ANNALS OF THE CHRYSENE FORMALISM

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

ORTHOGONAL REVIEW RECORD

The Chrysene Formalism as Candidate Mathematics and Candidate Biogenesis: A Quantitative and Categorical Survey of Volume 1, Number 2

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

Paper ID:	ACF-1.4-089
Issue:	Volume 1, Number 4
ISSN:	3144-2021
Review architecture:	Orthogonal single-round review (criteria M, C, H in one editor-side report), by the same model that drafted the manuscript; author response
Review focus:	Registry-class and parity proofs, review-tier formalization, survey statistics and classification, stratification of the genetic-code results, protocell realization hypotheses, verification code and Lean 4 proof
Acceptance date:	2026-10-11
Online publication:	2026-11-04
Pages:	1808–1819
Document version:	v1.0
Last audited:	4 November 2026

Citation: Schaper, C. D. (2026). The Chrysene Formalism as Candidate Mathematics and Candidate Biogenesis: A Quantitative and Categorical Survey of Volume 1, Number 2. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism*, 1(4), 1808–1819. ISSN 3144-2021. `https://chrysene.com/index.php/acf/article/view/89` • © 2026 Charles D. Schaper. Distributed under the CC Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0.

Declared conflict

The referee report was produced by the same model that drafted the manuscript, in the same session. It applied the three orthogonal criteria — mathematical validity (M), concordance with the formalism and the predecessor survey (C), and chemical and domain admissibility (H) — in a single editor-side round, which is the tier O_s that the manuscript itself defines. Read it as a deep author-side pass, not as an independent review. No independent-model report was prepared. The conflict bites unevenly: the proof checks and the arithmetic against the Volume 1 ledger are

mechanical and are re-checked by the verification code; what this arrangement is least able to assess is whether the survey's classifications and its allocation rule are the right ones rather than defensible ones. Verification code and a Lean 4 proof were conducted. The author's response, including the production changes made after review, is recorded in full below.

Scope of Review

The editorial surveys the twenty-one papers of Volume 1, Number 2. It proves the registry-class count and the even-fibre obstruction in full, formalizes the two orthogonal review tiers, and stratifies the genetic-code results by their dependence on published translation tables, so that a reader cannot mistake a construction that takes a table as input for a derivation of it. The review found the proofs of Theorem 1, Corollary 1, Proposition 2, Corollary 2(1), Proposition 5 and Proposition 8 correct, and the counts and shares in agreement with the ledger. It raised seven major points, all local: an ill-defined stratification (Definition 10), a non-collapse proof resting on the issue's one borderline classification, an allocation rule that is an unlabelled ex post reconstruction, a proposition true by definition, self-correction evidence without a counterfactual, an asymmetric technique comparison, and a model-theoretic proposition without an instance. None requires the conclusions to change.

Compiled disposition

Accept after minor revision. Major 1–3, 5 and 7 and Minor 1–9 were adopted; Major 4 was adopted in part, the per-paper audit of review records being outside the editorial ledger; Major 6, offered as a suggestion, was declined with reasons the referee had said would be acceptable. Production changes after review: renumbering as Article 89 in Volume 1, Number 4; DOIs added to every *Annals* reference; and an Appendix B on the verification artifacts, whose Remark 10 qualifies the "nineteen of twenty split classes" statement. The verification code passes 137 of 137 checks; the Lean 4 file proves 85 theorems, every one axiom-free. The conclusions stand.

Contents

1 Stage summary **3**

2 Stage summary of the author response **4**

3 Full referee report (same-model orthogonal review, verbatim) **5**

4 Full author response (verbatim) **9**

1 Stage summary

M — Mathematical validity

Theorem 1 (count $2^{2N-2} + 2^{N-1}$, orbit sizes, the 2^N and $2^{2N-2} - 2^{N-1}$ split; $20 = 8 + 12$ at $N = 3$, 72 at $N = 4$), Corollary 1, Proposition 2, Corollary 2(1), Proposition 5 and Proposition 8 checked and correct. Defects: Definition 10 inconsistent with Table 4 (Major 1); Proposition 6's witness fragile (Major 2); Proposition 4 definitional (Major 4); Proposition 8 needs an instance (Major 7).

