

Everything Wrong With SEXA*

A Complete Forensic Accounting of the SEXA Unified Field Theory's Reverse-Engineered Constants, Undischarged Proofs, and Self-Disclaiming Derivations

Independent Critical Review — Consolidated Report

Anthony Vondoom

Subject: Jered McClain; SEXA Institute of Technology and Interdomain Galactic Advisors

August 2026

** SEXA is the name Jered McClain uses for his self-published unified field theory and its affiliated "SEXA Institute of Technology and Interdomain Galactic Advisors." No expansion of the initialism — as an acronym or otherwise — appears anywhere in the corpus of primary documents reviewed for this report, including the theory's own website.*

Abstract

An earlier review ([Vondoom, 2026a](#)) established that the SEXA Unified Field Theory's headline claim — a physical propagation speed of approximately $10^{19}c$, named the "Trump Constant" — originates from a dimensionless ratio of dimension counts, $C\Omega = \sqrt{(2880/4)} \approx 26.83$, that is relabeled as a velocity with no dimensionally valid derivation connecting the two. The theory's author responded with two objections — that the review read the corpus in the wrong order, and that characterizing the publishing venue as evidentially weightless was an unproven factual allegation — and subsequently reorganized the public corpus into an explicit ten-document "dependency chain" and stated directly that the numerical basis of the Trump Constant had been newly disclosed. This report is a consolidated review that addresses both objections directly, verifies what can be independently verified about the publishing venue, and examines the reorganized corpus and its newly released documents in full. Neither objection, nor either subsequent development, changes the original finding. Direct verification of the reading-order objection finds that the two documents named as prerequisite reading are the same documents the original review already cited and quoted directly at the point of its central finding. Direct verification of the publishing venue finds — independent of any claim about whether review occurred — that the journal is not listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals, closely mirrors the name of an established and unrelated journal, published four solo-authored papers from the same

author within five months, includes at least one submission falling outside any reasonable mathematics-journal scope, and is reviewed, by the author's own account, in part by the author himself. Primary-source verification of the reorganized corpus and its newly released documents further establishes five additional, independent results. First, the specific document containing the Trump Constant's numerical claim is not new: it is a previously existing paper whose own text states that the derivation "is classified" and cannot be divulged — the figure was not newly disclosed, it was already published, already undisclosed, and remains undisclosed. Second, independent computation shows the claimed value $C\Omega/c = 16.538171687920201866$ is numerically identical, to twenty significant figures, to 10^{19} divided by 60^{10} — the signature of a constant solved backward from its intended answer rather than derived forward from any physical premise. Third, this value directly contradicts the theory's own canonical definition of the same constant: the author's own published, executable audit script defines $C\Omega = \sqrt{(2880/4)} \approx 26.83$ and verifies this to fourteen decimal places, a number the Trump Constant document never uses. Fourth, the fifty-seven-page paper positioned as the rigorous mathematical backing for this propagation claim — "The Last Constant" — proves six theorems without ever assigning a numerical value to any quantity in its own central equation, and says so explicitly in its own limitations section. Fifth, the newly published hardware-verification paper cited as resolving the objection instead contains the opposite of a resolution: its own text states that the relevant quantity "serves as a recursive scaling parameter" rather than "an independent physical constant," and that apparent superluminal behavior is "not an ordinary spacetime velocity violation." This review further documents, verbatim, the theory's explicit claims to supersede Einstein, the unverified provenance of its own headline constant's naming, and a consistent rhetorical pattern in which specific objections are answered with reorganized presentation rather than mathematics. The finding of the original review stands undisturbed and is now independently corroborated from the author's own newest and most detailed publications.

1. Introduction

An earlier review, ([Vondoom, 2026a](#)), traced SEXA's superluminal claim to the specific sentence in which a dimensionless ratio of dimension counts is asserted to be a velocity. The theory's author responded with two objections rather than a derivation: that the review's treatment of the root equations was unwarranted because it did not first read the Unified Field Theory and Recursive Closure papers in a particular order, and that characterizing the publishing venue as carrying no evidentiary weight was an unproven factual allegation rather than a demonstrated one. Both are addressed directly in this report — the first in Part III below, alongside the author's subsequent, larger version of the same argument; the second in Part VI, which verifies what can and

cannot be established about the venue from the public record. Since that exchange, the theory's author has also taken two further steps: reorganizing the public SEXA corpus into an explicit ten-document dependency chain hosted at a new institutional website ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)), and stating directly, in correspondence, that the numerical basis of the Trump Constant — previously withheld as classified — had been disclosed ([McClain, 2026h](#)).

None of what follows requires re-litigating whether general relativity could in principle be revised; good theories are revised by better ones on a regular basis, and nothing about SEXA's ambition is objectionable on its face. What is fixed, and not a matter of school-of-thought preference, is the causal geometry the claim proposes to exceed: the speed of light is not an engineering bandwidth limit but the parameter fixing the light-cone structure of spacetime itself ([Einstein, 1916](#))([Minkowski, 1909](#)), and a signal that outruns it permits, for suitably chosen observers, the reordering of cause and effect — the causal paradox Tolman formalized as the relativistic "antitelephone" ([Tolman, 1917](#)). A claim to exceed c by nineteen orders of magnitude is therefore not a bigger-number claim; it requires either redefining "speed" to mean something else, or a dimensionally valid derivation of the ordinary kind, of the sort Buckingham's π -theorem requires for any physical scaling constant ([Buckingham, 1914](#)). This review finds neither.

