ANNALS OF THE CHRYSENE FORMALISM

AI-AUGMENTED PEER-REVIEWED | VOL. 1, NO. 4 | ISSN 3144-2021 | OCTOBER 2026

ORTHOGONAL REVIEW RECORD

The Transformed Product: Membrane Invariants Measured against the Open Literature, and the Lipid the Patent Route Actually Makes

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

Paper ID:	ACF-1.4-083
Issue:	Volume 1, Number 4
ISSN:	3144-2021
Review architecture:	Consistency pass with dispositions followed by independent referee report
Review focus:	Membrane invariants, patent route resolution, lipid transformation, verification
Acceptance date:	2026-10-31
Online publication:	2026-10-31
Pages:	1675–1702
Document version:	v1.0
Last audited:	31 October 2026

Citation: Schaper, C. D. (2026). The Transformed Product: Membrane Invariants Measured against the Open Literature, and the Lipid the Patent Route Actually Makes. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism*, 1(4), 1675–1702. ISSN 3144-2021. `https://chrysene.com/index.php/acf/article/view/83` • © 2026 Charles D. Schaper. Distributed under the CC Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0.

Declared conflict

The first report was produced by an agent run with no sight of the drafting, but within the same session and by the same author-side model. It is independent of the drafting but not of the author-side model. A subsequent independent referee report was prepared for the Editorial Board. All twenty-six required items from the first report were addressed. There is no author-reply section in this record.

Scope of Review

The manuscript measures membrane invariants against the open literature and resolves the patent route. The first report recomputed every arithmetic block independently and identified three principal findings: an ungrounded route-P exclusion, a clean-ordering criterion that was not the chemical one, and a sequential reading that does not remove the positional activation block. All required items were accepted and acted on, with two partial rebuttals noted. The independent review recommends acceptance, noting methodological transparency, resolution of route ambiguity, and identification of fatal system flaws, while flagging residual gaps on chemical feasibility and extrapolative limits.

Compiled disposition

Accept with minor revisions. The first-round required items (R1–R26) were addressed: the route-P verdict was downgraded from excluded to not admitted, the clean-ordering criterion was strengthened, the activation obstruction was reported, and ledger and bookkeeping errors were corrected. The independent referee confirms the principal contributions and recommends acceptance after brief acknowledgement of thermodynamic barriers on ring-fusion cleavage, explicit note of the physical limits of the Route P extrapolation, and a short commentary on pore-lipid mechanical compatibility. No further computation is required. The finite layer, the isoprenoid non-reachability, the redox audit, and the physics results stand.

Contents

1 Stage summary of the first report **3**

2 Stage summary of the independent report **3**

3 Full first report (consistency pass with dispositions, verbatim) **4**

4 Full independent referee report (verbatim) **7**

1 Stage summary of the first report

Principal findings R1–R4

[**MAJOR**] R1: The route-P exclusion had no stated ground; the proof disclaimed its own extrapolation and nominated a remark that concluded nothing had been read at source. R2: The clean-ordering criterion was not the chemical one; under the stricter criterion the count is 24 of 27, not 27 of 27. R3: The sequential reading does not remove the positional activation block; at two to three of the four steps neither carbon of the bond bears a hydrogen. R4: A count was conflated; chrysene carries five fusion–fusion bonds, not three. Dispositions: R1 downgraded to not admitted; R2 strict criterion added; R3 hydrogen availability emitted and class transfer limited; R4 two macros emitted and error larger than reported.

R5–R26 and checked-and-sound items

R5–R10: retention margin reversed, macro substitutions, per-tail value, stale ledger figure, chemiosmotic quantity, capacitance film. R11–R26: K-region seed, sequence generalisation, superseded verdict, transfer register, status labels, appendix claims, flag discipline, range traceability, step-three gap, $\Delta 9$ position, half-time commensurability, unsourced constants, uncited corpus articles. All accepted and acted on, with two partial rebuttals (R17 asymmetry explained rather than removed; isoprenoid sweep strengthened). Checked and sound: the finite layer entire, isoprenoid non-reachability, the redox audit, the sequential theorem as graph theory, the physics item by item, two derived formulae, and code hygiene.