C — Concordance with the formalism and the predecessor survey

Category, basis, technique, tier and model counts agree with the ledger, as do the shares, the 687-page total and the 214/473 split by tier. The vocabulary extension is conservative and disclosed. The supersession of the predecessor survey's review scope is disclosed but its ex post character is not stated where the rule is defined (Major 3).

H — Chemical and domain admissibility

Fibre statements of Corollary 2 correct for NCBI tables 1 and 2. Phylogenetic framing of Remark 6 accurate. The "amino-acyl–adenosine linkage" of Article 54 is an interpretation of a stated connectivity and should be accompanied by it (Minor 6).

Major 1 — Definition 10 inconsistent with Table 4

[**MAJOR**] Stratum 1 requires that neither statement nor proof use a code table, yet Table 4 places "even fibres exclude the standard code" in stratum 1, and the clauses are not exclusive, so σ may be multi-valued. Remedy: distinguish a table used as hypothesis or input from a table that is the object tested; order the clauses; re-check Proposition 7.

Major 2–5 and 7

[**MAJOR**] Major 2: Proposition 6 rests on Article 48, the issue's one borderline classification; use Article 57 as witness. Major 3: Definition 6 reproduces the actual allocation exactly; label it a reconstruction, state its prospective test, and make the exclusion of Articles 50 and 55 explicit. Major 4: Proposition 4 holds by construction; separate its empirical counterpart. Major 5: printed self-correction is consistent with, not demonstrative of, the constrained-collaborator mechanism. Major 7: exhibit an expansion falsifying a protocell statement.

Major 6 and minor items

Major 6 (suggestion): apply the new techniques retroactively to Number 1 so that Table 3 compares like with like. Minor 1–9: prove that φ and ρ commute; state that even fibres are necessary, not sufficient (the mitochondrial table splits nineteen of twenty classes); list the ten amino acids; report medians (29 against 11 pages); mark the erratum completion as the editor's; give the Article 54 connectivity; split the mixed-tier row of Table 4; state the filings' year (2025); date the NCBI reference.

2 Stage summary of the author response

Adopted

Major 1: the clauses of Definition 10 are applied in order (3, then 2, then 1), a table that is only the object tested is neither hypothesis nor input, and Proposition 7's proof is rewritten. Major 2: witnesses Articles 47 and 57; the proposition is shown not to depend on Article 48. Major 3: the rule is labelled a reconstruction tested by Number 3; the exclusion of Articles 50 and 55 under clause (c) is stated with its reason. Major 5: one sentence of qualification. Major 7: Remark 9 interprets a membrane predicate as empty in an expansion of the explicit model. Minor 1–9: all adopted.

Adopted in part, and declined

Major 4: the text now states that Proposition 4 holds by construction and separates its empirical counterpart; the per-paper statement of record completeness is not added, because it is not in the editorial ledger and belongs to the prospective provenance study proposed in Article 41. Major 6: declined. Back-application would revise figures already published in the predecessor survey, the asymmetry is already disclosed, and no conclusion rests on the daggered rows; Table 3's caption now says that those rows support no comparison between issues.

Production changes after review

Renumbered as Article 89 in Volume 1, Number 4 (November 2026), first page 1808. DOIs added to every *Annals* reference. Appendix B added on the verification artifacts; its Remark 10 records that the "nineteen of twenty split classes" statement after Corollary 2 holds exactly for the identifications under which complementation of markers is Watson–Crick complementation. Verification: 137/137 checks; Lean 4: 85 theorems, all axiom-free.

3 Full referee report (same-model orthogonal review, verbatim)

The following is the complete text of the referee report. Its theorem, proposition and table numbers refer to the manuscript as reviewed.

Manuscript ID: ACF-2026-089 (Vol. 1, No. 4, first page 1808; reviewed as Article 86)
Title: *The Chrysene Formalism as Candidate Mathematics and Candidate Biogenesis: A Quantitative and Categorical Survey of Volume 1, Number 2*
Author: Charles D. Schaper, Ph.D.
Review tier: O_s (orthogonal, single-round): criteria M, C, H in one editor-side review
Date: 11 October 2026
Recommendation: Accept after minor revision

1. Summary of the submission

The manuscript is the editorial introduction to Volume 1, Number 3. It surveys the twenty-one papers of Number 2 (Art. 39–59, pp. 476–1162) and makes five contributions.

