

The Hessian of the G_2 3-form on the Grassmannian, a geometric ratio matching the Koide angle, and two obstruction theorems

P. Music

Abstract

We compute the Hessian of the G_2 3-form φ restricted to $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6)$ at the flavour-symmetric point, obtaining eigenvalues $0^5, (-2\varphi_0)^3, (-3\varphi_0)^1$ on the $\text{SO}(3)$ -decomposition $\text{Sym}_0^2 \oplus \Lambda^2 \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot I$. The geometric ratio $|\lambda_{\Lambda^2}|/|\Delta f/\varphi_0| = 2/9$ matches the empirical Brannen–Koide phase to 0.02%.

We prove two obstruction theorems constraining any dynamical derivation of $\delta = 2/9$. First, since $\cos(2/3)$ is transcendental (Lindemann–Weierstrass), no symmetric polynomial in the mass eigenvalues with algebraic coefficients can select $\delta = 2/9$ as an extremum. Second, any topological flux quantisation mechanism produces phases that are rational multiples of π , for which $\cos(3\delta)$ is algebraic; such mechanisms are therefore also excluded by the same transcendentality. These results establish that the Koide phase $\delta \approx 2/9$ — if exact — cannot arise from any polynomial potential or standard topological mechanism, severely constraining the space of viable explanations.

All analytic results are verified by independent numerical computation.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Setup	2
3	Hessian of f at the democratic point	2
4	The geometric ratio and structural identities	3
4.1	The ratio $2/9$	3
4.2	Structural identity	3
4.3	Dimensional uniqueness of $N = 3$	4
5	Obstruction theorems	4
5.1	Polynomial obstruction	4
5.2	Topological obstruction	4
5.3	Perturbative exclusion	5
6	Confrontation with experiment	5
7	Discussion	5
7.1	What is proven	5
7.2	What is conjectured	6
7.3	What kind of mechanism could work?	6
7.4	On the identification $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \cong \mathfrak{3}$	6
7.5	Falsifiable predictions	6
7.6	Limitations	7

1 Introduction

The charged lepton masses satisfy the Koide relation [1]

$$Q \equiv \frac{m_e + m_\mu + m_\tau}{(\sqrt{m_e} + \sqrt{m_\mu} + \sqrt{m_\tau})^2} = 0.6666661 \approx \frac{2}{3} \quad (1)$$

to a precision of 6×10^{-6} . In the Brannen parametrisation [2], $\sqrt{m_k} = \mu(1 + \sqrt{2} \cos(\delta + 2\pi k/3))$ with $Q = 2/3$ holding identically for any δ . The empirical phase is $\delta_{\text{exp}} = 0.22227$ rad, remarkably close to $2/9 = 0.22222\dots$ (deviation $\sim 0.02\%$). Here δ is defined on the principal branch $(0, \pi/3)$ by assigning $k = 0$ to τ (heaviest), $k = 1$ to e (lightest), $k = 2$ to μ ; other assignments shift δ by $\pm 2\pi/3$.

Sumino [3] showed that a $U(3)$ family gauge symmetry can protect $Q = 2/3$ from radiative corrections, but did not derive the value of δ . Many approaches have been explored — Casimir ratios, exceptional algebraic structures, topological mechanisms — but none has produced a derivation of $\delta = 2/9$.

In this paper we provide two results that constrain any such derivation:

1. A complete computation of the Hessian of the G_2 3-form on $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6)$, yielding the geometric ratio $2/9$ (Section 3).
2. Two obstruction theorems showing that $\delta = 2/9$ cannot arise from (a) any symmetric polynomial in the mass eigenvalues with algebraic coefficients, nor (b) any topological flux quantisation mechanism (Section 5).

These obstructions do not prove that $\delta = 2/9$ is accidental; they prove that any mechanism producing it must be *neither polynomial nor topological* in the standard sense, which severely restricts the space of viable theories.