2 Stage summary of the independent report

Principal contributions confirmed

Methodological transparency (predefined invariant ranges). Resolution of route ambiguity (single process at two extents; dimension invariant selects Route A). Identification of fatal system flaws (chemiosmotic gradient relaxes in 368 seconds). Crucial ledger corrections (4.7% shortfall, missing reducing-equivalent flux). Recommendation: Accept, provided the author addresses residual methodological and interpretative gaps.

Residual gaps

Chemical feasibility of ring-fusion cleavage: acknowledge high thermodynamic and kinetic barriers. Extrapolation of the Route P dimension: note physical limits of applying diacyl scaling to single-chain amphiphiles. Pore-lipid mechanical compatibility: brief commentary on whether the 28.8 Å hydrophobic thickness is compatible with the pore. Minor: buffer assumptions and isoprenoid non-reachability already well handled.

3 Full first report (consistency pass with dispositions, verbatim)

The following is the complete text of the first referee report and revision record.

Reviewer disclosure. This report was produced within the same session as the manuscript, and the limitation is material and is stated first. The report was written by an agent run with no sight of the drafting: it received the compiled manuscript, the LaTeX sources, the verification script and the data module, and no part of the conversation in which the paper was composed. It was instructed to find defects and told that a referee who finds nothing has not looked hard enough. It is therefore independent of the drafting but not of the author-side model. The journal's stated methodology calls for an editorial-side pass by a different model, which this is not and does not replace. The report recomputed every arithmetic block in its own code rather than re-running the author's, and its "checked and sound" list is therefore an independent reproduction. Its three principal findings were each verified a second time by the author before being accepted; all three held, and one of them revealed an error the report had itself understated.

Recommendation

Major revision. Accepted. All twenty-six required items were addressed; the dispositions are recorded below, with two partial rebuttals noted. The report's summary judgement was that the arithmetic is almost everywhere right and that three of five headline results did not survive inspection as stated. That judgement is upheld. The revision walks back one headline result substantially, restates a second, corrects two ledger figures and repairs about a dozen discrete errors.

Principal findings

- **1. The route-P exclusion had no stated ground.** The proof of the dimension theorem disclaimed its own extrapolation as "an indication and not the ground of the exclusion" and nominated a remark as the ground; that remark concluded that nothing had been read at source. The paper's most visible positive result therefore rested on a void.
- **2. The clean-ordering criterion was not the chemical one.** The sequential theorem counted orderings in which no step severs a bond lying in two rings of the current smallest set of smallest rings. Chrysene has two bonds that pass that test while being exactly the configuration the paper's negative concerns. Under the stricter criterion the count is 24 of 27, not 27 of 27.
- **3. The sequential reading does not remove the feature that blocks the cited reaction class.** Both cited dioxygenases install their activating diol on the two carbons they then cleave between. At two to three of the four steps neither carbon of the bond bears a hydrogen — so the activation cannot be installed where the class requires it. This is positional, not an enumeration gap.
- **4. A count was conflated.** "Three of four cuts fall on bonds between ring-fusion carbons" in fact counted bonds bearing a fusion carbon. On verification the author

found the report had understated the error: chrysene carries five fusion–fusion bonds, not three. The true distribution is two such cuts in four openings, three in twenty and four in three.

- **5–10. Errors of fact and bookkeeping.** A retention remark stating a margin that reversed its own proposition; a macro substitution making one sentence contradict itself; a per-tail value labelled per-dimer; a section computing on a ledger figure the preceding section supersedes; a chemiosmotic result quoted at the weaker of two quantities; and a capacitance taken from a glyceryl-monooleate film never identified as one.
- **11–26.** A K-region seeded as a measured attack site on the strength of a mutagenicity assay; an unregistered compound-class transfer; an asymmetry between transfers accepted and refused; status labels; a block index that omitted four blocks; flag discipline; a measured range whose minimum came from a row the paper never displays; a reaction class not covering the third step; an unregistered premise on the position of the retained unsaturation; a half-time and a $1/e$ constant compared as commensurable; two unsourced constants; and three uncited corpus articles.

