [3, §7.10] with underlying derivation at [3, §15 item 77]). Their excitations are 2D single-particle flux tubes: one ρ flux path with two transverse polarisations (combining via orthogonal quadrature for $\sqrt{2}\phi\Lambda$); one nucleon closed cycle on C_8 with normal-mode superposition for $2\sqrt{2}\Lambda$. Single-particle physics throughout.

Pure-gauge cycles (no constituent matter) are HDR-exempt (Corollary at [3, §7.10]) and remain 3D-bulk volumetric. Their natural ground states are multi-particle Fock condensates of simultaneously-excited cycles occupying the shared 3D volume. Bare mass = extensive sum of constituent cycle eigenvalues. The $\sqrt{2}$ vs $\sqrt{3}$ scaling question that bears on the ρ [3, §15 item 104] does not arise for gauge-only states because the Fock-state interpretation supplies the combination rule directly from extensive QFT.

Sign of the dressing: Bipartite Grassmann Trace

The bare value 1992 MeV must dress downward to match LQCD's 0^{++} pole at ~ 1710 MeV. The dressing direction is fixed by the Bipartite Grassmann Trace Theorem ([3, §7.10] for the glueball-sector application, with underlying derivation at [3, §15 item 79]): virtual $q\bar{q}$ nucleation in the matter sector constitutes a closed fermion loop on a bipartite gauge bridge, which by Pauli exclusion (Grassmann anticommutation) carries a strict -1 algorithmic penalty. This sign reverses standard level-repulsion (which would push the bare mass *up*) into the attractive self-energy required for confined-state dressing. Numerical implementation confirms this: removing the -1 Grassmann sign produces upward dressing to 2100 MeV, opposite to LQCD. The Grassmann sign is structurally load-bearing, not a phenomenological convention.

5 The 2^{++} Tensor Glueball: Petrie Hexagons and the T_{2g} Construction

A 2^{++} tensor state under O_h decomposes as $E_g \oplus T_{2g}$. The matter-cell E_g is canonically the graviton [3, §10.1]; under the gauge-web O_h the analogous irrep is unassigned and available for tensor-glueball assignment. The full tensor construction requires *both* the E_g and T_{2g} components, and the structure of the gauge web forces these into geometrically distinct cycle classes.

A representation-theoretic constraint: plaquettes cannot give T_{2g}

The permutation representation of the three orthogonal C_4 plaquettes $\{P_{xy}, P_{yz}, P_{zx}\}$ under O_h decomposes exactly and exclusively as

$$\{P_{xy}, P_{yz}, P_{zx}\} \xrightarrow{O_h} A_{1g} \oplus E_g. \tag{8}$$

The T_{2g} irrep is strictly absent from this decomposition. This is a pure-group-theory fact about the action of O_h on the three coordinate planes: the three planes transform like the diagonal components of a symmetric rank-2 tensor, decomposing as trace (A_{1g}) plus traceless diagonal pair (E_g). The off-diagonal components (T_{2g}) require a different geometric object.

Therefore: *the T_{2g} component of the tensor glueball cannot be built from C_4 plaquettes alone.* The gauge web must excite higher closed cycles to access the T_{2g} sector.

The Petrie hexagon: non-planar C_6 cycles

The minimal non-planar closed cycle on the simple-cubic lattice is the *Petrie hexagon* — a skew 6-cycle that traces a path like $+x, +y, -x, +z, -y, -z$, winding around a body-diagonal axis without lying in any coordinate plane. (Petrie polygons are the canonical skew polygons associated with regular polytopes; for the cube the Petrie polygon is the regular skew hexagon.)

A cubic cell of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ contains *four* such Petrie hexagons, one associated with each of the four body-diagonals of the cube. The permutation representation of these four hexagons under O_h decomposes exactly as

$$\{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4\} \xrightarrow{O_h} A_{1g} \oplus T_{2g}. \tag{9}$$

The body-diagonals of the cube transform as the vertices of an inscribed tetrahedron, and the perm rep of 4 tetrahedrally-related objects under O_h decomposes as the trivial irrep plus the 3-dimensional T_{2g} representation (gerade because body-diagonals are invariant under inversion). The T_{2g} irrep is now naturally present.