(i) It recalls the extensions of the formal core made in Number 2. Complete proofs are given for the registry-class count $2^{2N-2} + 2^{N-1}$ (Theorem 1) and for the even-fibre parity obstruction (Proposition 2, Corollary 2).

(ii) It formalizes the two orthogonal review tiers O_m and O_s and states a consequence-weighted rule allocating papers between them.

(iii) It extends the classification vocabulary of the predecessor survey conservatively (Proposition 5) and reports the Number 2 distributions.

(iv) It stratifies the genetic-code results by logical dependence on published translation tables.

(v) It sets the protocell program of Number 3. Every link from the formalism to a protocell component is stated as a realization hypothesis, a requirement grounded in a model-theoretic proposition (Proposition 8).

The central claims are that Number 2 advances Thesis A through new proved results and printed self-corrections, that it sharpens Thesis B by replacing the Identification Hypothesis with named, testable premises, and that neither thesis is established.

The manuscript is careful, internally consistent in its large structure, and notably restrained in its claims. The issues below are local. None of them requires the conclusions to change.

2. Assessment by criterion

M — Mathematical validity

I checked the following proofs and found them correct:

- Theorem 1 (Burnside count, orbit sizes, and the 2^N / $2^{2N-2} - 2^{N-1}$ split, including the values $20 = 8 + 12$ at $N = 3$ and 72 at $N = 4$);

- Corollary 1 (the capacity ratio $\frac{1}{4} + 2^{-(N+1)}$);
- Proposition 2 and Corollary 2(1);
- Proposition 5;
- Proposition 8.

Three points require attention: an inconsistency in Definition 10 (Major 1), a fragile witness in Proposition 6 (Major 2), and a proposition whose content is definitional (Major 4).

C — Concordance with the formalism and the predecessor survey

I checked the category, basis, technique, tier, and model counts against the ledger. They agree, and so do the derived figures: the shares, the 687-page total, and the 214/473 page split by tier. The extension of the vocabularies is handled conservatively and disclosed (Proposition 5 and the paragraph after it). The supersession of the predecessor survey's review scope by Definition 6 is a change of editorial policy. It is disclosed in Remark 4, but its ex post character should be stated where the rule is defined (Major 3).

H — Chemical and domain admissibility

- The fibre statements of Corollary 2 are correct for NCBI tables 1 and 2. The standard code has singleton fibres for Met (AUG) and Trp (UGG). The vertebrate mitochondrial code reassigns AUA to Met, UGA to Trp, and AGA/AGG to stop, so every fibre has cardinality 2, 4, or 6.
- The phylogenetic framing in Remark 6 is accurate and appropriately cited.
- The description of the target of Art. 54 as an "amino-acyl–adenosine linkage" is an interpretation of a stated connectivity and should be accompanied by it (Minor 6).

3. Major comments

Major 1. Definition 10 is inconsistent with Table 4, and σ is not well defined. Clause (1) places a result in stratum 1 only if *neither its statement nor its proof* uses an element of $\mathfrak{T}$. The third row of Table 4, "Even fibres exclude the standard code", is placed in stratum 1, yet its statement names the standard table. Separately, the three clauses are not mutually exclusive. A result may assert a chemical selection and also take a table as input (the forced placement of Art. 57 is compared with the placements of the observed codes), so σ may be multi-valued.

Requested:

- distinguish a table used as a *hypothesis or input* from a table that is merely the *object to which* a theorem is applied;
- give the clauses an order of precedence, so that σ is a function;
- re-check Proposition 7 against the revised definition.

Major 2. Proposition 6 rests on a borderline classification. The witnesses are Art. 47 (Math) and Art. 48 (Mol). The manuscript itself calls the basis of Art. 48 borderline. If Art. 48 were reclassified, the proof as written would fail, although the proposition would remain true. *Requested:* choose a witness whose classification is not in doubt (Art. 57, Mol, also in Γ_4), and state that the proposition is robust to the reclassification of Art. 48.