Checked and sound

The report recomputed the following independently and confirms them: the finite layer entire (18 vertices, 21 edges, cyclomatic number 4; 1,189 spanning trees; 27 chain-forming cut sets; 252 distinct alkane skeletons); isoprenoid non-reachability (zero hits over all 1,189 trees and all longest paths); the redox audit (hydrogen counts right; decomposition closes at $16 + 8 + 2 = 26$); the sequential theorem as graph theory; the physics item by item; two derived formulae; and code hygiene.

Dispositions

Every required item was accepted and acted on. Two were accepted with a qualification, recorded here rather than absorbed.

#	Finding	Disposition
R1	Route P exclusion ungrounded	Verdict downgraded from *excluded* to *not admitted*; the extrapolation is owned as the ground with its weakness stated, and the abstract, theorem, ruling and conclusion follow.
R2	Clean-ordering criterion wrong	Strict criterion added and emitted; the theorem now states both, and 24 of 27 is quoted wherever the chemical conclusion is drawn.
R3	Activation positionally blocked	Hydrogen availability computed per step and emitted; the class is now said to transfer for the first cleavage and at most one later step.
R4	Count conflated	Two macros emitted. On verification the error was larger than reported: five fusion–fusion bonds, not three.
R5	Retention margin reversed	Deleted and replaced by the emitted value.

#	Finding	Disposition
R6	Obtained data listed as not obtained	List rewritten; the residual is now the compound class, not the quantity.
R7, R8	Wrong macros	Substituted.
R9	Stale ledger figure	Redox demand recomputed on the corrected membrane entry.
R10	Chemiosmotic quantity	Potential and pH gradient separated; the *RC* shortfall of 10,530 is now the headline, and the unbuffered row is marked a formal limit with its free-proton count.
R11	Capacitance film	Identified as a monoacylglycerol and registered as a third transfer; the alkane range is emitted from the rows.
R12	K-region seeded	Seed withdrawn. Measured bonds 6→4, unattacked orbits 1→2.
R13	Sequence generalised	Counts given per opening family.
R14	Verdicts on reformulated hypotheses	Both forms returned; the amendment is declared, not silent.
R15	Superseded verdict in present tense	Rewritten.
R16	Transfer unregistered; charge unmentioned	Transfer register added, ranked by what measures the target class; the charge difference is now stated at every use.
R17	Transfers asymmetric	*Partial rebuttal.* The asymmetry is real and is now explained rather than removed: the refusal rests on a direct measurement of the target class and the accepted transfers do not. The report agreed the refusal itself is sound.
R18	Status labels	Corrected.
R19	Appendix claims false	Block index generated from the blocks the file defines — which immediately failed, naming the two the report found by hand; stale tables deleted; the oxidation sums emitted.
R20	Flag discipline	Flags asserted at every read; the capacitance scalar cross-checked against its row.
R21	Range not traceable	Defined over the displayed rows; minimum moves 20.8 to 21.9.
R22	Step three outside both entries	Stated as a gap; the fused-ring case is not claimed.
R23	$\Delta 9$ position unregistered	Registered as H10.
R24	Half-time vs. $1/e$	Made commensurable at the point of comparison.
R25	Unsourced constants	The membrane potential is marked a stipulation.
R26	Uncited corpus articles	Articles 66, 76 and 79 cited.
M1–M19	Minor items	Addressed, with two qualifications. The isoprenoid sweep was strengthened to all longest paths (0 hits, unchanged). The tension between the two sequence remarks is resolved by distinguishing *which bonds* must be cut from *what becomes of the product*; both remarks stand.

What the revision did not close

Three items are left open deliberately. The amended form of the scission hypothesis is declared in the text rather than applied silently. The third step of the cleavage sequence opens one ring of a fused naphthalene, and neither cited reaction-class entry covers a fused partner. The activation obstruction of Required 3 is reported and not resolved; the manuscript's position is that the matter is unsupported rather than refuted, and belongs to experiment.

4 Full independent referee report (verbatim)

The following is the complete text of the independent referee report.

Overall Assessment. This manuscript provides a rigorous, highly structured concordance test of the chrysene formalism against empirical measurements from the open literature. By treating the mathematical architecture of the proposed membrane not as an abstract model but as a physical hypothesis subject to validation, the author successfully bridges formal theory and experimental reality. The work is exceptionally transparent, particularly in its willingness to highlight where the formal architecture fails physical or chemical tests. The manuscript is recommended for acceptance, provided the author addresses a few specific methodological and interpretative gaps regarding chemical feasibility and extrapolative limits.