2 Setup

Let $V = \mathbb{R}^7$ carry the standard G_2 -invariant 3-form $\varphi \in \Lambda^3(V^*)$, and let $\mathbb{R}^6 \subset \mathbb{R}^7$ be orthogonal to a fixed unit vector e_7 . The restriction $\varphi|_{\mathbb{R}^6} = \text{Re}(\Omega)$ where $\Omega = dz_1 \wedge dz_2 \wedge dz_3$ is the holomorphic volume form on \mathbb{C}^3 via $z_k = e_k + ie_{k+3}$. Explicitly,

$$\varphi|_{\mathbb{R}^6} = e^{123} - e^{156} + e^{246} - e^{345}. \quad (2)$$

For an oriented 3-plane $W \in \text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6)$ with frame (v_1, v_2, v_3) :

$$f(W) = \frac{\varphi(v_1, v_2, v_3)}{\text{vol}(v_1, v_2, v_3)}, \quad \text{vol} = \sqrt{\det G}, \quad G_{ij} = \langle v_i, v_j \rangle. \quad (3)$$

The democratic point $V_0 = \text{span}(e_1, e_2, e_3)$ has $\varphi_0 = f(V_0) = 1$. The tangent space $T_{V_0} \text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6) \cong M_3(\mathbb{R})$ parametrises deformations $v_i(\varepsilon) = w_i + \varepsilon \sum_k A_{ik} u_k$ with $w_k = e_k$, $u_k = e_{k+3}$.

3 Hessian of f at the democratic point

Lemma 1 (Levi-Civita). *At V_0 : (a) $\varphi(w_i, w_j, u_k) = 0$ for all i, j, k . (b) $\varphi(w_k, u_a, u_b) = -\varphi_0 \varepsilon_{kab}$.*

Proof. Since $\varphi|_{\mathbb{R}^6} = \text{Re}(\Omega)$ and $z_k = w_k + iu_k$, the expansion of $\text{Re}(\Omega)$ contains only terms with an even number of u -type indices. Part (a) follows (one u -index). Part (b) follows by direct evaluation against (2). Verified computationally for all $3^3 = 27$ index combinations. \square

Lemma 2 (Gram matrix). $G_{ij}(\varepsilon) = \delta_{ij} + \varepsilon^2(AA^T)_{ij}$, hence $\text{vol}(\varepsilon) = 1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\|A\|^2 + O(\varepsilon^4)$.

Lemma 3 (Numerator expansion). $\varphi(v_1(\varepsilon), v_2(\varepsilon), v_3(\varepsilon)) = \varphi_0 + \varepsilon^2 N_2(A) + O(\varepsilon^3)$ with

$$N_2(A) = \frac{\varphi_0}{2} [\text{Tr}(A^2) - (\text{Tr } A)^2]. \quad (4)$$

Proof. The $O(\varepsilon)$ term vanishes by Lemma 1(a). The $O(\varepsilon^2)$ term uses Lemma 1(b) and the identity $\sum_k \varepsilon_{kij} \varepsilon_{kab} = \delta_{ia} \delta_{jb} - \delta_{ib} \delta_{ja}$. \square

Theorem 4 (Hessian). *The Hessian of $f = \varphi/\text{vol}$ on $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6)$ at the democratic point is*

$$H_f(A) = -\varphi_0 [(\text{Tr } A)^2 + 2\|A_{\text{anti}}\|^2], \quad (5)$$

where $A_{\text{anti}} = \frac{1}{2}(A - A^T)$.

Proof. $f(\varepsilon) = (\varphi_0 + \varepsilon^2 N_2)(1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\|A\|^2) + O(\varepsilon^4)$, so $H_f(A) = 2N_2 - \varphi_0\|A\|^2$. Decomposing $A = S + \Lambda$ (symmetric + antisymmetric): $\text{Tr}(A^2) = \|S\|^2 - \|\Lambda\|^2$ and $\text{Tr}(AA^T) = \|S\|^2 + \|\Lambda\|^2$, giving (5). \square

Remark. *Both contributions to the Hessian are essential. The numerator alone gives $N_2|_{\Lambda^2} = -\frac{\varphi_0}{2}\|A\|^2$ and $N_2|_{\text{Sym}_0^2} = +\frac{\varphi_0}{2}\|A\|^2$, while the normalisation contributes $-\frac{\varphi_0}{2}\|A\|^2$ uniformly. On Sym_0^2 they cancel; on Λ^2 they add; on $\mathbb{R} \cdot I$ the ratio is 2:1.*

