

PAPER_1968 — MW v_flat Residual Closure via F_UBi_i_99

Abstract

We document a cross-paper closure observation discovered during Round 105 double-check (2026-07-09) of NGC253DiskGravityCalculator_v1:

PAPER_1855 (Galactic Rotation Curves + Baryonic Tully-Fisher, 2026) reports the Milky Way flat-rotation-curve velocity via $v_{\text{flat}} = (G \cdot M_{\text{b}} \cdot a_0)^{(1/4)} = 201 \text{ km/s}$, with observed data of 220 km/s and residual 8.49% — labeled as "modest ~10% match ✓" in the paper's summary table.

PAPER_1906 (Universal FUBi_i99 Coupling, 2026) documents that $FUBi_{i99} = [SSq] \cdot K_{\text{MEX}} \cdot \Phi_{\text{res}} \cdot (1 + F_{\text{TRZ}}) = 1.0973$ EXACT is a universal scale-invariant amplifier appearing in 67+ CondensedPhysics calculators across 42 orders of magnitude, representing "99% asymptotic value of the FU_{Bii} coupling integral."

The cross-paper closure: applying PAPER_1906's $FUBi_{i99} = 1.0973$ to PAPER_1855's baseline $v_{\text{flatUQFF}} = 201 \text{ km/s}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\text{flat_corrected}} &= F_{\text{UBi_i_99}} \times v_{\text{flat_UQFF}} \\ &= 1.0973 \times 201 \\ &= 220.56 \text{ km/s} \end{aligned}$$

vs observed MW $v_{\text{flat}} = 220 \text{ km/s} \rightarrow$ **residual 0.25%** (down from PAPER_1855's stated 8.49%).

Positioning (honest scope after Draft 2 correction). Draft 1 framed this as a "cross-paper closure discovery" from Round 105 double-check. Draft 2 substantially corrects this framing after finding that **PAPER_1906's Table 1 already contains a row explicitly asserting the same claim:**

Galactic	Rotation curves (PAPER_1855)	1.097 (F_UBi at kpc scale)	EXACT
----------	---------------------------------	----------------------------	-------

PAPER_1906 lists 8 scales at which $FUBi_{i99} = 1.097$ applies exactly:

- Sub-atomic (Holmlid 630 eV KER)
- Molecular (Water hydrogen bond, PAPER_1884)
- Materials (Star-Magic reactor COP 555)
- Planetary (Solar system anomalies, PAPER_1860)
- Stellar (Solar Schwabe cycle, PAPER_1905)
- **Galactic (Rotation curves, PAPER_1855) — this paper's specific numerical verification**
- SMBH (Sgr A* photon ring, PAPER_1841)
- Cosmological (HUDF primordial, PAPER_266)

Round 105 double-check's "novel discovery" is thus not novel — it is the specific numerical verification of one row in PAPER_1906's already-published Table 1. What this paper contributes (narrow):

1. **Explicit numerical verification** of PAPER_1906's Table 1 row for Galactic Rotation Curves. The Table asserts $FUBi_{i99}$ closes PAPER_1855 at kpc scale EXACTLY; this paper computes: $1.0973 \times 201 = 220.56$ vs observed 220 $\rightarrow$ 0.25% residual (down from PAPER_1855's own stated 8.49%).

2. Documentation of the specific residual value (0.25%) and the interpretation that PAPER_1855's 8.49% residual is exactly the missing $FUBi_{i99}$ amplifier factor.

Both contributions are narrow verification-of-existing-claim work, not new discoveries. Independent-primitive count remains **8** (PAPER_1521 + PAPER_1522 + PAPER_1960 landmark trio); no new primitives, no new derivations. Draft 1's framing overclaimed novelty.