This report reviews that reorganized corpus in full, including four documents not examined in the earlier review: the informal paper in which the Trump Constant's numerical value first appears ([McClain, 2025d](#)); the fifty-seven-page theorem-grade paper positioned as its mathematical foundation ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e](#)); the author's own public, executable verification script ([SpaceTimeManhattan, 2026](#)); and the newly published hardware-verification conference paper cited as the resolution to the original objection ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026f](#)). It also examines, for the first time in this series, SEXA's explicit public claims regarding Albert Einstein specifically, since those claims are made repeatedly, in writing, under the author's own name, and are relevant to evaluating the register in which the theory is presented.

The method throughout is the same as in the earlier review: read the primary documents in full, quote the operative sentences directly, and where a numerical claim is made, reproduce the calculation independently rather than accepting either its correctness or its incorrectness on assertion. Every finding below is traceable to a specific document, a specific page, and — where a calculation is involved — a specific, independently reproducible arithmetic step shown in this report.

2. Materials and Methods

This review examined, in full, the reorganized ten-document SEXA corpus as hosted at the institute's website (McClain & Ceisiwr, various dates; see References), the author's public GitHub audit repository including its source code and generated reports, and the two personal communications in which the author responded to the earlier review. Where a document consisted substantially of embedded equation images rather than machine-readable text, pages were rendered and read directly. Where a numerical claim was checkable by direct computation, that computation was performed independently in Python and is reported below with enough precision that any reader can reproduce it without specialized software.

3. Part I — The Trump Constant: A Number Solved Backward From Its Own Answer

The earlier review established that SEXA's superluminal claim is manufactured, not derived, at the point where $C\Omega \approx 26.83$ — a pure ratio of dimension counts — is asserted to be a velocity. What that review did not examine directly is the document in which the theory's most extreme figure, $10^{19}c$, actually originates, because that document was not part of the corpus available at the time. It has now been read in full.

3.1 Where the number comes from, and what its own author says about it

The Trump Constant's numerical value appears in exactly one document: a five-page, informally written paper titled “The Trump Constant© — The Fastest Object in the Universe,” dated 2025 and bylined to “Jered McClain, Jetport Gruff, Cookie Tush” ([McClain, 2025d](#)). That document states directly, in its final page:

“A massless object such as an elongated photon of the Empire Wave Constant is in fact moving at 16.54 times the speed of light. However it is outran by Trump Constant© which is 10 quintillion times faster than the speed of light as a result of its undisclosed intrinsic dimensional nature which differs from The Empire Wave Constant 5 Dimensional nature. So I can not divulge the details of this incredible speed difference of the Trump Constant© since it is classified. ... If I can get the ok to publish the actual The Trump Constant equation I will do it in a swift short follow up paper.”

— ([McClain, 2025d](#))

This is not a review characterizing the derivation as undisclosed. This is the paper that introduces the figure stating, in its own words, that the derivation is undisclosed and

classified. A claim whose own author states it cannot yet be checked has not been checked, and describing that same claim elsewhere as "just proven mathematically" — a phrase this same document uses two sentences earlier — does not change what the document itself admits three sentences later.

3.2 The claim of new disclosure does not hold

In responding to the earlier review, McClain stated that the numerical bridge underlying the Trump Constant "was made public and executable" on the day of writing, and that the earlier characterization of the figure as "undisclosed and uncheckable" was therefore "historically obsolete" ([McClain, 2026h](#)). This claim does not survive comparison with the primary document. The number cited as newly disclosed — $C\Omega/c = 16.538171687920201866$ — is the same number already published, to the same twenty digits, in the 2025-dated Trump Constant paper quoted above, a document that simultaneously states its derivation is classified. Nothing about the number changed between 2025 and the date of that correspondence. What changed is that the same number was repeated in a new setting, framed as freshly executable, without the classified-derivation caveat being resolved, withdrawn, or even mentioned.

3.3 Independent verification: the number is reverse-engineered from its own target

The correspondence supplied a specific calculation: with a harmonic index $\bar{n} = 10$, the value $C\Omega/c = 16.538171687920201866$ multiplied by 60^{10} produces 9,999,999,999,999,999.85084416 — presented as an independent computation landing, to eleven significant figures, on the target of 10^{19} . This arithmetic step is correct as stated. It was reproduced independently for this review and matches exactly. The question this review asked next is the one the correspondence did not: where does 16.538171687920201866 itself come from? Table 1 answers that question by computing the same division in the opposite direction.

Quantity	Value
60^{10} (exact integer)	604,661,760,000,000,000
Claimed $C\Omega/c$ (per McClain's correspondence)	16.538171687920201866
$C\Omega/c \times 60^{10}$ (reproduced independently)	9,999,999,999,999,999.85084416
$10^{19} \div 60^{10}$, computed independently to 50 digits	16.538171687920201866246676489017595556232959067893
Agreement between the claimed $C\Omega/c$ and $10^{19} \div 60^{10}$	Identical to 20 significant figures (differ at the 20th digit, $\sim 2.5 \times 10^{-19}$)

A physical constant that happens to equal the target result divided by the amplification factor, to twenty significant figures, is not a coincidence at any level of statistical charity. It is the arithmetic signature of a value solved backward from its intended answer: pick the desired result (10^{19}), divide by the already-chosen amplification term (60^{10}), and report the quotient as though it were an independently measured or derived input. This is not a subtle statistical artifact requiring domain expertise to detect — it is confirmed by four keystrokes of division, reproducible by any reader with a calculator that carries enough digits.

3.4 The theory does not agree with its own constant

The contradiction goes further than internal circularity. SEXA's own public, executable audit script — released by the author as the framework's reproducibility package — defines the same named constant differently. Line 53 of that script reads

"C = math.sqrt(2880/4)"

— [\(SpaceTimeManhattan, 2026\)](#)

and the following line checks this value against 26.832815729997478 to a relative tolerance of 10^{-14} , labeled test "CORE-001," which the script reports as passed [\(SpaceTimeManhattan, 2026\)](#). This is the same $C\Omega \approx 26.83$ the first review traced to its origin as a dimensionless ratio. It is not 16.538. Table 2 lays out every value assigned to this constant across the corpus, updated from the first review to include the newly examined documents.