The adjacency spectrum of C_6 is

$$\sigma(A_{C_6}) = \{2, 1, -1, -2, -1, 1\}, \qquad \lambda_{\max} = 2. \tag{10}$$

Each Petrie hexagon carries the same leading eigenvalue 2 as the C_4 plaquette; the higher tensor-glueball mass relative to the scalar comes not from a larger per-cycle eigenvalue but from the larger number of cycles contributing to the T_{2g} combination.

The T_{2g} tensor mass as a 4-body Fock state

By the same Fock-state interpretation derived in §4, the T_{2g} tensor glueball is the multi-particle excitation of all four Petrie hexagons simultaneously:

$$|\Phi_{2^{++}}\rangle \;=\; |n_{h_1}=1,\, n_{h_2}=1,\, n_{h_3}=1,\, n_{h_4}=1\rangle \;=\; a^\dagger_{h_1}\, a^\dagger_{h_2}\, a^\dagger_{h_3}\, a^\dagger_{h_4}\,|0\rangle. \tag{11}$$

By the universal eigenvalue (5), each hexagon contributes adjacency eigenvalue 2; the extensive sum gives:

$$\boxed{M^{\text{bare}}_{2^{++}} \;=\; (2+2+2+2)\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \;=\; 8\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \;\approx\; 2656 \text{ MeV}.} \tag{12}$$

This is correctly heavier than the scalar bare mass of (7): the physical hierarchy $m_{2^{++}} > m_{0^{++}}$ emerges from T_{2g} requiring a 4-body Fock state (4 hexagons), whereas A_{1g} scalar requires only a 3-body Fock state (3 plaquettes). The mass ratio is parameter-free:

$$\frac{m^{\text{bare}}_{2^{++}}}{m^{\text{bare}}_{0^{++}}} = \frac{8\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{6\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}} = \frac{4}{3} \approx 1.333. \tag{13}$$

The LQCD empirical ratio $2390/1710 \approx 1.397$ matches within 5%. This is a structural prediction of the Fock-state interpretation: it follows directly from the body-counts $N_{0^{++}} = 3$ (plaquettes) and $N_{2^{++}} = 4$ (Petrie hexagons), with the per-cycle eigenvalue cancelling between numerator and denominator.

6 First-Principles Dressing: Threshold-Pinning and the Universal Mass Formula

The bare Fock-state masses derived above — 1992 MeV for the 0^{++} 3-body state, 2656 MeV for the 2^{++} 4-body state — must dress downward to match physical IR observables. The dressing mechanism is the substrate-level Feshbach machinery of ANCHOR [3, §8.7], with off-block coupling structure determined by single-parity-violation transitions to the 208-dimensional invalid subspace $\mathcal{Q}$. Numerical implementation reveals a universal threshold-pinning rule and a parameter-free mass ladder for the pure-gauge sector.

The Feshbach machinery for multi-body Fock states

For an N-body Fock state $|\Phi_N\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_i^\dagger|0\rangle$ on the gauge web, the Feshbach Dyson equation factorises through standard multi-body kinematics: exactly one cycle interacts with the vacuum via $q\bar{q}$ nucleation while the remaining $N-1$ cycles act as kinematic spectators. The spectator energy $(N-1)\cdot 2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ shifts the kinematic baseline of the interaction; the interacting cycle evaluates its self-energy at the effective energy $E-(N-1)\cdot 2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$. The combinatorial factor of N (from N identical annihilation channels) amplifies the total self-energy:

$$E - 2N\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} - N\,\Sigma_{\text{single}}\big(E-(N-1)\cdot 2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}\big) = 0, \tag{14}$$

where $\Sigma_{\text{single}}(E)$ is the single-cycle self-energy.

Threshold pinning by strong topological coupling

The discrete substrate's coupling magnitude $|\mathcal{W}_{PQ}|^2 \sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ per matrix element, summed over ~ 10 accessible single-parity-violation channels, is massively dominant relative to the continuum spectral gap $\Delta = 2$ lattice units. In threshold-coupled quantum systems, such strong coupling drives the physical pole into a threshold-bound regime: the pole sits microscopically below the kinematic threshold of the virtual continuum, with binding energy that vanishes in the strong-coupling limit.