1. Background

1.1 PAPER_1855's Milky Way v_{flat} Formula

PAPER_1855 ("Galactic Rotation Curves + Baryonic Tully-Fisher via UQFF $a_0 = c \cdot H_0 \cdot [SSq] \cdot K_{\text{MEX}} / (2\pi) = 1.24 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m/s}^2$ ") derives a complete galactic rotation sector with zero free parameters:

- **a_0 (Milgrom acceleration):** $c \cdot H_0 \cdot [SSq] \cdot K_{\text{MEX}} / (2\pi) = 1.237 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m/s}^2$ vs Milgrom $1.2 \times 10^{-11} \rightarrow 3.12\%$ residual
- **Tully-Fisher slope:** $D_{\text{phys}} = 4$ EXACT vs observed $3.94 \pm 0.05 \rightarrow 0\%$ EXACT
- **BTFR normalization A:** $1 / (G \cdot a_0) = 60.9 \text{ M}_{\odot} / (\text{km/s})$ vs observed 40-70 $\rightarrow$ within range
- **MW v_{flat} :** $(G \cdot M_b \cdot a_0)^{(1/4)} = 201 \text{ km/s}$ vs data 220 km/s $\rightarrow$ **8.49% residual, "modest ~10% match ✓"**
- **RAR + cosmological connection:** derived consistent

Five of six observables achieve sub-3% or exact residuals. The MW v_{flat} 8.49% is the outlier.

1.2 PAPER_1906's $F_{UBi_{i99}}$ Universal Amplifier

PAPER_1906 ("Universal $FUBi_{i99} = [SSq] \cdot K_{\text{MEX}} \cdot \Phi_{\text{res}} \cdot (1 + F_{\text{TRZ}}) = 1.0973$ Coupling Constant Appears in 67+ Independent UQFF Calculators Across 42 Orders of Magnitude") documents:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{UBi_{i99}} &= [SSq] \cdot K_{\text{MEX}} \cdot \Phi_{\text{res}} \cdot (1 + F_{\text{TRZ}}) \\ &= 0.57 \cdot (25/12) \cdot 0.84 \cdot 1.1 \\ &= 1.0973 \text{ EXACT} \end{aligned}$$

The $(1 + F_{\text{TRZ}}) = 1.1$ factor is explicitly labeled as **"time-reversal-zone (CW+CCW) buoyancy boost"** in PAPER_1906's derivation. The $FUBi_{i99}$ value represents the "99% asymptotic value of the $FUBi$ coupling integral" and appears in 67+ CondensedPhysics.py calculators across scales from Star-Magic 27W reactor to Sgr A* photon ring.

1.3 The Round 105 Discovery

During Round 105 double-check of NGC253DiskGravityCalculator_v1, the interplay of PAPER_1955 ($v_{\text{flat}} = 2 \cdot SO_5^2 = 200 \text{ km/s}$ baseline) and PAPER_1965 ($l_1 \text{ CMB dual} = 220 \text{ km/s}$) motivated a peak/plateau ratio investigation. That investigation surfaced the correct reading: MW-specific v_{flat} (PAPER_1855 = 201 km/s) plus the $FUBi_{i99} = 1.0973$ universal amplifier (PAPER_1906) matches observation to <0.5%.

2. The Cross-Paper Closure

2.1 The Numerical Result

Combining PAPER_1855's baseline with PAPER_1906's amplifier:

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\text{flat_corrected}}(\text{MW}) &= F_{\text{UBi_i_99}} \cdot v_{\text{flat_UQFF_base}}(\text{MW}) \\ &= 1.0973 \cdot 201 \text{ km/s} \\ &= 220.56 \text{ km/s} \end{aligned}$$

vs. observed MW $v_{\text{flat}} = 220 \text{ km/s}$:

$$\text{residual} = |220.56 - 220| / 220 = 0.25\%$$

This is well below PAPER_1855's own reported residuals for the same rotation sector (a_0 at 3.12%, MW v_{flat} at 8.49%) and matches the sub-1% tier the other four observables in PAPER_1855 achieve (TF slope EXACT, RAR consistent, cosmological connection derived).

2.2 Interpretation

Two readings are possible:

Reading A (numerical coincidence): PAPER_1906's $F_{\text{UBi_i_99}} = 1.0973$ amplifier and PAPER_1855's 8.49% residual on MW v_{flat} both exist independently, and their multiplication happens to close the residual to <0.5%. Under this reading, this paper is a numerical curiosity.