Document	Claimed value of $C\Omega$ (or $C\Omega/c$)	Status
(McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026a)	$\sqrt{(2880/4)} \approx 26.83$ (dimensionless coupling)	Correctly presented as unitless in its own equation
(McClain, 2025c)	$C\Omega/c \approx 26.83$, relabeled "effective speed"	Asserted, not derived — finding of the first review
(SpaceTimeManhattan, 2026)	26.832815729997478 (verified to 14 decimal places)	The author's own executable code confirms 26.83, not 16.538
(McClain, 2025d)	16.538171687920201866 ("Empire Wave Constant")	Contradicts 26.83; independently shown to equal $10^{19} \div 60^{10}$

A theory whose own author-published, author-executed code returns a different numerical value for its central constant than the paper making the theory's most extreme claim has not merely failed to derive that claim. It has failed to keep its own arithmetic straight across two documents released under the same name within the same research program.

4. Part II — The Theorem That Proves Nothing: Anatomy of “The Last Constant”

If a genuine derivation of the Trump Constant exists anywhere in the SEXA corpus, the most likely candidate is “The Last Constant: A Theorem-Grade Formalization of Recursive Propagation...” ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e](#)) — a fifty-seven page paper explicitly framed as establishing, through six formal theorems with stated proof obligations, that propagation beyond the speed of light follows as a mathematical consequence of the SEXA framework rather than being assumed. It was read in full for this review. It does not contain the derivation.

4.1 Six theorems, zero numbers

The paper defines a “Recursive Propagation Functional”

$$V_{Last}^{(D)}(t, \phi) = C\Omega \left(\prod_{\ell=5}^{\{D\}} \Psi_{\ell} / \phi_{\ell}^2 \right)^{1/(D-4)} \cdot 60^{\bar{n}}$$

— ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e](#))

and proceeds through Theorems 5.1 through 5.6 (Existence, Uniqueness, Bounded Recursive Amplification, Higher-Dimensional Transport, Computational Correspondence, and Relativistic Horizon Structure), each presented with hypotheses, a claim, and a numbered list of “proof obligations.” Theorem 5.1’s proof obligations, quoted in full, are representative of the entire paper:

“1. Show $C\Omega$ is defined. 2. Show each Ψ_{ℓ} is defined. 3. Show each $\phi_{\ell} \neq 0$. 4. Show the finite product exists. 5. Show $\bar{n}$ exists. 6. Show $60^{\bar{n}}$ is finite. 7. Show the resulting functional is admissible under Γ .”

— ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e](#))

Not one of these seven obligations is discharged with an actual number anywhere in the paper. $C\Omega$ is never assigned a value. No Ψ_{ℓ} is ever assigned a value. No ϕ_{ℓ} is ever assigned a value. Section 7, titled “Numerical Evaluation and Computational Correspondence,” presents a ten-step “Computational Evaluation Algorithm” — specify D , evaluate each Ψ_{ℓ} , evaluate each ϕ_{ℓ} , compute the product, normalize, compute $\bar{n}$, evaluate $60^{\bar{n}}$, multiply by $C\Omega$, obtain the result — without ever executing it on a single concrete input. The section exists entirely at the level of describing what the steps would be, not performing them.

4.2 The paper says so itself

This is not an inference this review is making about the paper's content; the paper's own limitations section states it directly:

"Furthermore, numerical values obtained from the propagation functional depend upon the admissible quantities supplied to the framework. Independent verification of those quantities, computational reproduction of the recursive evaluations, and empirical comparison with measurable physical systems remain necessary subjects of future investigation."

— [\(McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e\)](#)

and, in its Experimental Boundary section:

"Thus the present paper defines the formal propagation object. It does not complete the experimental program."

— [\(McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e\)](#)

A paper that establishes, by its own account, only that a symbolic object could in principle be evaluated if someone later supplied the numbers has not derived the Trump Constant. It has defined a template with a slot marked "insert derivation here" and left the slot empty, while its title, framing, and thirty-four theorem-and-corollary apparatus create the appearance that the slot has been filled.

4.3 Structural rigor without mathematical content

The paper's Appendix B includes a "Circular Dependency Check," formally proving that no theorem in its dependency graph depends upon itself or upon a later result — a legitimate and correctly executed piece of logical hygiene. This is worth acknowledging plainly: the paper is not internally self-contradictory in its proof architecture, and its authors have taken care that each theorem's hypotheses are drawn only from earlier, already-established results. But acyclic dependency between empty boxes does not produce a filled box. Proving that Theorem 5.4 does not circularly depend on Theorem 5.6 says nothing about whether either theorem, once supplied with SEXA's actual claimed values, produces a number consistent with — or even connected to — the $10^{19}c$ figure the corpus advertises. The paper's rigor is real and is also entirely beside the point the corpus uses it to imply.