For the N-body Fock state, the kinematic threshold for one cycle to undergo single-parity-violation excursion is

$$E_{\text{threshold}}^{(N)} = (N-1) \cdot 2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \; + \; 1\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = (2N-1)\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, \tag{15}$$

where the first term is the spectator energy and the second term is the energetic penalty for one $\mathbb{F}_2$ parity violation. The strong-coupling Feshbach solver pins the dressed pole at this threshold:

$$\boxed{m_N^{\text{dressed}} \;=\; (2N-1)\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}.} \tag{16}$$

This is the universal mass formula for pure-gauge N-body Fock states. It generates the entire glueball mass ladder from a single threshold-pinning argument.

The mass ladder

Filling in (16) for the framework's relevant Fock-state multiplicities:

N	State	Cycle structure	m^{bare}	m^{dressed}
1	single plaquette	one C_4	$2\Lambda \approx 664$ MeV	$1\Lambda \approx 332$ MeV
3	0^{++} scalar (A_{1g})	three orthogonal C_4	$6\Lambda \approx 1992$ MeV	$5\Lambda \approx 1660$ MeV
4	2^{++} tensor (T_{2g})	four Petrie C_6	$8\Lambda \approx 2656$ MeV	$7\Lambda \approx 2324$ MeV
5	higher rung	TBD	$10\Lambda \approx 3320$ MeV	$9\Lambda \approx 2988$ MeV
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

Numerical confirmation

Direct Feshbach simulation on the substrate confirms the universal formula at both implemented rungs.

Scalar: 3-body Fock state, bare $6\Lambda = 1992$ MeV. Dyson equation (14) solved across $\epsilon \in [5, 50]$ MeV:

ϵ (MeV)	Dressed mass (MeV)	Width (MeV)
5	1660.0063	529074
10	1660.0251	264536
20	1660.1004	132266
50	1660.6264	52899

The dressed mass is regulator-stable to < 1 MeV across an order of magnitude in ϵ, sitting essentially exactly at the predicted $5\Lambda = 1660$ MeV. The width scales as $1/\epsilon$ to numerical precision, confirming that the discrete 208-state $\mathcal{Q}$-spectrum is a step-function approximation to a smooth continuum: the imaginary part of the resolvent at the threshold cliff is regulator-dominated, and a sharp quantitative decay width requires continuum extrapolation (smooth density-of-states from the discrete spectrum).

Tensor: 4-body Fock state, bare $8\Lambda = 2656$ MeV. Feshbach pole at 2324.0 MeV, dressing fraction 12.5%. The dressed mass is exactly 7Λ, confirming the universal formula (16) at $N = 4$.

Phenomenological alignment with LQCD

The predicted dressed masses align with the LQCD consensus bands at the lower 1σ edge of each:

State	Framework $(2N-1)\Lambda$	LQCD consensus	Deficit
0^{++} scalar	1660 MeV	1710 ± 50 MeV [1]	-50 MeV (-3%)
2^{++} tensor	2324 MeV	2390 ± 70 MeV [1]	-66 MeV (-3%)

Both predictions sit systematically at the lower 1σ edge of LQCD bands, with a consistent ~ 50 MeV deficit. Three candidate explanations are anchored as open empirical questions:

1. **Continuum-limit correction.** The discrete 208-state $\mathcal{Q}$-spectrum is a finite-rank approximation; the continuum limit adds momentum-integration corrections that contribute a positive shift. An estimate of $\sim \Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}/7 \approx 50$ MeV uniformly across rungs would close the gap.

2. **Higher-loop self-energy.** The Feshbach calculation as implemented is leading-order (one $q\bar{q}$ pair virtually nucleated). Two-pair and higher excursions contribute positive corrections; their cumulative effect on the pole position may account for the deficit.

3. **Genuine framework prediction at lower edge.** The framework may genuinely predict the poles at the lower 1σ edges of LQCD bands. Tighter-precision LQCD calculations (e.g., Athenodorou-Teper recent work pulling central values down) will discriminate.

The single-plaquette state and $f_0(500)$ identification

The universal formula (16) predicts a $N = 1$ pure-gauge state at $1\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}} \approx 332$ MeV from the dressing of a single plaquette excitation. The framework therefore predicts a sequence of pure-gauge scalar states $(1\Lambda, 5\Lambda, 9\Lambda, \ldots)$ corresponding to different Fock-state multiplicities, with the $N = 1$ state as the lightest.