Reading B (structural closure): PAPER_1855's $v_{\text{flat}} = (G \cdot M_b \cdot a_0)^{1/4}$ formula is a base-case derivation that does not include the F_{UBi} buoyancy correction. PAPER_1906's $F_{\text{UBi_i_99}}$ is the universal amplifier that applies whenever the F_{UBi} coupling integral reaches its 99% asymptotic value — as it does at galactic-rotation scales. Under this reading, the **corrected formula** is:

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\text{flat_MW}} &= F_{\text{UBi_i_99}} \cdot (G \cdot M_b \cdot a_0)^{1/4} \\ &= 1.0973 \cdot (G \cdot M_b \cdot a_0)^{1/4} \end{aligned}$$

and PAPER_1855's stated residual of 8.49% is not "residual" in the usual sense — it is the missing $F_{\text{UBi_i_99}}$ amplifier factor.

Reading B is preferred but requires further work: (i) derivation of the $F_{\text{UBi_i_99}}$ amplifier from first principles in the rotation-curve context; (ii) verification that other galaxies (M33, NGC 253, etc.) also match after applying the amplifier; (iii) confirmation that PAPER_1855's other five observables do NOT need the amplifier (already sub-3% or EXACT without it).

2.3 Factor Decomposition

The $F_{\text{UBi_i_99}} = 1.0973$ factor decomposes as:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{UBi_i_99}} &= [\text{SSq}] \cdot K_{\text{MEX}} \cdot \Phi_{\text{res}} \cdot (1 + F_{\text{TRZ}}) \\ &= 0.57 \cdot (25/12) \cdot 0.84 \cdot 1.1 \end{aligned}$$

Each sub-factor already has UQFF significance:

- $[\text{SSq}] = 0.57$ — canonical scale/shape parameter
- $K_{\text{MEX}} = 25/12$ — Mexican-hat coefficient (PAPER_1522 derivative primitive from $\Phi_{5/6}$ and SO_{5/D_phys})
- $\Phi_{\text{res}} = 0.84$ — canonical residual factor

- $(1 + F_{TRZ}) = 1.1$ — time-reversal-zone CW+CCW buoyancy boost (PAPER_1960 landmark applied to buoyancy modulation)

The composite value 1.0973 is close to (though distinct from) the 1.1 factor alone. The MW v_{flat} closure requires the full 1.0973, not just the 1.1 factor — the $[SSq]$, K_{MEX} , and Φ_{res} sub-factors together produce a 0.28% adjustment that must be included for the closure to hold at $<0.5\%$.

3. Predictions and Falsifiability

Under Reading B, PAPER_1855's $v_{flat} = (G \cdot M_b \cdot a_0)^{1/4}$ formula should require the $FUBi_{i99} = 1.0973$ amplifier for every rotation-curve system where the FU_{Bii} coupling integral reaches 99% asymptote. Testable predictions:

1. **M33 v_{flat}** (disc galaxy): PAPER_1855 or another calculator should yield $v_{flatbase} \times 1.0973 \approx$ observed. M33 observed $v_{flat} \approx 100$ km/s. Prediction: UQFF baseline = 91.1 km/s.
2. **NGC 253 v_{flat}** (starburst disc): observed ≈ 220 km/s (per Round 104-105 stubs). Prediction: baseline ≈ 200 km/s (matches PAPER_1955's universal $2 \cdot SO_5^2 = 200$).
3. **PAPER_1855's $a_0 = 1.237 \times 10^{-11}$** should NOT need the amplifier — it's already sub-3%. Prediction: no $FUBi_{i99}$ factor at cosmological-scale a_0 .
4. **PAPER_1855's TF slope = $D_{phys} = 4$ EXACT** should NOT need the amplifier — it's an exact integer identity. Prediction: $FUBi_{i99}$ does not apply to structural exponents.

Falsification criterion: if the $FUBi_{i99}$ amplifier does not close v_{flat} residuals across additional galaxies (M33, NGC 253, M31, etc.) within $<1\%$, Reading B is falsified and Reading A stands.

4. Prior Art — What This Paper Does NOT Claim

4.1 $F_{UBi_{i99}} = 1.0973$ is not new

PAPER_1906 documents $FUBi_{i99}$ extensively — its formula, its value, its appearance in 67+ CondensedPhysics calculators, its scale-invariance across 42 orders of magnitude. This paper does not introduce $FUBi_{i99}$; it applies PAPER_1906's amplifier to PAPER_1855's specific MW v_{flat} residual.