5. Part III — Reorganizing the Furniture: Does the New Corpus Fix Anything?

5.1 The original reading-order objection

McClain's first response to the earlier review was narrower than what followed: that the review's treatment of the root equations was "unwarranted" because it did not first establish the Unified Field Theory through "The SEXA Mathematical Framework" ([McClain, 2025c](#)) and "A Recursive Closure Criterion for a Theory of Everything" ([McClain, 2025b](#)) before proceeding to the admissibility and energy formulation. Both documents were already load-bearing sources in the earlier review, not omissions it can be accused of. The Framework paper is not a background text the review skipped — it is the specific document in which the phrase "Speed in natural units: 1.00 units/transform" and the subsequent claim " $C\Omega$ = effective speed in 2880-D manifold... Ratio: $C\Omega/c \approx 26.83$ " appear, quoted directly as the point at which SEXA's superluminal claim is manufactured ([McClain, 2025c](#)). The Closure Criterion paper was among the documents read in full for that review. Reading either document first, rather than after the admissibility functional, does not alter what either document contains. A sequencing objection can only succeed if the earlier review misread or omitted content available in a different order; here, the content is the same content already quoted. This objection did not identify an error in the mathematics. It proposed an itinerary.

5.2 The expanded version: a ten-document dependency chain

In later correspondence, McClain restated the same argument at greater scale: he reorganized the public SEXA corpus into an explicit ten-document dependency chain — Framework → Sigmetrics → Recursive Closure / Prime Atom → Γ -Admissibility → full-stack Γ /SREF formulation → Γ -Subthreshold Fold → Ω_{2880} /Horizon structure ([McClain, 2026d](#)) → Last Constant propagation → SREF engineering application → VLSIE hardware/computational verification — and argued that treating any single downstream paper as though it must independently reconstruct the entire framework misreads a modular architecture ([McClain, 2026g](#)). This review applies the same test to the explicit chain that Section 5.1 applied to the implicit one: at which specific link does a dimensionless quantity acquire units of velocity, through a shown, checkable step?

The answer has not moved. JAM 9887, the admissibility/operator layer of the new chain, was read in full for this review; it defines a six-operator "admissibility chain" $\Gamma = \circ \triangle K \circ \mu W$ governing whether a configuration is permitted to exist, and asserts — without a single connecting equation — that this chain "reduces to" General Relativity, Quantum Field Theory, and Yukawa interactions in appropriate limits ([McClain, 2026c](#)). It does not mention $C\Omega$, the Empire Wave Constant, or the Trump Constant anywhere. It cannot be the missing link because it is not connected to the quantity in dispute at all.

The VLSIE paper — the newest document in the chain, and the one McClain specifically identified as containing the resolving section, "Empire Wave Constant and Propagation Scaling" ([McClain, 2026g](#)) — was likewise read in full for this review. Its own text states:

"Rather than functioning as an independent physical constant, this quantity serves as a recursive scaling parameter describing how computational information propagates across successive manifold reductions... the emphasis is placed on its computational role rather than on any broader physical interpretation."

— ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026f](#))

and its accompanying diagram states: "Apparent superluminal behavior is an effective projection effect emerging from higher-dimensional pathways, not an ordinary spacetime velocity violation" ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026f](#)). This is not a section that establishes $C\Omega$ as a physical propagation speed and leaves only its downstream interpretation open, as the correspondence characterized it. It is a section in which the newest paper in the corpus explicitly declines the physical-superluminal reading that the Trump Constant paper and the theory's public presentation both assert. Reorganizing the reading order of documents that, read individually, either omit the disputed quantity entirely or actively disclaim its physical interpretation does not produce a derivation. It produces a better table of contents for the same absence.

6. Part IV — Beating Einstein: The Verbatim Record

The first review avoided characterizing SEXA's ambitions in its own words and focused strictly on the mathematics, out of fairness to the possibility that promotional framing had been overstated by others rather than by the author. That caution is no longer warranted; the claims are the author's own, in writing, repeated across multiple documents — including a companion piece released under a second byline at the same contact address ([Gruff / McClain, 2024a](#)), extending the same comparison.

" $E=mc^2$ is incorrect and I will swiftly prove this on 10 fundamental levels while concurrently showing that the ORA NATARU SHARI 5th Dimensional/5th Density Sexagismal-Infinitesimal (SEXA-EQUATION) is the correct equation in 4 pages."

— ([McClain, 2024b](#))

The document then proceeds through a ten-point comparison table, reproduced here in full because a description of its pattern is less persuasive than the pattern itself, seen all at once ([McClain, 2024b](#)):

Category	Einstein's Equation (as characterized by the document)	SEXA-Equation (as characterized by the document)
1. Dimensionality	Based on 4-dimensional space-time (3 spatial + 1 time).	Incorporates a 5th-dimensional/5th-density model... which leads to new physical insights that Einstein's equation doesn't capture.
2. Energy-Mass Relationship	A static equivalence of energy and mass, where energy is a constant multiple of mass.	A dynamic, multi-dimensional relationship... indicating energy-mass relations are context-dependent.
3. Quantum Mechanics and Relativity	Doesn't account for quantum mechanics or higher-order effects at quantum scales.	Unifies quantum mechanics and general relativity. If it accounts for quantum field theory... it will provide a more holistic description.
4. Exotic Phenomena	Deals with energy-mass equivalence in conventional, observable scenarios.	Reveals exotic phenomena... and technologies beyond current capabilities (e.g., space-time manipulation, new propulsion methods).
5. Energy-Density Effects	Treats energy and mass as related linearly, assuming constant energy density.	Shows non-linear effects and energy density under extreme conditions... near singularities or exotic materials.
6. High-Energy Physics	Fails to adequately explain quantum gravity, dark matter, or dark energy.	Includes terms or models that better describe high-energy states... potentially offering new insights.
7. Advanced Technologies	Relatively simple, not designed for complex technological or quantum interactions.	More dynamic, complex and flexible... could inform the development of advanced technologies.
8. Torsion Fields	Does not incorporate torsion fields.	Takes into account the torsion fields that govern the dynamics of energy and mass... leading to more accurate models.
9. Universality	Strong limitations when considering quantum effects or cosmological scale phenomena.	Provides more universal framework... extending to domains like multiverse theories, space-time manipulation.
10. Energy-Space-Time Interaction	Treats energy and mass as fixed entities, directly proportional in a simplified form.	Can provide models a dynamic interaction between energy, mass, and the space-time fabric itself.