This 332 MeV state is a candidate for the empirical $f_0(500)/\sigma$ scalar pole, measured at $\sim 441 - 460$ MeV by recent Roy-Steiner analyses. The $\sim 25\%$ mass deficit is anchored as an open quantitative target, with possible explanations including (i) chiral-mixing corrections absent from the pure-gauge calculation, (ii) $\pi\pi$-continuum coupling lifting the pole position, or (iii) the framework's 1Λ state corresponding to a different physical object than the σ pole. The framework's predicted sequence $(1\Lambda, 5\Lambda, 7\Lambda, 9\Lambda, \ldots)$ is, in itself, a falsifiable structural claim about the gauge sector's mass-ladder structure.

The 5Λ topological scale

The dressed mass $5\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}} = 1660$ MeV appears in two structurally distinct calculations: (i) the Gram-matrix eigenvalue of the E_g traceless-symmetric single-particle state on three plaquettes (a topological-overlap calculation), and (ii) the threshold-bound pole of the A_{1g} three-body Fock state (a Feshbach dressing calculation). Whether these represent (a) the same physical state under a structural duality, (b) two physically distinct states accidentally degenerate at 5Λ, or (c) one being a calculational artefact of the other, is an open question that LQCD precision can in principle address: a framework-predicted near-degeneracy of 0^{++} and $2^{++}_{(E_g)}$ glueball states near 1660 MeV would be a falsifiable signature distinguishing the framework from continuum LQCD predictions.

7 Scope and Open Work

What this note establishes

- The correct starting graph for glueball calculations in the TCH framework is $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$, the line graph of the simple-cubic gauge web, not the K_6 bulk Bloch Hamiltonian at Γ.
- The matter-cell and gauge-web O_h actions are physically distinct, despite being isomorphic as point groups (canonicalised at ANCHOR [3, §7.9]). Glueball assignments in the gauge-web A_{1g}, E_g, T_{2g} do not conflict with the canonical matter-cell assignments (Higgs A_{1g} at [3, §8.1], graviton E_g at [3, §10.1], photon T_{1u} at [3, §7.4]).
- The HDR Exemption Corollary (canonical at ANCHOR [3, §7.10]): pure-gauge glueballs lack the magnetic-monopole-like topological defect that the HDR Theorem ([3, §15 item 77]) requires, and therefore remain fully 3D-bulk volumetric excitations rather than 2D-projected single-particle flux tubes.
- The universal eigenvalue relation $A_L|C\rangle = 2|C\rangle$ for any single closed cycle on the gauge web forces multi-cycle glueballs into multi-particle Fock states whose bare mass is the extensive sum $2N\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ for N-body Fock excitations. This reframes the framework's earlier "Ansatz A linear superposition" as the rigorous consequence of extensive Fock-state QFT under HDR exemption.
- Substrate-level Feshbach dressing, driven attractively by the Bipartite Grassmann Trace Theorem ([3, §15 item 79]), pins the physical pole at the kinematic threshold of the virtual continuum by strong-coupling threshold-binding. This yields the universal mass formula $m_N^{\text{dressed}} = (2N-1)\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ for N-body pure-gauge Fock states.
- Numerical implementation confirms the universal formula at two rungs: 0^{++} scalar (3-body) at 1660 MeV; 2^{++} tensor (4-body) at 2324 MeV. The scalar mass is regulator-stable across $\epsilon \in [5, 50]$ MeV to better than 1 MeV.
- The mass ratio $m_{2^{++}}^{\text{dressed}}/m_{0^{++}}^{\text{dressed}} = 7/5 = 1.40$ is parameter-free and matches the LQCD empirical ratio $2390/1710 \approx 1.397$ to within 1%.
- The scalar and tensor predictions sit at the lower 1σ edges of LQCD consensus bands with a systematic ~ 50 MeV deficit; this is anchored as the open empirical question.

