ANNALS OF THE CHRYSENE FORMALISM

AI-AUGMENTED PEER-REVIEWED | VOL. 1, NO. 3 | ISSN 3144-2021 | OCTOBER 2026

ORTHOGONAL REVIEW RECORD

Configuration at the Transannular Centre: Uniformity of the Selected Branch over the Structure Series, and the Descriptor Pattern of the Twenty

Compiled by the Editorial Office
Annals of the Chrysene Formalism
Schaper Systems Press

Paper ID:	ACF-1.3-061
Issue:	Volume 1, Number 3
ISSN:	3144-2021
Review architecture:	Author-side check by the drafting model (not independent; does not discharge editorial review)
Review focus:	Verification-block drift, junction homochirality, stack versus vessel framing
Acceptance date:	2026-10-15
Online publication:	2026-10-15
Pages:	1250–1278
Document version:	v1.0
Last audited:	15 October 2026

Citation: Schaper, C. D. (2026). Configuration at the Transannular Centre: Uniformity of the Selected Branch over the Structure Series, and the Descriptor Pattern of the Twenty. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism*, 1(3), 1250–1278. ISSN 3144-2021. `https://chrysene.com/index.php/acf/article/view/61` • © 2026 Charles D. Schaper. Distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Disclosure, and the standing of this report

This report is not an independent editorial review and must not be recorded as one. The reviewing model participated in drafting the manuscript under review: it wrote the verification script, the audit script, the section text and the journal build. A model reviewing its own drafting cannot supply the orthogonality the journal's review methodology is built to obtain, and its failure to notice something in review is uninformative, since the same failure would have been available to it in drafting. What this report can be is an author-side check, of the kind the journal places before submission rather than after it. It is offered in that role. The findings below are of a kind that a fresh reading catches and a drafting pass does not: arithmetic that no longer matches, references

that renumbering broke, and two places where a printed statement and a printed block now disagree. One finding, M4, is substantive and bears on a headline result. An independent editorial review by a model that did not participate in drafting is still owed, and this report does not discharge it. The findings below should be treated as a list for the author to act on, not as an editorial decision. There is no author-reply section.

Scope of Review

The paper works between two things the corpus already holds: that an oriented cage condition at C6α supplies a section of a $\mathbb{Z}/2$ torsor, and that naming the selected configuration L requires a convention the architecture does not supply. It does not attempt the naming. It asks instead whether the section is the same section across the structure series, and answers that it is: at sixteen of nineteen chiral structures because the side chain lies outside the reactive subgraph, and at all nineteen under a supposition about the order of two generators of the canonical word. It then computes the descriptor over the series, treats the second centre at C5, extends the account to two residues made together at a junction, and states the whole at cluster level as a condition on the parity of the assembly's symmetry group.

Compiled disposition

Revise before circulation. Four findings are classed major. Three of them (M1, M2, M5) are internal inconsistencies between the body and the printed verification blocks and can be repaired by regenerating the blocks and editing two remarks; they do not touch any result. One (M4) is substantive: the junction result may rest on the datum the paper elsewhere declares open, and if it does, a headline statement is conditional in a way the paper does not say. M3 asks for an argument the paper currently asserts. None of the findings suggests a result is wrong. They suggest that three statements claim a standing the manuscript does not establish, and that the appendix and the body have drifted apart.

Required before print

Blocking before circulation. Regenerate the verification blocks so that statement references name roles rather than superseded numbers. Reconcile Block V7 with Remark 7.14. Supply the argument for Remark 6.16, or register the additional premise on Proposition 6.9. Settle whether Proposition 9.6 assumes what Target 14.1 asks, and if so register Corollary 9.7 as conditional. Reconcile the stack framing of Theorem 6.11(c) with the vessel framing of Theorem 10.2. Fill the sequence-rules citation.

Contents

1 Stage 1 — Mathematical and logical **4**

2 Stage 2 — Concordance with the corpus **5**

3 Stage 3 — Chemical **6**

4 Stage 4 — Targeted verification **6**

5 Stage 5 — Editorial **7**

1 Stage 1 — Mathematical and logical

M3 — [major] Proposition 6.9 may relocate the problem rather than remove it

Proposition 6.9 argues that under early amination the branch is selected on a substrate that does not yet distinguish the residues, so uniformity is total. The argument is correct as far as it goes. But Remark 6.16 concedes that on that reading C6α is stereogenic at the moment of installation, carrying the ether oxygen, the nitrogen, a hydrogen and C6β, and that the bond to C5 is formed later by substitution at that centre. That later substitution need not occur on the common substrate. If the excision has run by then, the side chain exists, and the stereochemical course of the substitution, retention or inversion, is in principle a function of x after all.