Corollary 5 (Eigenvalue decomposition). *Under $\text{SO}(3)$, $M_3(\mathbb{R}) = \text{Sym}_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \oplus \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \oplus \mathbb{R} \cdot I$ with eigenvalues:*

Subspace	dim	Eigenvalue	Interpretation
$\text{Sym}_0^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$	5	0	flat directions
$\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$	3	$-2\varphi_0$	mass splitting
$\mathbb{R} \cdot I$	1	$-3\varphi_0$	trace/scale

Remark. *The full 12×12 Hessian on $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^7)$ is observed numerically to have spectrum $(-3)^4, 0^8$. Restricting to $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6) \subset \text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^7)$ yields the universal spectrum $0^5, (-2)^3, (-3)^1$, independent of which codimension-1 restriction is chosen (verified for all four choices).*

4 The geometric ratio and structural identities

4.1 The ratio 2/9

Theorem 6 (Geometric ratio). *For $N = 3$, the ratio*

$$\delta_{\text{geom}} = \frac{|\lambda_{\Lambda^2}|}{|\Delta f/\varphi_0|} = \frac{2}{5 \times 0 + 3 \times 2 + 1 \times 3} = \frac{2}{9} \quad (6)$$

matches the empirical Brannen–Koide phase to 0.02%.

4.2 Structural identity

Proposition 7. *For all $N \geq 2$, $C_2(\text{Sym}^N(N)) = N(N-1) = 2 \dim \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

Proof. $C_2(\text{Sym}^k(N)) = k(N+k)(N-1)/(2N)$. Setting $k = N$: $N \cdot 2N \cdot (N-1)/(2N) = N(N-1)$. Since $\dim \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N) = \binom{N}{2} = N(N-1)/2$, the identity follows. Verified numerically for $N = 2, \dots, 7$. \square

Remark. *For $N = 3$, the Hessian trace on Λ^2 satisfies $|\text{Tr}(H_f|_{\Lambda^2})|/\varphi_0 = 3 \times 2 = 6 = C_2(\text{Sym}^3 3)$. Both the Hessian eigenvalue 2 and the centre charge $c(\Lambda^2) = 2$ originate from the second exterior power Λ^2 : the former via the antisymmetriser $\delta_{ia} \delta_{jb} - \delta_{ib} \delta_{ja}$, the latter via $c(\Lambda^k) = k \bmod N$. This shared algebraic origin is suggestive but does not constitute a proven structural link between the variational and representation-theoretic constructions.*

4.3 Dimensional uniqueness of $N = 3$

Two independent conditions single out $N = 3$:

1. $\dim \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N) = N$ iff $N = 3$ (since $\binom{N}{2} = N$ gives $N = 3$).
2. The Casimir ratio $C_2(\overline{N})/C_2(\text{Sym}^N(N)) = (N + 1)/(2N^2) = 2/9$ iff $N = 3$.

5 Obstruction theorems

5.1 Polynomial obstruction

Theorem 8 (Polynomial obstruction). *Let $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any polynomial with algebraic coefficients. On the Koide surface (parametrised by δ with $Q = 2/3$ fixed), every symmetric polynomial in the three mass eigenvalues (equivalently, every polynomial invariant under the Weyl group S_3) depends on δ only through $\cos(3\delta)$. Therefore F can select $\delta = \delta_0$ as an extremum only if $\cos(3\delta_0)$ is algebraic. Since $\cos(2/3)$ is transcendental by the Lindemann–Weierstrass theorem, no such F can select $\delta = 2/9$.*

Proof. On the Koide surface, define $x_k = \sqrt{m_k}/\mu = 1 + \sqrt{2} \cos(\delta + 2\pi k/3)$. The elementary symmetric polynomials of $\{x_k\}$ satisfy:

$$\sigma_1 = \sum x_k = 3, \quad \sigma_2 = \sum_{i < j} x_i x_j = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \sigma_3 = \prod x_k = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \cos(3\delta), \quad (7)$$

where σ_1 and σ_2 are constant (using $\sum \cos(\delta + 2\pi k/3) = 0$ and $\sum \cos^2 = 3/2$), and only σ_3 varies with δ .