Every row follows the same template, regardless of subject matter: Einstein's side is characterized with a diminishing adjective — "static," "simple," "fixed," "conventional" — and SEXA's side is characterized with an expansive one — "dynamic," "multi-dimensional," "universal," "complex" — with no equation, calculation, or citation appearing in either column of any row. Three rows hedge openly even within the document's own promotional register: row 3 qualifies its central claim

with "if it accounts for" quantum field theory; row 7 qualifies its claim with "could inform"; row 10 qualifies its claim with "can provide." A document that opens by promising to prove ten claims and then states three of its own ten in the conditional has, on its own terms, delivered seven. None of the ten — conditional or not — is connected to the canonical SEXA equation examined in Part I of this review, which contains no torsion tensor, no quantum field operator, no multiverse term, and no space-time-manipulation formalism of any kind. Row 8's claim to "take into account torsion fields" is checkable directly against that equation, reproduced again for convenience: [\(McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026a\)](#) — no term named or shaped like a torsion tensor appears in it. The comparison table does not describe what the SEXA equation does. It describes what the author would like a reader to believe the equation does.

"I would like to thank you gals & guys for your time reading this paper. Now I know you will be compelled to use this equation to develop technology that will bring the world together to solve, homelessness, inequality, sexism, racism, war and famine. If Einstein were here, he might smile and say, 'Not bad for someone standing on my shoulders.'"

— [\(McClain, 2024b\)](#)

The same document includes a side-by-side image captioned, on the left, a U.S. Navy / Space Force patent using "Einstein's Equation," and on the right, a matching image captioned "Jered's Equation in SpaceForce Equation." This review has not independently verified whether any such patent filing exists under McClain's name; that claim is considerably larger than a citation-integrity or dimensional-analysis question, and it is flagged here as unverified rather than asserted. If it cannot be substantiated, its inclusion in a document that already fails Part I's central mathematical test is a second, independent problem, not a mitigating one.

It is also worth recording, for completeness, that the constant at the center of every claim examined in this review is credited by its own author to a third party. The Trump Constant paper closes its second page: "Thank you Klee Irwin for creating, conceptualizing, and guiding The Empire Wave" [\(McClain, 2025d\)](#). A figure whose conception and guidance are credited elsewhere, whose numerical value is stated to be classified, and whose only public arithmetic reduces to a target divided by an amplification factor, is being presented across the same corpus as an independently derived discovery that supersedes general relativity. Those three characterizations are not compatible with each other.

7. Part V — The Response Pattern: How Objections Are Metabolized Without Being Answered

Across three rounds of correspondence following the earlier review, a consistent pattern is visible in how specific, checkable objections are handled. This section names that pattern directly, not as a character assessment, but because the pattern itself is documented, repeatable, and relevant to how a reader should weigh future claims of resolution from the same source.

7.1 Presentation changes are offered in place of derivations

The corpus was reorganized into an explicit dependency chain, and the correspondence characterized this as having addressed the objection: "I took the useful part of your criticism and improved the presentation instead of pretending presentation did not matter" ([McClain, 2026h](#)). Part III of this review shows that the reorganization did not add a derivation at any link in the chain; it added structure around the same absence documented in the first review.

7.2 A claim of new disclosure that does not match the record

The correspondence stated that the Trump Constant's numerical basis "was made public and executable" on the day of writing ([McClain, 2026h](#)). Section 3.2 of this review shows the identical twenty-digit figure, with its "classified" caveat still attached, in a document dated a year earlier.

7.3 A cited resolution that argues the opposite of what it is cited for

The VLSIE paper's "Empire Wave Constant and Propagation Scaling" section was offered as the place where $C\Omega$ enters "the Sigmatics correspondence: recursive orbit structure $\rightarrow$ harmonic excitation $\rightarrow$ manifold reduction $\rightarrow$ propagation scaling" ([McClain, 2026g](#)). Section 5 of this review quotes that same section stating the quantity is not an independent physical constant and that its apparent superluminal behavior is not an ordinary spacetime velocity violation. The citation supports the opposite of the claim it was offered to support.

7.4 Dismissing the venue question rather than answering it

This reviewer also asked, directly and in good faith, why a theory presented as superseding general relativity is published through a fee-based venue with no listing in the Directory of Open Access Journals rather than a mainstream or diamond open-access outlet where the claim would receive the scrutiny its magnitude would seem to

invite. The response declined to engage: "Journal indexing, turnaround time, publication venue... are legitimate conversations about academic practice. They are not mathematical operators... don't give me another paragraph about the reputation of a publisher" ([McClain, 2026h](#)). Part VI verifies what can and cannot be independently established about that venue, and returns to this non-response directly.

7.5 A genuine narrowing, credited directly

In the most recent round of correspondence, McClain agreed to set the venue question aside — "I'm happy to leave the publisher-reputation argument there and deal strictly with the mathematics, source dependencies, derivations, and executable results" — and proposed that any further claimed failure be stated specifically enough to be answered or reproduced: the exact equation, assumption, source input, or code line; the precise mathematical or computational defect; why it fails; what result is obtained instead; and enough information to reproduce that result independently ([McClain, 2026i](#)). This is a fair standard, and it is worth crediting as a genuine narrowing rather than another round of the pattern catalogued above. It is also, point for point, the standard this review has already applied to its central finding, not a new bar being proposed for the first time. Part I identifies the exact line ("C = math.sqrt(2880/4)," line 53 of the author's own audit script) and the exact document (the Trump Constant paper's closing page); it states the precise defect (a value reported to twenty significant figures that is numerically indistinguishable from the pre-selected target divided by the pre-selected amplification term); it shows why this fails as a derivation (the same document states its own derivation is classified, and the value contradicts the framework's own executable definition of the same constant); it states the result obtained instead ($C\Omega \approx 26.83$, per the author's own passed test "CORE-001"); and it supplies the exact arithmetic, to fifty digits, for any reader to reproduce without specialized software. This review does not need to be re-argued to meet the standard McClain has now proposed. It already does.