Remark 6.16 states that the substitution is the same substitution at every structure, so whatever its course it acts alike on all of them. That is the claim at issue and it is asserted rather than argued. The paper should either supply the argument, presumably that the substitution's reactive subgraph is also disjoint from the retained set, which would be a second application of Lemma 6.3 and would inherit its three exceptions, or state that Proposition 6.9 carries an additional premise. As it stands, the proposition that rescues the three exceptional rows may reintroduce them one step later.

M5 — [major] Theorem 6.11(c) and Theorem 10.2 describe the selection in incompatible terms

Step (c) of Theorem 6.11 establishes uniformity by observing that the cage condition is stated against the stack, which is invariant over $\Sigma^{\times}$. Theorem 10.2 requires, as an explicit hypothesis, that the selection at C6α is stated intrinsically at each vessel, so that the operation τ_{ij} transports it. These pull opposite ways. A condition stated against the stack is a condition in a global frame; a condition stated intrinsically at a vessel is a condition in the vessel's own frame.

If the first reading is right, then τ does not transport the selection and the parity argument of Theorem 10.2 needs restating. If the second is right, then step (c) of Theorem 6.11 is loosely worded and should say that the condition is evaluated on data invariant over $\Sigma^{\times}$ at each vessel, which is what its argument actually needs. The falsification register for Section 10 already anticipates this. A selection at C6α not stated intrinsically at a vessel would break the transport. The paper knows the hypothesis is load-bearing. It does not notice that its own Section 6 supplies a reading under which the hypothesis fails. One sentence reconciling the two would close it.

m2 — [minor] Lemma 4.4 counts two rows where Lemma 6.3 and block V6 count three

Lemma 4.4 states that two rows require separate treatment below: the one whose retained set contains C6 in two instances, and the one carrying a closure. Block V6 reports three rows, named. The phrase "the one … in two instances" appears to be an attempt to say "two rows" inside a list of two items. The result reads as two and is three.

m3 — [minor] Proposition 3.1(ii) mis-states the pattern it refuses

It describes one descriptor at nineteen structures with a single inversion at the sulfur-bearing one. Nineteen is the count of chiral structures. The pattern is one letter at eighteen and its opposite at the nineteenth. The consolidated register states it correctly, so this is the outlier.

m4 — [minor] Remark 11.1 does not sum

It reports five are finite, five are derived, one is a supposition and one is a refusal over twelve entries. By the standings printed in the register the counts are: one imported [C], five finite [A], four derived [D], one supposition, one refusal. The imported entry is in none of the four classes and the derived count is four, not five. The scholium that follows does not depend on the arithmetic, but the arithmetic is printed.

2 Stage 2 — Concordance with the corpus

M4 — [major] Proposition 9.6 may assume what Target 14.1 asks

This is the report's substantive finding and it should be taken up before anything else. Proposition 9.6 argues: the two strands at a junction are related by face inversion with the order of sites kept; face inversion presents the other face of a unit; presenting the other face of a planar object is a rotation by π about an in-plane axis; that operation is proper; hence $\det \tau = +1$, and by Theorem 9.5 the junction pair is homochiral. The second step is the one to examine. In the source, face inversion is defined as an operation on the orientation values of a stack, on words the position-wise complement, and it is established there as the frame relation between the two codons. Nothing in that definition is a claim about a physical motion. The step from the combinatorial operation to a π rotation about an in-plane axis is this paper's, and it is made without argument in a single clause.

The difficulty is that Remark 10.4 of this same paper insists, correctly and at length, that an orientation marker records which of two orientations a unit is in; it does not record how the two orientations are related in space, and the parity lives entirely in that realisation. Target 14.1 then asks for precisely that realisation and calls it the whole of what stands between the architecture and homochirality over a cluster. If the realisation of face inversion at a junction is the same question as the realisation of the orientation alternation in a cluster, then Proposition 9.6 answers by assumption a question the paper declares open forty lines later, and Corollary 9.7, that the junction pair is homochiral, both residues L, is conditional on Target 14.1 rather than established. That would also mean Corollary 10.3 is not exhibiting two values of a parameter found in the corpus; it is exhibiting one value assumed here and one imported from elsewhere. If the two are not the same question, if the strand relation at a junction is fixed by the junction geometry independently of how orientations alternate within a strand, then the paper is sound here and needs one paragraph saying why, together with an entry in the hypothesis register. The manuscript should not be circulated without settling which of these it means. As drafted, Section 9 reads as established and Section 10 reads as open, and they may be the same statement.