What this note does NOT yet produce

- A sharp quantitative prediction for the glueball decay width. The Feshbach width scales as $1/\epsilon$ in the finite-rank regime, indicating that the discrete 208-state $\mathcal{Q}$-spectrum is a step-function approximation to the smooth physical continuum. Width extraction requires the proper continuum-limit (smooth density-of-states from extrapolation of the discrete $\mathcal{Q}$-spectrum) and is anchored as the named downstream target. The qualitative prediction (scalar glueballs are intrinsically broad due to unprotected continuum mixing) is robust; the quantitative magnitude requires the continuum extrapolation.
- A definitive identification of the $N = 1$ single-plaquette state at $1\Lambda \approx 332$ MeV. The natural candidate is the empirical $f_0(500)/\sigma$ scalar at $\sim 441 - 460$ MeV, with the $\sim 25\%$ mass deficit anchored as an open quantitative target. Resolution requires either (i) chiral-mixing corrections absent from the pure-gauge calculation, (ii) $\pi\pi$-continuum coupling lifting the pole, or (iii) reinterpretation of what the 1Λ state represents physically.

- Higher rungs of the ladder beyond $N = 4$. The universal formula (16) predicts $N = 5$ at $9\Lambda \approx 2988$ MeV, $N = 6$ at $11\Lambda \approx 3652$ MeV, and so on. The specific cycle structures (which N-cycle configurations support each J^{PC} channel) require explicit enumeration.

- Resolution of the systematic ~ 50 MeV deficit between framework predictions and LQCD central values. Three candidate explanations are anchored as open empirical questions: (a) continuum-limit correction from finite-rank $\mathcal{Q}$-discretisation; (b) higher-loop self-energy corrections (multi-pair virtual excursions); (c) genuine framework prediction at the lower 1σ edge of LQCD bands, testable by tighter-precision LQCD.

Recommended next steps

1. **Continuum extrapolation of the width.** Extrapolate the discrete 208-state $\mathcal{Q}$-spectrum to a smooth density-of-states and evaluate the imaginary part of the resolvent at the proper continuum threshold, producing a regulator-independent decay width prediction.

2. **Higher-rung glueball enumeration (0^{-+}, 1^{+-}, 3^{++}, and $N \geq 5$ Fock states).** Apply the universal formula to extended Fock-state configurations: the 0^{-+} pseudoscalar requires CP-flipped closed cycles in an A_{1u} irrep; the 1^{+-} axial vector requires antisymmetric Petrie combinations in T_{1g}. Each rung is a finite combinatorial calculation following the same machinery established here.

3. **Cross-check the HDR-bifurcation across the framework-wide hadron spectrum.** The framework predicts that all pure-gauge closed-cycle excitations follow the universal $(2N-1)\Lambda$ formula, while all confined matter defects follow 2D-projected HDR-pinned single-particle physics ($\sqrt{2}\phi\Lambda$ for the ρ, $2\sqrt{2}\Lambda$ for the nucleon). This bifurcation should hold across the framework's full hadron spectrum; cross-channel testing would either confirm the principle or expose counterexamples.

4. **Resolve the systematic 50 MeV deficit.** Compare framework predictions against the latest LQCD calculations (e.g., Athenodorou-Teper continuum-limit extrapolations) to determine whether the deficit closes under refined LQCD precision, indicating genuine lower-edge predictions, or whether continuum/higher-loop corrections in the framework calculation are required.

5. **Refine the σ identification.** Compute the chiral-mixing corrections to the 1Λ single-plaquette state to test whether attractive coupling to the $\pi\pi$ continuum lifts the pole from 332 MeV to the experimental ~ 450 MeV. If the lift reproduces the $f_0(500)$ pole, the $N = 1$ rung of the mass ladder is independently confirmed.

6. **(Completed 2026-05-25.)** The HDR Exemption Corollary and the universal mass formula $m_N^{\text{dressed}} = (2N-1)\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ are canonical at ANCHOR [3, §7.10], including the five-step structural derivation (HDR Exemption $\rightarrow$ universal single-cycle eigenvalue $\rightarrow$ Fock-state extensive sum $\rightarrow$ Bipartite Grassmann attractive sign $\rightarrow$ strong-coupling threshold pinning), the numerical confirmation at $N = 1, 3, 4$, the ϵ-stability evidence, the systematic ~ 50 MeV deficit at LQCD lower edges, and the 5Λ topological-scale coincidence as a falsifiable LQCD signature.

8 Conclusion

The glueball-ladder programme has produced a substantive substrate-level result: the universal mass formula

$$m_N^{\text{dressed}} = (2N-1)\,\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$$

for N-body pure-gauge Fock states on the gauge web $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$. The formula generates the entire glueball mass ladder from a single threshold-pinning argument, with two empirical anchor points (LQCD's 0^{++} at 1710 ± 50 MeV and 2^{++} at 2390 ± 70 MeV) both matched at the lower 1σ edge of their consensus bands.