Since $m_k = \mu^2 x_k^2$, any symmetric polynomial in $\{m_k\}$ is a symmetric polynomial in $\{x_k^2\}$. By Newton's identities, this is a polynomial in the power sums $p_{2n} = \sum x_k^{2n}$, each of which is a polynomial in $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$. With σ_1, σ_2 fixed, all dependence on δ enters only through σ_3 , hence through $\cos(3\delta)$. Thus any S_3 -symmetric polynomial F in the mass eigenvalues restricts to a polynomial $P(\cos(3\delta))$ on the Koide surface.

At an interior extremum ($\delta \neq 0, \pi/3$), $P'(\cos(3\delta_0)) = 0$, which forces $\cos(3\delta_0)$ to be algebraic.

By Lindemann–Weierstrass, if $\alpha \neq 0$ is algebraic then $e^{i\alpha}$ is transcendental. Since $2/3$ is algebraic and nonzero, $e^{2i/3}$ is transcendental, so $\cos(2/3) = \text{Re}(e^{2i/3})$ is transcendental (if it were algebraic, $e^{2i/3} = \cos(2/3) + i \sin(2/3)$ with $\sin(2/3) = \sqrt{1 - \cos^2(2/3)}$ algebraic would give a contradiction). Thus $\cos(3 \times 2/9) = \cos(2/3)$ is transcendental and cannot be a root of any polynomial with algebraic coefficients. \square

Remark. *This eliminates all polynomial approaches with algebraic coefficients to deriving $\delta = 2/9$, including: the $J_3(\mathbb{O})$ cubic norm, polynomial Casimir combinations, any Sumino-type polynomial potential $V(\Phi)$ with algebraic couplings, and the G_2 volume functional restricted to the Koide surface (verified numerically: $f(\Phi(\delta))$ is monotonic in $\cos(3\delta)$ with extrema only at $\delta = 0, \pi/3$).*

5.2 Topological obstruction

The polynomial obstruction has a powerful corollary for topological mechanisms.

Theorem 9 (Topological obstruction). *Any mechanism that produces the Brannen phase δ (in radians) as a rational multiple of π is excluded as a derivation of $\delta = 2/9$.*

Proof. In any topological flux mechanism (e.g. 't Hooft flux quantisation [4], discrete Wilson lines on resolved ADE singularities [5]), holonomy eigenvalues are of the form $e^{2\pi i p/q}$ for integers p, q . If such a mechanism determines the Brannen phase, then $\delta = r\pi$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$. But then $3\delta = 3r\pi$ is a rational multiple of π , and $\cos(3r\pi)$ is algebraic — since $e^{2\pi i \cdot 3r/2}$ is a root of the

cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_q(x)$ for some q , and real and imaginary parts of algebraic numbers are algebraic.

By contrast, $\cos(3 \times 2/9) = \cos(2/3)$ is transcendental (Theorem 8). Since $2/9 \neq r\pi$ for any $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ (equivalently, $2/(9\pi) \notin \mathbb{Q}$, which follows from the transcendence of π), no rational multiple of π equals $2/9$. \square

Remark. *This theorem applies to all standard topological mechanisms in gauge theory: 't Hooft flux quantisation ($m \in \mathbb{Z}_N$), discrete Wilson lines, orbifold phases, and Chern–Simons levels. All produce phases that are rational multiples of π , which are precisely the values not excluded by the polynomial obstruction. There is thus a complementarity: polynomial functionals can only select algebraic $\cos(3\delta)$ (rational multiples of π among them), while the empirical $\delta = 2/9$ gives transcendental $\cos(2/3)$, which lies outside both classes.*

5.3 Perturbative exclusion

We verify independently that perturbative dynamics also fail to select $\delta = 2/9$.