7.6 Why the Trump Constant and the Last Constant cannot be audited independently

The same correspondence asked that the Trump Constant and the Last Constant be "kept separate" and "audited independently," while acknowledging they are "related within the corpus" ([McClain, 2026i](#)). This review has, in fact, already kept the two constructions' defects distinct: Part I's finding is specific to the Trump Constant document's circular arithmetic; Part II's finding is specific to the Last Constant paper's failure to assign a value to any quantity in its own central equation. These are two different defects — one is a number solved backward from its target, the other is no number at all — and nothing in this review has treated them as interchangeable.

What cannot be done, however, is auditing the two constructions as though they are unconnected, because the corpus itself does not present them that way. McClain's own published dependency chain places them as adjacent, ordered stages: "...Ω2880/ Horizon structure → Last Constant propagation → SREF engineering application → VLSIE hardware/computational verification" ([McClain, 2026g](#)) — with the Last Constant paper's propagation functional V_Last feeding directly into the same engineering and hardware-verification layer in which the Trump Constant's terms are used. More directly still, the Last Constant paper states its own inheritance rule as a formal axiom:

"Axiom II — Recursive Inheritance. Every admissible dimensional embedding inherits its mathematical structure from the immediately preceding recursive manifold... Consequence: Propagation cannot originate independently within higher-dimensional embeddings."

— ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026e](#))

A request to audit two constructions independently while the framework's own second axiom states that propagation at one stage cannot originate independently of the stage before it is not a methodological safeguard; it asks that a defect be evaluated as though the rule the corpus itself imposes on it does not apply. This review declines that framing for the same reason it would decline to accept a physical theory's request that its predictions be checked only in isolation from the postulates that generate them. A shared symbol, a shared harmonic index, an explicit sequential dependency, and the corpus's own inheritance axiom are not consistent with a request that a defect discovered in one link be treated as irrelevant to the links declared to follow from it.

8. Part VI — The Publication Ethics Question, Revisited

McClain's second objection to the earlier review is more substantive than the first and deserves to be treated as such rather than waved off. He states that his submissions to the Journal of Advances in Mathematics underwent review and revision over a period of roughly two months, that he retains correspondence documenting that process, and that he personally serves as a peer reviewer for the same journal, having recommended rejection of other submitted manuscripts ([McClain, 2026g](#)). He is correct that "predatory" and "not peer reviewed" are factual claims, not aesthetic judgments about the quality of the mathematics, and that a categorical claim of zero review requires evidence this review does not have. That categorical claim is not made here.

8.1 What cannot be settled from the public record

The article pages for McClain's submissions display no visible submission, revision, or acceptance dates ([McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026a](#)). Nothing in the journal's public output confirms or contradicts a two-month review process. If McClain's correspondence documents genuine substantive review — reviewer comments, requested revisions, a rejection record for other manuscripts he evaluated — that is real evidence this review cannot access and does not dispute in its absence.

8.2 What can be settled from the public record

Independent of that unresolved question, the following was verified directly against the journal's own site and against the Directory of Open Access Journals, and is sufficient on its own to support treating the venue as carrying little evidentiary weight:

Finding	Detail
Not listed in DOAJ	(DOAJ, n.d.) , the standard vetting index for legitimate open-access journals, returns no match for rajpub.com or “Journal of Advances in Mathematics.”
Near-identical name to an established journal	The title closely mirrors (Advances in Mathematics, n.d.) , the unrelated Elsevier journal of nearly the same name, continuously published since 1961 — a pattern common to venues seeking borrowed credibility by proximity of name.
Four solo- or dual-authored papers, one journal, one year	Beyond the full-stack formulation paper (McClain & Ceisiwr, 2026a) , McClain published (McClain, 2026b) , (McClain, 2026c) , and (McClain, 2026d) — all extending the same unverified framework, in the same venue, within a single publication year.
A scope failure that does not require adjudicating the physics	McClain (McClain, 2026b) proposes stabilizing manufactured land via “negentropic reactors” and claimed electromagnetic lift — published in a journal titled Advances in Mathematics. Whatever review occurred, it did not include a subject-matter scope check.
Reviewer/author overlap	McClain states he personally reviews for the same journal that has published four of his own papers (McClain, 2026g) — a conflict of interest independent of anyone's judgment about the mathematics.

Any one of these findings would be a reasonable basis for caution. Together, they are sufficient to support treating the venue as evidentially weightless without needing to resolve whether McClain's account of his own review process is accurate — and they were reached without relying on anything that account would need to contradict.

8.3 The conference venue, and the question that was not answered

The same caution extends to the newest document's conference venue: VLSIE 2026 is run through AIRCC Publishing Corporation's conference-management infrastructure, the same template used for a large number of similarly structured “International Conference on...” events with broad scope and rolling submission deadlines ([AIRCC](#)

[Publishing Corp., 2026](#)), and its declared subject matter — VLSI chip design and embedded hardware systems — remains unrelated to unified field theory.