Major 3. The allocation rule is an ex post reconstruction and should be labelled as one where it is defined. Definition 6 reproduces the actual allocation $\{40, 44, 45, 48, 57, 59\}$ exactly. A reader will notice that clause (c) is worded so as to exclude Art. 50, whose output (the mitochondrial table at all sixty-four codons) is the most "natural-looking" result of the issue. The exclusion is principled: Art. 50 reads demand from the standard table, so its agreement is explained by its input. But the burden of showing that it is principled rather than tailored lies with the manuscript.

Requested:

- state in Definition 6, not only in Remark 4, that the rule is a reconstruction;
- state that its test is its prospective application to Number 3;
- make the exclusion of Art. 50 and Art. 55 under clause (c) explicit, with its reason.

Not requested: I do not ask that Art. 50 or Art. 55 be re-reviewed. Proposition 4 and the limitations section already state what O_s establishes for them.

Major 4. Proposition 4 is true by definition, and its empirical counterpart is incompletely documented. Part (1) holds because Definition 4 builds into meta-review the classification of every prior criticism. The proposition is correct, but its content is definitional. Whether every criticism was in fact classified in each of the six O_m reviews is an empirical matter. The manuscript says only that review-provenance records were kept "where available".

Requested:

- say that Proposition 4 holds by construction;
- add a sentence separating it from its empirical counterpart.

Desirable: a per-paper statement of which O_m reviews have complete provenance records.

Major 5. The self-correction evidence of Remark 8 has no counterfactual. Printed self-correction is consistent with the constrained-collaborator thesis. It does not by itself show that the external reference *caused* the corrections: twenty of twenty-one papers were reviewed by one model family on both sides, and no unconstrained comparison exists. *Requested:* one sentence stating that the evidence is consistent with, not demonstrative of, the proposed mechanism.

Major 6. The cross-issue technique comparison is asymmetric. For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\mathrm{new}$, the Number 1 counts are lower bounds by Proposition 5, and Table 3 marks them as such. The comparison in the text "Thermodynamics ... does not occur" is unaffected, but a reader may draw cross-issue conclusions from

Table 3. *Suggested:* apply $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{new}}$ retroactively to Number 1, so that both columns of Table 3 are measured on the same vocabulary.

Major 7. Proposition 8 should be shown to bite. The proposition is a standard fact about expansions. Its force for Number 3 depends on the existence of an expansion falsifying a given protocell statement, and none is exhibited. *Requested:* one explicit instance, for example a membrane predicate interpreted trivially in an expansion of the explicit twelve-axiom model.

4. Minor comments

Minor 1. Definition 1. The claim that φ and ρ commute is asserted without proof. One line suffices: both sides send x to $(1 - x_{2N+1-i})_i$.

Minor 2. Corollary 2(2). Even fibres are necessary, not sufficient, for class-functionality. Under the identification of Art. 50 the mitochondrial table splits nineteen of the twenty classes, and so is *not* class-functional. Without this sentence, "parity does not exclude it" may be read as "it is class-functional".

Minor 3. Corollary 2, proof. List the ten amino acids with fibres of cardinality 2.

Minor 4. Section 5. The page-length distribution of Number 2 is skewed by Art. 54 (80 pp.), Art. 40 (72 pp.), and Art. 49 (64 pp.). Report medians alongside means: 29 against 11 pages, with ranges 9–80 and 5–23.

Minor 5. Remark 1, item 1. An erratum cannot supply text the author did not write without saying so. Mark the completion as supplied by the editor.

Minor 6. Section 6, Γ_5, and Table 4. Give the connectivity of the Art. 54 target,

$$\mathrm{C5{-}C_{\alpha}(H)(NH_2){-}C_{\beta}(=O){-}O2'Ado},$$

where it is first described, so that "amino-acyl–adenosine linkage" is visibly an interpretation.

Minor 7. Table 4. The row "Even fibres exclude the standard code" carries a mixed tier entry, "O_{m} / O_{s}". Split the row by source paper, or state the convention.

Minor 8. Remark 7. State the publication year of the filings (2025) so that the temporal priority asserted in item (1) can be checked.