Strengths & Major Contributions

- **Methodological Transparency.** The author explicitly sets predefined invariant ranges before scoring the theoretical products against them, avoiding the trap of retroactively fitting parameters. The paper meticulously distinguishes between finite topological connectivity and actual chemical reachability.
- **Resolution of Route Ambiguity.** The manuscript elegantly resolves the conflicting patent figures by demonstrating they represent a single process at two different extents of cleavage. The dimension invariant successfully selects the uncleaved Route A (28.8 Å) over the fully cleaved Route P (17.2 Å).
- **Identification of Fatal System Flaws.** The paper is unflinching in identifying catastrophic failures in the proposed architecture's current state. The demonstration that the chemiosmotic gradient relaxes in 368 seconds against a 43,200-second forcing period effectively closes off an entire avenue of theoretical energy extraction.
- **Crucial Ledger Corrections.** The audit of the material ledger provides vital structural corrections to the wider corpus. Identifying the 4.7% shortfall in the stipulated head-group area refines the membrane unit requirement from 13,146 to 12,530 units. Furthermore, exposing the shortfall of 20 reducing equivalents per dimer reveals a major missing flux in the architecture's material ledger.

Major Critiques & Areas for Improvement

- **Chemical Feasibility & the "Unsupported" Defense.** The paper finds that three of the four necessary cleavages must occur at ring-fusion bonds. The author notes there is no literature precedent for this under any conditions, let alone the anaerobic, caged environment specified. While the author correctly classifies this as "unsupported" rather than strictly "refuted", the manuscript treats this absence of evidence somewhat gently as a "specification". The text should briefly acknowledge the high thermodynamic and kinetic barriers typically associated with severing catacondensed arene ring-fusion bonds, to ensure readers understand the magnitude of this empirical gap.
- **Extrapolation of the Route P Dimension.** The rejection of Route P relies heavily on extrapolating the C_9 chain's thickness to 17.2 Å using a linear fit from a saturated phosphatidylcholine series. The author openly acknowledges this extrapolation extends below the range of the source data. While the ultimate conclusion is sound, the author should explicitly note the physical limits of applying diacyl scaling to single-chain amphiphiles, as their packing dynamics differ fundamentally.
- **Pore-Lipid Mechanical Compatibility.** The manuscript proves that the Route A lipid cannot passively admit activated nucleotides, making the pore detailed in Article 66 a strict necessity rather than an enhancement. However, the manuscript stops short of addressing whether the 28.8 Å hydrophobic thickness of the Route A lipid is physically compatible with the hydrophobic mismatch requirements of that specific pore. A brief commentary on whether this dimension supports the pore's integration is warranted.

Minor Corrections & Specific Notes

- **Superseded Values.** The explicit documentation of the superseded literature values from the water permeability study is highly commendable. Retaining this error track ensures a pristine provenance record.
- **Buffer Assumptions.** The assumption of carrying the full osmolyte content (100 mM) as a perfect buffer at pH 7 to generate the 368-second relaxation time is generous. The author may want to briefly clarify if this 100 mM concentration is chemically realistic for the internal lumen of the proposed 13.04 nm closure vesicle.
- **Isoprenoid Non-Reachability.** The rigorous proof that an archaeal-style isoprenoid tail is unreachable across all 1,189 cut sets is a definitive topological finding. The subsequent observation that a carotenoid spacing (4,5,4) is invariant across the tetrasubstituted cleavages is a fascinating hook for future theoretical work.

Recommendation

Accept with minor revisions. Acknowledge the high thermodynamic and kinetic barriers on ring-fusion cleavage, note the physical limits of the Route P extrapolation, and add a brief commentary on pore-lipid mechanical compatibility. No further computation is required. The finite layer, the isoprenoid non-reachability, the redox audit, and the physics results stand. All twenty-six required items from the first report were addressed.

References

[Art82] C. D. Schaper. The partition concordance. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* 1(4):1662–1674, 2026. Article 82.

Revision history

Version	Date	Notes
v1.0	2026-10-31	Review record published with Article 83.

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.