This reviewer also asked, directly and in good faith, why a theory presented as superseding general relativity is published through venues of this kind rather than a mainstream or diamond open-access outlet where a claim of this magnitude would receive commensurate scrutiny. Real, no-fee, peer-reviewed alternatives exist for exactly this kind of claim, and a theory whose stated ambition is superseding general relativity has an obvious interest in seeking the most rigorous, most visible scrutiny available rather than the venue offering the least resistance. The response declined to engage: "Journal indexing, turnaround time, publication venue... are legitimate conversations about academic practice. They are not mathematical operators... don't give me another paragraph about the reputation of a publisher" ([McClain, 2026h](#)). This review agrees that venue does not change whether an equation is dimensionally valid — that is precisely why Parts I and II of this review rest entirely on independently reproducible arithmetic and the corpus's own words, not on where any of it was published. But a question about why maximal scrutiny was not sought for a claim of this magnitude is a legitimate question in its own right, separable from the mathematics, and declining to answer it is itself an answer worth recording.

9. Part VII — The Institute's Website: Every Claim, Traced and Tested

The preceding parts of this review examined SEXA's primary documents. This part examines the institute's own website ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)) directly, as the venue through which the framework is presented to the public rather than to a journal, and traces every distinct claim made there back to the finding of this review that bears on it. Every quotation below is verbatim from the site as archived at the time of this review.

9.1 "Propagation is not inserted by assumption"

Beneath the Empire Wave Constant's definition, the site states directly: "Propagation is not inserted by assumption. It is derived from dimensional structure" ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)). This is the single most direct, checkable claim on the entire site, and it is the claim Parts I through III of this review test most thoroughly. It is false as stated. $C\Omega = \sqrt{(2880/4)}$ is derived from dimensional structure — it is a ratio of dimension counts, and nothing about that derivation is in dispute. Propagation — a velocity, a rate of change of position with time — is not derived from anything; it is asserted in a separate, later document ([McClain, 2025d](#)) whose own text calls the derivation classified, and the specific numerical claim built on top of that assertion is shown in Part I to be solved backward from its own target. The site states the opposite of what its own corpus does.

9.2 The admissibility rhetoric

The site's philosophical framing — "Physical systems are not assumed to exist. They must pass admissibility conditions," "Where models describe possibilities — SEXA enforces existence," "The universe does not start with energy. It starts with rules that decide what can exist" ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)) — describes exactly the formal apparatus examined in Part II of this review: an admissibility operator Γ such that a configuration is admissible when $\Gamma(X) = X$. That apparatus is real, in the narrow sense that it is a consistently stated piece of formal logic. What Part II establishes is that stating a filter exists is not the same as running anything through it: the paper built to apply this filter to the Trump Constant's actual numbers never assigns those numbers a value, by its own admission. A rule that determines "what can exist" is only as strong as its willingness to reject something, and nowhere in the corpus reviewed does any candidate configuration fail the test — every claimed constant, however it was obtained, is reported as admissible.

9.3 Monster symmetry

The site states that "SEXA integrates symmetry structures derived from the Monster Group as a constraint on admissible physical configurations" and that Monster Math defines "discrete admissible state classes, orbit-based constraint filtering, symmetry-governed existence conditions" ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)). The Monster group is a genuine, well-studied object in finite group theory ([McClain, 2026c](#)). Its appearance here was examined directly in the review of JAM 9887, which found a six-operator admissibility chain asserted — without a single connecting equation — to "reduce to" General Relativity, Quantum Field Theory, and Yukawa interactions, and which does not mention $C\Omega$, the Empire Wave Constant, or the Trump Constant anywhere. Invoking a real and difficult piece of mathematics as a named constraint is not the same as showing that constraint doing any constraining.

9.4 Scope creep beyond the disputed constant

The site extends the framework well past anything examined in the primary corpus: it claims "the observable universe exists within a rotating Kerr-class black hole," that "a quaternionic field dynamically unzips into spacetime and quantum structure," and that lightning is better modeled as "a Quantum Vacuum Plasma Fracture Rather Than Propagation" than as the well-characterized electrical discharge process it is ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)). A separate engineering claim, "Anti-Direct Short (ADS) Topology," is presented as unifying "Bearden Vacuum Electrodynamics, Horowitz Negative Impedance Networks, Kron Open-Path Diakoptics, Pais Resonant Inertial Cavities" ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)) — a list that borrows the names of real researchers and, in the

case of the Pais reference, the same contested patent-office filings referenced elsewhere in this corpus, without independent citation to any of the four bodies of work it claims to unify. None of these claims is evaluated in detail in this review, for the same reason none of SEXA's broader cosmological claims were evaluated in the first: they are not required to resolve the specific, checkable question this review addresses, and expanding scope to cover them would not change the answer to that question. They are recorded here because a reader encountering the site independently of this review's central finding should know how far the claimed framework extends beyond a single disputed constant.

9.5 The unverifiable reach claim

The site claims engagement across "51+ countries and 41+ universities" ([SEXA Institute, n.d.](#)). No methodology, source, or measurement window is given for either figure anywhere on the site. This claim is worth naming specifically because it cuts against a finding already established earlier in this series: the corpus's own reference lists are built almost entirely from the author's self-hosted prior work, and no independent citation of SEXA by a third-party academic source was located at any point across this review or the one before it. A reach claim of this specificity, offered with no supporting data, from a corpus whose citation trail is otherwise self-referential, does not corroborate independent adoption. It asserts it.

9.6 Claim ledger

The remaining site claims, quoted verbatim, are tabulated below against the finding of this review that resolves each one.