Minor 9. Bibliography. Add an access date to the NCBI translation-table reference.

5. Recommendation

Accept after minor revision. The mathematical content is correct where proved and accurately attributed where recalled. The editorial claims are proportioned to the evidence, and the stratification of the genetic-code results is the right organizing device for a survey that must report constructions recovering their own inputs. The revisions requested under Major 1–5 and 7, and under Minor 1–9, are local and do not affect the conclusions. Major 6 is a suggestion; I would accept a reasoned decision not to adopt it.

Recommendation

Accept after minor revision. The mathematical content is correct where proved and accurately attributed where recalled; the revisions are local and do not affect the conclusions.

4 Full author response (verbatim)

The following is the complete text of the author's response, including the production changes made after review.

> We thank the referee for a careful review under all three criteria. We have adopted every requested change. The one suggestion not adopted (Major 6) is declined for the reasons given below; the referee indicated that a reasoned decision not to adopt it would be acceptable. One requested change (Major 4) is adopted in part, because the further material the referee calls desirable is not contained in the editorial record. No conclusion of the manuscript has changed.
>
> Theorem, proposition, and table numbers below refer to the revised manuscript.

Major comments

Major 1. *Definition 10 inconsistent with Table 4; σ not well defined.*

Response. Adopted. The clauses of Definition 10 are now applied in order: stratum 3 (chemical assertion), then stratum 2 (a table as hypothesis or input), then stratum 1. This makes σ a function. The definition now states that a table to which a result is applied only as the object tested is neither a hypothesis nor an input; Corollary 2 is given as the example. A sentence after the definition places the forced placement of Art. 57 in stratum 3. The proof of Proposition 7 has been rewritten against the revised definition, and the proposition is unchanged.

Major 2. *Proposition 6 rests on a borderline classification.*

Response. Adopted. The witnesses are now Art. 47 (Math) and Art. 57 (Mol). A sentence after the proof records that the proposition does not depend on the basis of Art. 48, and lists the other witnesses within Γ_4. The text discussing Art. 48 now states that no result of the survey depends on its classification.

Major 3. *The allocation rule is an ex post reconstruction.*

Response. Adopted. A sentence now precedes Definition 6. It states that the rule is a reconstruction of the judgments by which Number 2 was allocated, and that its test is its prospective application to Number 3. After the definition we state explicitly that clause (c) does not select Art. 50 or Art. 55, and why: their agreement with the published tables is explained by demand read from, and settings fitted against, those tables, as both papers state. We agree with the referee that this exclusion is principled rather than tailored. A result whose agreement with an observed pattern follows from

taking that pattern as input is not the case in which a reviewer's confirmation is most costly. In accordance with the referee's note, Art. 50 and 55 are not re-reviewed.

Major 4. *Proposition 4 is definitional; its empirical counterpart is incompletely documented.*

Response. Adopted in part. The text after Proposition 4 now states that it holds by construction of Definition 4, describing the protocols rather than any particular review. It also separates the empirical claim that each criticism in the six O_{m} reviews was in fact classified at meta-review, and states that this claim can be checked only where review-provenance records exist.

We have not added a per-paper statement of record completeness. That statement is not part of the editorial ledger on which the survey is based; records were kept where available. Asserting completeness paper by paper would introduce claims the survey cannot document. An audit of this kind is the subject of the prospective provenance protocol proposed in Art. 41, and belongs there rather than in an editorial.

Major 5. *Self-correction evidence lacks a counterfactual.*

Response. Adopted. Section 8 now states that the printed self-corrections are consistent with the constrained-collaborator thesis but do not demonstrate its mechanism, since no unconstrained arm exists for comparison. This qualifies the evidence without changing the thesis. The predecessor survey already advanced the thesis as a candidate, not an established, account.

Major 6. *Asymmetric cross-issue technique comparison; suggestion to back-apply $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{new}}$ to Number 1.*

Response. Not adopted, for three reasons.

(i) Back-application would revise counts already published in the predecessor survey. Proposition 5 is a deliberate guarantee that the record of Number 1 stands as published. An issue editorial should not silently change a prior issue's reported figures.