Proposition 10. *The one-loop effective potential for $U(3)$ family gauge bosons compactified on S^1 , with holonomy eigenvalues $\theta_k = \delta + 2\pi k/3$ (matching the Brannen convention, δ in radians), is monotonic on the Brannen domain $\delta \in (0, \pi/3)$ and has no interior critical points. In particular, $\delta = 2/9$ is not a critical point.*

Proof. The adjoint contribution depends only on differences $\theta_i - \theta_j = 2\pi(i - j)/3$, independent of δ . For fundamental matter, $\sum_{k=0}^2 e^{in\theta_k} = e^{in\delta} \sum_k e^{2\pi ink/3}$, which vanishes unless $3|n$. The surviving terms give $V_{\text{fund}}(\delta) \propto \sum_{m \geq 1} \cos(3m\delta)/m^4$, which equals $B_4(3\delta/(2\pi))$ (fourth Bernoulli polynomial, periodised) up to normalisation. Since $B_4'(x) = 2x(2x - 1)(x - 1)$ has roots at $x = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1$, the critical points in δ are $\delta = 0, \pi/3, 2\pi/3$ — all on the boundaries of the Brannen domain $(0, \pi/3)$. No interior critical point exists. Verified numerically: V_{fund} is strictly monotonic on $(0, \pi/3)$. \square

This provides an independent exclusion: the one-loop potential, with δ in the Brannen convention (radians), is monotonic on the physical domain $(0, \pi/3)$ and has no interior critical points.

6 Confrontation with experiment

We use PDG 2024 [6] central values: $m_e = 0.51099895$ MeV, $m_\mu = 105.6583755$ MeV, $m_\tau = 1776.86 \pm 0.12$ MeV.

Setting $\delta = 2/9$ and $Q = 2/3$, with μ fixed from m_μ alone (one mass as input), the remaining two masses are predicted with zero free parameters:

Observable	Prediction ($\delta = 2/9$)	Data	Deviation
Brannen phase δ	$2/9 = 0.22222\dots$	0.22227	0.02%
m_τ	1776.97 MeV	1776.86 ± 0.12 MeV	0.9σ
m_e	0.510994 MeV	0.510999 MeV	0.001%

A measurement of m_τ to ± 0.05 MeV would provide a 2σ test of $\delta = 2/9$.

7 Discussion

7.1 What is proven

1. The Hessian formula (5) and eigenvalue decomposition (Theorem 4, Corollary 5).

2. The geometric ratio $\delta_{\text{geom}} = 2/9$ (Theorem 6).
3. The structural identity $C_2(\text{Sym}^N(N)) = 2 \dim \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all N (Proposition 7).
4. The polynomial obstruction: no symmetric polynomial in the mass eigenvalues with algebraic coefficients selects $\delta = 2/9$ (Theorem 8).
5. The topological obstruction: no flux quantisation mechanism selects $\delta = 2/9$ (Theorem 9).
6. The one-loop potential is monotonic on the Brannen domain $(0, \pi/3)$ (Proposition 10).

7.2 What is conjectured

Conjecture 11 (Koide phase). *The Brannen–Koide phase equals $\delta = 2/9$ exactly.*

No dynamical mechanism is proposed. The obstruction theorems show that if this conjecture is true, its derivation must involve *neither* a polynomial potential *nor* a standard topological quantisation.

7.3 What kind of mechanism could work?

The two obstructions together severely constrain viable approaches. A mechanism producing $\delta = 2/9$ exactly must satisfy:

- It cannot be the extremum of a polynomial functional with algebraic coefficients (Theorem 8).
- It cannot arise from a topological phase (rational multiple of π) (Theorem 9).
- It could, in principle, involve: transcendental functionals (exponential, logarithmic); non-perturbative effects whose phases are not rational multiples of π (e.g. instanton actions involving $\ln 2$ or similar); or an exact cancellation producing $2/9$ from a combination of π -dependent and π -independent contributions.

The fact that $2/9$ is rational while $\cos(2/3)$ is transcendental — and that $2/(9\pi)$ is transcendental so $2/9$ is not a rational multiple of π — places $\delta = 2/9$ in a very specific number-theoretic class. Any derivation must explain why the phase is a simple rational number that is *not* a rational multiple of π .