m9 — [minor] Remark 13.5 cites Target 14.13 with no attribution

This paper has a Section 14 with targets numbered 14.1 to 14.6. A reader meets Target 14.13 and looks in the wrong document. Attribute it to the coordinating paper.

m10 — [minor] Remark 7.16 says it corrects Proposition 7.8

Proposition 7.8 is already the corrected statement. The correction is to the withdrawn stronger form, which Remark 7.9 records. As written the sentence implies the printed proposition is wrong.

Reference [6] is never cited. The registry-classes article appears in the reference list and in no citation, including the Appendix E concordance, which is the place that would carry it.

3 Stage 3 — Chemical

C1 — [comment] The mode-(b) geometry remains the chemically least comfortable claim

Proposition 7.1 mode (b) has the transannular arm reaching an in-plane framework direction at C5 rather than a face. Appendix C names this and refers it to the certification layer, which is the right disposition under the declared scope. A chemical referee will still stop there, and the paper is correct to have flagged it rather than smoothed it.

C2 — [comment] The descriptor computation's chemistry is standard and its dependence is correctly bounded

Every comparison in blocks V2, V3, V4 and V7 resolves at sphere one or two. The manuscript states that no result depends on any refinement of the sequence rules beyond the first point of difference. That is the right bound and it is stated. The missing citation is m8 below and is editorial rather than chemical.

Appendix C is correctly scoped and should not be enlarged. The refusal to let rotameric arguments bear on configuration is the manuscript's soundest chemical judgement. A reader who wants the anti/gauche account promoted should be told it is a claim about an interconverting ensemble, which Remark C.2 already says.

4 Stage 4 — Targeted verification

The blocks were re-read against the statements that cite them. The computations agree with the body. The prose of the blocks does not.

M1 — [major] Every printed block cites statement numbers from a superseded numbering

Block V1 refers to Remark 6.4, Theorem 6.2, Corollary 6.3 and Target 6.5. Block V2 refers to Supposition 8.2, Theorem 6.2 and Corollary 6.3. Block V3 refers to Target 6.5. In the manuscript as set, those are Remark 6.5, Theorem 6.11, Corollary 6.13, Target 6.18 and Supposition 8.4. The blocks were emitted before the journal build put every environment on a shared counter, and the emitted text was pasted verbatim and not regenerated. Every reference inside a block now points somewhere else.

The companion articles warn against exactly this. One of them keeps its block names unrenumbered on the stated ground that renumbering would silently invalidate every proof reference. Here the paper renumbered and the blocks did not follow. The repair is to have the emitting script name statements by role rather than by number, the uniformity theorem, the anchor, so that the blocks are stable under any future renumbering, and to regenerate.

M2 — [major] Block V7's printed conclusion contradicts Remark 7.14

V7 ends: the account as computed here costs TWO parameters and not one, and states that the reduction to one does not reach the branch at C6α without a further datum. Remark 7.14 concludes that under Supposition 7.12 the account is restored to one external input. Both are printed, four pages apart, and a reader cannot tell which the paper holds. The block was emitted before the lattice supposition was adopted and was not revisited. Either V7's reading should be rewritten to say that the two parameters are uncoupled by anything computed in the block and are made one composite by a premise stated in the body, or Remark 7.14 should acknowledge that it overrides the block. The first is preferable and is what the body actually argues.

m1 — [minor] Supposition 8.4 self-registers as H1; the register lists it as H4

H1 in the register is the cage condition.

Suppositions are called hypotheses in five places: Proposition 6.9 (Assume Hypothesis 6.7), Corollary 6.13, Remark 6.15, Remark 7.16 (Hypothesis 7.12) and the Section 12 register (Hypothesis 7.12). The distinction between a hypothesis and a supposition adopted as best case is one the paper introduced deliberately. It should be maintained in the text that invokes them.

The Section 9 falsification register carries Corollary 10.3. It belongs with Section 10, whose register is two pages later.

Block V2b prints its framing paragraph twice. The appendix prose and the block's own opening lines say the same thing in nearly the same words.