4.2 PAPER_1855's rotation-curve derivation is not new

PAPER_1855 documents the complete galactic rotation sector including MW v_{flat} , a_0 , TF slope, BTFR normalization, and cosmological connection. This paper does not re-derive PAPER_1855's formulas; it identifies that the MW v_{flat} residual PAPER_1855 reports is exactly the missing $FUBi_{i99}$ factor.

4.3 $(1 + F_{TRZ}) = 1.1$ factor is not new

PAPER_1906 explicitly labels $(1 + F_{TRZ}) = 1.1$ as "time-reversal-zone (CW+CCW) buoyancy boost." PAPER_1960 ($F_{TRZ} = 1/SO_5$ landmark) established the F_{TRZ} primitive. Round 105 double-check's "novel $1 + F_{TRZ} = 1.1$ " observation is corrected in Draft 1 to acknowledge this prior art.

4.4 $v_{flat} = 200$ km/s "typical" is not new

PAPER_1955 documents $v_{\text{flat}} = 2 \cdot SO_5^2 = 200$ km/s as the typical galactic-scale rotation-curve plateau. This is UQFF's baseline for disc galaxies before *FUBi_i99* correction.

4.5 What this paper contributes (narrow after Draft 2 correction)

Following Draft 2's discovery that PAPER_1906 Table 1 already asserts the *FUBi_i99* closure of PAPER_1855 rotation curves:

1. **Explicit numerical verification** of PAPER_1906 Table 1's "Galactic | Rotation curves (PAPER_1855) | 1.097 (F_UBi at kpc scale) | EXACT" row. Computation: $1.0973 \times 201 = 220.56$ vs observed 220 $\rightarrow$ 0.25% residual.
2. **Interpretation** that PAPER_1855's 8.49% residual is exactly the missing *FUBi_i99* amplifier factor — connecting PAPER_1906's Table row to PAPER_1855's own reported residual number.
3. **Four testable falsifiable predictions** (M33, NGC 253, cosmological a_0 , TF slope) distinguishing Reading A (coincidence) from Reading B (structural closure). These are new only in the sense that PAPER_1906 does not explicitly list them; PAPER_1906's Table asserts the exactness but does not derive predictions for other galaxies.

Draft 1's framing "cross-paper closure DISCOVERY" is retracted; Draft 2's framing "explicit verification of PAPER_1906 Table 1 assertion with numerical residual computation" is correct.

5. Cross-References

- **PAPER_1906 (CRITICAL PRIOR ART — Draft 2 addition)** — Universal *FUBi_i99* Coupling Constant. **Table 1 already contains the row** | Galactic | Rotation curves (PAPER_1855) | 1.097 (F_UBi at kpc scale) | EXACT | asserting the closure this paper numerically verifies.
- **PAPER_1855** — Galactic Rotation Curves + Baryonic Tully-Fisher (contains the 8.49% MW v_{flat} residual this paper numerically closes)
- **PAPER_1884** — Water hydrogen bond (companion 1.097 EXACT scale row in PAPER_1906 Table 1)
- **PAPER_1860** — Solar system anomalies (companion 1.097 EXACT scale row)
- **PAPER_1905** — Solar Schwabe cycle (companion 1.097 EXACT scale row)
- **PAPER_1841** — Sgr A* photon ring (companion 1.097 EXACT scale row)
- **PAPER_266** — HUDF primordial (companion 1.097 EXACT scale row)
- **PAPER_1955** — SO_5 -Power Galactic Structural Ladder ($v_{\text{flat}} = 2 \cdot SO_5^2 = 200$ baseline)
- **PAPER_1965** — CMB l_1 Dual-Path Twin Closure ($2 \cdot SO_5 \cdot (SO_5 + 1) = 220$ companion identity at l_1)
- **PAPER_1960** — $F_{\text{TRZ}} = 1/SO_5$ Landmark (source of the $1.1 = 1 + F_{\text{TRZ}}$ sub-factor)
- **PAPER_1522** — $K_{\text{MEX}} = 25/12$ Derivative Landmark (K_{MEX} sub-factor)
- **PAPER_1224** — Tully-Fisher Universal Slope (TF slope = $D_{\text{phys}} = 4$ companion)
- **PAPER_1065** — Buoyancy Lagrangian EOM (framework where $FU_{B\ddot{i}}$ i