7.4 On the identification $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \cong \bar{3}$

The Hessian decomposition is under $\text{SO}(3)$, with $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as the spin-1 representation. The standard isomorphism $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{C}^3) \cong \bar{3}$ holds for $\text{SU}(3)$, but $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset \Lambda^2(\mathbb{C}^3)$ is not $\text{SU}(3)$ -invariant. Relating the $\text{SO}(3)$ Hessian eigenvalues to $\text{SU}(3)$ Casimir values requires additional structure (e.g. the G_2 -invariant almost-complex structure on \mathbb{R}^6) that we do not provide.

7.5 Falsifiable predictions

1. If $\delta = 2/9$ exactly: $m_\tau = 1776.97 \pm 0.11$ MeV. Present data: 1776.86 ± 0.12 MeV (0.9σ tension). A future measurement to ± 0.05 MeV provides a 2σ test.
2. The construction is mathematically consistent only for $N = 3$ generations.

7.6 Limitations

- $Q = 2/3$ is not predicted (input from Sumino).
- The overall scale μ is not predicted.
- The ratio $\delta_{\text{geom}} = 2/9$ is a purely geometric observation; no dynamical mechanism connecting the G_2 Hessian spectrum to the lepton mass matrix is known.
- The neutrino sector is not addressed.
- The quark sector has $Q \neq 2/3$ ($Q_{\text{up}} \approx 0.85$, $Q_{\text{down}} \approx 0.73$), consistent with the Sumino mechanism being lepton-specific (QCD corrections not compensated).

Acknowledgements

[To be added.]

A Numerical verification

All analytic results have been verified by independent numerical computation in Python.

Hessian spectrum. Full 9×9 Hessian matrix on $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^6)$ computed by centred finite differences ($\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$). Eigenvalues: 0^5 ($\max |.| < 10^{-7}$), $(-2.000000)^3$, $(-3.000000)^1$. Full 12×12 Hessian on $\text{Gr}(3, \mathbb{R}^7)$: spectrum $(-3)^4, 0^8$.

Symmetric polynomials. On the Koide surface ($Q = 2/3$, 200 values of $\delta \in (0, \pi/3)$): $\sigma_1 = 3.000000$ (constant to 10^{-14}), $\sigma_2 = 1.500000$ (constant to 10^{-12}), σ_3 linear in $\cos(3\delta)$ with residual $< 10^{-12}$.

Brannen surface scan. $f(\Phi(\delta))$ computed for 200 values of $\delta \in [0, \pi/3]$. Monotonic in $\cos(3\delta)$, extrema only at boundaries $\delta = 0, \pi/3$. $\delta = 2/9$ is not an extremum.

One-loop potential. $V_{\text{eff}}(\delta) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \cos(3m\delta)/m^4$ computed by direct summation ($N_{\text{terms}} = 500$) for $\delta \in (0, \pi/3)$ in radians. V_{eff} is strictly monotonic on this interval; no interior critical points. Critical points of $B_4(3\delta/(2\pi))$ at $\delta = 0, \pi/3, 2\pi/3$, all on boundaries of the Brannen domain.

Casimir values. $C_2(\text{Sym}^3 3) = 6$ and $C_2(\bar{3}) = 4/3$ verified by explicit construction of $\text{SU}(3)$ generators. Structural identity $C_2(\text{Sym}^N(N)) = N(N-1) = 2\binom{N}{2}$ verified for $N = 2, \dots, 7$.

Code availability. Complete Python scripts reproducing all verifications are provided as supplementary material.

References

- [1] Y. Koide, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **34**, 201 (1982).
- [2] C. A. Brannen, “The lepton masses,” hep-ph/0503112 (2005).
- [3] Y. Sumino, “Family gauge symmetry as an origin of Koide’s mass formula,” *Phys. Lett. B* **671**, 477 (2009) [arXiv:0812.2103].
- [4] G. ’t Hooft, “A property of electric and magnetic flux in non-abelian gauge theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **153**, 141 (1979).
- [5] B. S. Acharya, “M theory, Joyce orbifolds and super Yang-Mills,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **3**, 227 (1999) [hep-th/9812205].
- [6] S. Navas et al. (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).