5 Stage 5 — Editorial

- Corollary 8.5: "and and, under Hypothesis 7.3."

- The hypothesis register runs H1, H2, H2b, H3, H7, H6, H8, H4, H5. H7 sits between H3 and H6 and H4 sits near the end. Either sort them or say the order is by dependence.
- Remark 6.6's title breaks as "load- -bearing."
- Reference [12], the sequence rules, is unfilled. The central computation of the paper rests on a standard that is not cited. The manuscript bounds the dependence correctly; it still needs the citation. (The Cahn–Ingold–Prelog 1966 paper is the appropriate source.)
- Three CONFIRM markers remain, at Article 54's pagination and the two patent grant dates.

Findings, collected

id	class	finding	disposition
M1	major	Blocks cite a superseded numbering throughout	Regenerate; name by role
M2	major	Block V7 contradicts Remark 7.14	Rewrite V7's reading
M3	major	Prop. 6.9 does not cover the datum Rem. 6.16 introduces	Supply argument or add premise
M4	major	Prop. 9.6 may assume what Target 14.1 asks	Settle; register if conditional
M5	major	"Against the stack" vs "intrinsically at each vessel"	Reconcile in one sentence
m1	minor	Sup. 8.4 self-registers as H1; register says H4	Correct
m2	minor	Lemma 4.4 counts two exceptional rows; there are three	Correct
m3	minor	Prop. 3.1(ii) mis-states the descriptor pattern	Correct
m4	minor	Remark 11.1's counts do not sum	Recount
m5	minor	Suppositions called hypotheses in five places	Correct
m6	minor	Cor. 10.3 filed in Section 9's register	Move
m7	minor	Reference [6] uncited	Cite or remove
m8	minor	Sequence-rules citation unfilled	Supply
m9	minor	"Target 14.13" ambiguous	Attribute
m10	minor	Rem. 7.16 says it corrects the printed Prop. 7.8	Reword
e1–e5	editorial	Typography, ordering, CONFIRM markers	As listed

What this review did not check

Stated so that its silence is not read as endorsement.

1. The decoration record. Every computed block runs on a product-graph record declared in the verification script and not printed from the corpus. Target 14.5 says so. This review checked the blocks against that declaration and the declaration against nothing. If the declaration is wrong at a row, the blocks agree with it and the review agrees with the blocks.
2. The imported statements. The branch torsor, the cage condition, the severance record, the atom maps and the frame relation are taken as the corpus has them. Nothing here re-derives any of them, and M4 is the one place where an import is questioned, and it is questioned as an inference from the import rather than as the import itself.

3. The chemistry of the transformation. Whether the transformation occurs is refused by the paper and not examined here.

4. Independence. See the disclosure. A model that did not draft the manuscript would have a materially better chance of finding what both the drafting and this review missed.

References

[Art54] C. D. Schaper. Cage-constrained chemical reachability in π-stacked chrysene–adenosine systems. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* 1(2):935–1014, 2026.

[Art60] C. D. Schaper. The origins arc. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* 1(3):1163–1249, 2026. Source of Target 14.13 and of the coordinating apparatus.

[CIP] R. S. Cahn, C. K. Ingold, and V. Prelog. Specification of molecular chirality. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* 5 (1966) 385–415. The unfilled sequence-rules citation.

Revision history

Version	Date	Notes
v1.0	2026-10-15	Review record published with Article 61.

Living Document Notice

As with any actively developing field, the mathematical and applied claims in this article are subject to periodic re-evaluation as the surrounding formalism matures and as the journal's AI-augmented review tooling advances. Consistent with standard scientific practice for provisional or fast-moving frameworks, this article and its review record may be re-audited by subsequent review systems, and a revised version bearing an updated review history may be issued to reflect developments in the field. Readers should consult the Revision History table above, and the journal's records, for the current version number and audit date of this article.

Editorial Disclaimer

The *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* aims to develop the Chrysene Formalism through the application of advanced mathematics, using AI systems selected as well suited to this task. In pursuing this aim, it is possible that errors occur during the mathematical progression and analysis of the formalism, including within the review and editing process itself. However, the formalism is constructed within a multidisciplinary, horizontal framework that is grounded in a specific instantiation of molecular matter and its associated networks, an instantiation that is invariant and falsifiable. For this reason, the editorial office considers the formalism well suited to an AI-augmented approach, and anticipates that this approach will continue to be adapted as AI models and the surrounding mathematical understanding advance.