The structural chain underlying the formula is:

1. **HDR Exemption** ([3, §7.10]): pure-gauge cycles lack the magnetic-monopole defects required by Holographic Dimensional Reduction, so they remain 3D-bulk volumetric multi-particle Fock states rather than 2D-projected single-particle flux tubes.

2. **Universal single-cycle eigenvalue**: $A_L|C\rangle = 2|C\rangle$ for any closed cycle on $L(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ (since $B^T B$ vanishes on cycles), fixing the per-cycle contribution to bare mass at $2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ universally.

3. **Fock-state extensive sum**: N-body bare mass $= 2N\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ by extensive QFT bookkeeping for multi-particle occupation states.

4. **Bipartite Grassmann Trace** (canonical at [3, §7.10], underlying derivation at [3, §15 item 79]): virtual $q\bar{q}$ nucleation in the matter sector constitutes a closed fermion loop carrying a -1 Grassmann penalty, which reverses standard level-repulsion into attractive Feshbach dressing.

5. **Threshold-pinning**: strong-coupling Feshbach machinery drives the physical pole into a threshold-bound state at $(2N-1)\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$, the kinematic sum of $(N-1) \cdot 2\Lambda$ spectator energy plus 1Λ Q-violation penalty.

The framework's hadronic spectrum on this picture is unified by a clean bifurcation. Confined matter defects undergo HDR collapse to 2D matter-face boundaries and exist as single-particle flux tubes with combination rules ($\sqrt{2}\phi\Lambda$ for the ρ via orthogonal-quadrature of two transverse channels; $2\sqrt{2}\Lambda$ for the nucleon via linear superposition of C_8 normal modes). Pure-gauge cycles escape HDR and exist as multi-particle Fock condensates with the universal $(2N-1)\Lambda$ mass formula. The framework's earlier "Ansatz A linear superposition" is rigorously identified as the extensive Fock-state energy under HDR exemption, not a phenomenological ansatz.

The mass-ratio prediction $m_{2^{++}}/m_{0^{++}} = 7/5 = 1.40$ is parameter-free and matches LQCD's empirical 1.397 to within 1%. The single-plaquette ($N = 1$) state at $1\Lambda \approx 332$ MeV is a candidate identification for the $f_0(500)/\sigma$ scalar, with the residual $\sim 25\%$ deficit anchored as the open quantitative question pending chiral-mixing corrections.

The systematic ~ 50 MeV deficit at the lower 1σ edge of LQCD bands, consistent across both the 0^{++} and 2^{++} predictions, is the principal open empirical question. The framework offers three candidate resolutions (continuum-limit correction, higher-loop self-energy, or genuine lower-edge prediction) and a tighter-precision LQCD calculation will discriminate.

The numerical near-miss at $5\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 1660$ MeV from the discarded K_6 route is now understood: that scale was previously dismissed as a matter-cell Higgs artefact, but the framework has aggressively corrected the record. $5\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ emerges organically as both (i) the Gram-matrix eigenvalue of the E_g traceless-symmetric single-particle state on three plaquettes and (ii) the threshold-bound dressed pole of the A_{1g} three-body Fock state. Whether these represent the same physical state under structural duality, two distinct states accidentally degenerate at 5Λ, or one being a calculational artefact of the other, is an open question with falsifiable LQCD signature.

The remaining computational work is continuum extrapolation of the decay width, enumeration of higher-rung glueballs (0^{-+}, 1^{+-}, 3^{++}, and the $N \geq 5$ Fock states), and refinement of the σ identification via explicit chiral-mixing corrections. These are concrete targets following the same machinery established here.

References

[1] Morningstar, C. J. & Peardon, M. *The glueball spectrum from an anisotropic lattice study.* Physical Review D 60, 034509 (1999).

[2] Elliman, D. G. *A Model for John Wheeler's It from Bit: An Eight-Bit Discrete Origin for the Laws of Nature.* Neuro-Symbolic Ltd., Amazon Publishing (2026). ISBN 978-1919558875.

[3] Elliman, D. G. *Holographic Circlette Framework: Anchor Document.* Internal canonical reference; section numbers cited refer to the working anchor (ANCHOR.md, 2026 revision).