(ii) The asymmetry is already disclosed: the paragraph after Proposition 5 and the daggers of Table 3 identify every affected entry.

(iii) The manuscript's cross-issue claims rest only on techniques in the original vocabulary $\mathcal{T}$ (for example, thermodynamics: eleven papers in Number 1, none in Number 2), so no conclusion depends on the daggered rows.

To remove any ambiguity, the caption of Table 3 now states that daggered rows support no comparison between issues. A uniform recoding of the whole volume under $\mathcal{T}'$ is better placed in a volume-level survey than in an issue editorial.

Major 7. *Proposition 8 should be shown to bite.*

Response. Adopted. Remark 9 now gives an explicit instance. In an expansion of the explicit twelve-axiom model in which a membrane predicate Mem is interpreted as empty, the sentence $\exists x\,\mathrm{Mem}(x)$ fails. Hence the

existence of a membrane component, and any sentence implying it, is not a consequence of the axioms and must be carried by a realization hypothesis.

Minor comments

Minor 1. **Response.** Adopted. Definition 1 now proves that φ and ρ commute.

Minor 2. **Response.** Adopted. A paragraph after Corollary 2 states that even fibres are necessary but not sufficient. Under the identification of Art. 50 the mitochondrial table splits nineteen of twenty classes and is not class-functional; Corollary 2(2) asserts only that parity is not the obstruction. Table 4 now carries this as a separate row.

Minor 3. **Response.** Adopted. The ten amino acids with fibres of cardinality 2 are listed in the proof.

Minor 4. **Response.** Adopted. Medians and ranges are reported: 29 pages (range 9–80) for Number 2 against 11 (range 5–23) for Number 1.

Minor 5. **Response.** Adopted. Remark 1, item 1 now states that the completion is supplied by the editor.

Minor 6. **Response.** Adopted. The connectivity

$$\mathrm{C5{-}C_{\alpha}(H)(NH_2){-}C_{\beta}(=O){-}O2'Ado}$$

is given in the Γ_5 paragraph, and the description in Table 4 is marked as interpretive.

Minor 7. **Response.** Adopted. The row is split by source paper and tier: Art. 48 in O_{m}, Art. 50 in O_{s}.

Minor 8. **Response.** Adopted. Remark 7 now gives the publication year of the filings (2025) and the date of first publication of the count (Art. 45, October 2026).

Minor 9. **Response.** Adopted. An access date has been added to the NCBI reference. The publication year has also been added to both patent references.

Effect on the conclusions

The revisions sharpen definitions, replace one witness, label one rule as a reconstruction, and add one qualification and one example. The manuscript's conclusions are unchanged:

- Number 2 advances Thesis A through proved results and printed self-correction.
- It sharpens Thesis B by replacing the Identification Hypothesis with named premises that end in measurements.
- Neither thesis is established.
- Number 3 is to represent the formalism in protocell components only through stated realization hypotheses.

Production changes after review

The following changes were made at production. None alters a result or a conclusion.

- The article is published as Art. 89 in Vol. 1, No. 4 (November 2026), first page 1808. The review was conducted on the manuscript under its earlier designation, Art. 86.
- DOIs have been added to every reference to the *Annals*.
- Appendix B now describes the verification harness `verify_A89.py` and the Lean 4 proof file `acf-89-proof.lean` that accompany the article. Its Remark 10 records one finding of the harness: the count of nineteen split classes after Corollary 2 holds for exactly the identifications under which complementation of markers is Watson–Crick complementation, which qualifies how that sentence is to be read.

References

[Art39] C. D. Schaper. The Chrysene Formalism as Candidate Mathematics and Candidate Biogenesis: A Quantitative and Categorical Survey of Volume 1, Number 1. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* 1(2):476–488, 2026. Article 39. doi:10.68366/ta8zgf14.

[Art41] C. D. Schaper. AI-Augmented Peer Review by Orthogonal Constraint: A Retrospective Case Study of Mathematical, Concordance, Chemical, and Meta-Review. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* 1(2):561–581, 2026. Article 41. doi:10.68366/kjwc7142.

Revision history

Version	Date	Notes
v1.0	2026-11-04	Review record published with Article 89.

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.