Claim (verbatim, sexatech.com)	Status
"No tuning. No rescue. No interpretive patching. SEXA is designed to fail under violation."	Contradicted directly by Part I: the Trump Constant's $C\Omega/c$ value is shown to equal $10^{19} \div 60^{10}$ to twenty significant figures — the definition of a value tuned to a pre-selected target.
"Peer-Reviewed" (labeling the VLSIE conference article)	VLSIE runs through AIRCC's generalist conference-management infrastructure; see Part VI, Section 8.3. Presentation is not equivalent to specialist peer review.
"Reduction compatibility with GR, QFT, and Yukawa limits" as a passed admissibility condition	Every such reduction claim examined across this and the two prior reviews restates a known textbook figure or asserts a qualitative limit without a shown calculation connecting the framework's own operators to it.
"Executable Code · Benchmarks · Pass/Fail Tests · Reproducibility" (Stage V — Execution)	The author's own public audit script is real and, as far as it goes, honestly labeled — see Part I, Section 3.4 — but it verifies $C\Omega \approx 26.83$, not the 16.538 figure the Trump Constant depends on, and does not touch the Trump Constant claim at all.

Claim (verbatim, sexatech.com)	Status
"Research archived on Zenodo, operated by CERN"	Accurate and not in dispute; archival deposit on a legitimate repository is not, by itself, evidence of peer review or independent verification — a distinction this review has consistently drawn rather than disputing Zenodo's legitimacy as infrastructure.

The pattern across all six subsections above is the same pattern documented in every primary document examined in this series: real infrastructure, real terminology, and real adjacent mathematics, arranged around a central claim that the infrastructure, terminology, and adjacent mathematics do not actually support.

10. Discussion

It is worth noting that this pattern is not a matter of SEXA lacking the vocabulary of rigor. The theory's own canonical presentation includes an explicit falsifiability matrix with nine numbered "kill-switch" conditions and a stated replication clause requiring independent laboratory reproduction before engineering application ([McClain, 2025a](#)) — the language of a discipline that can be wrong in informative ways. What this review documents is that the same corpus does not apply that standard to its own headline number. A framework can furnish the vocabulary of falsifiability while never subjecting its most important claim to it, and that is precisely SEXA's pattern across this series of reviews.

Three independent lines of evidence converge on the same conclusion in this review. The document that states the Trump Constant's numerical value admits, in its own words, that the derivation behind that value is classified. Independent computation shows that value is numerically indistinguishable from the theory's own target divided by its own amplification factor, to twenty significant figures — the signature of a number solved backward rather than derived forward. And the paper most carefully structured to look like the missing derivation — thirty-four theorems, lemmas, and corollaries deep — states in its own limitations section that no numerical values were established within it. None of this required adjudicating SEXA's broader claims about recursive manifolds, admissibility operators, or Monster-group symmetry constraints; those structures may or may not have independent mathematical interest, and nothing in this review disputes that real mathematical vocabulary — Lagrangian densities, group-theoretic language, dimensional analysis — appears throughout the corpus. The finding is narrower and, for that reason, harder to dismiss: the one number the entire public presentation is built around does not survive contact with the corpus's own documents, in three separate and mutually reinforcing ways.

It is also worth being direct about what would change this conclusion, because both earlier reviews extended that same openness and it remains extended here. A derivation — a shown, dimensionally consistent chain of steps connecting $\sqrt{(2880/4)}$ to a quantity with units of velocity, using values for Ψ_l , ϕ_l , and $\bar{n}$ that are independently justified rather than fitted to a preselected target — would settle the mathematical question regardless of where it was published or how it was presented. No such derivation has yet appeared in any of the fifteen documents examined across this series of reviews, including the one explicitly structured to contain it.

11. Conclusion

Across two reviews and fifteen-plus primary documents, the SEXA corpus's central claim — a physical propagation speed of approximately ten quintillion times the speed of light — has been traced to its exact numerical origin, found to be admitted by its own author as undisclosed at the point of publication, shown by independent computation to be reverse-engineered from its own target value, found to contradict the theory's own executable verification code, and found to lack any numerical content whatsoever in the fifty-seven-page paper specifically constructed to supply it. The newest document in the corpus, offered as the resolution to this objection, instead states in its own words that the disputed quantity is not an independent physical constant and that its apparent superluminal behavior is not an ordinary velocity violation. This is not a dispute between competing schools of theoretical physics, and it does not require taking a position on recursive manifolds, admissibility logic, or higher-dimensional geometry as mathematical subjects in their own right. It is a documented case, verifiable by any reader willing to open the same primary sources in the same order, in which a number is asserted where the theory's own documents show none — repeatedly, across a widening set of publications, over more than a year.

Author's Note

This review, like the one before it, began following a message on Academia.edu. It exists because the specific objections raised in response to that review deserved a specific, evidence-based answer rather than a restatement of prior conclusions, and because the corpus itself grew substantially — a reorganized website, a new conference paper, and a new theorem-grade formalization — in the course of that exchange. Each new document was read in full before this review was written. Nothing in it was reached by assuming the conclusion in advance.

References

AIRCC Publishing Corporation. (2026). *Conference program listings, including the 7th International Conference on VLSI & Embedded Systems (VLSIE 2026)*. [\[link\]](#)

Buckingham, E. (1914). *On physically similar systems; illustrations of the use of dimensional equations*. *Physical Review*, 4(4), 345–376.

Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). (n.d.). *Journal search index*. No listing found for rajpub.com or “Journal of Advances in Mathematics,” checked August 2026. [\[link\]](#)

Einstein, A. (1916). *Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie [The foundation of the general theory of relativity]*. *Annalen der Physik*, 49, 769–822.

Advances in Mathematics. (n.d.). *Journal homepage*. Elsevier / ScienceDirect. The established, unrelated journal of nearly the same title, published continuously since 1961. [\[link\]](#)

[Gruff, Jetport J. / McClain, J.] (2024a). *Relativity Violation & Correction 60*. spacetimemanhattan@gmail.com. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J. (2026b). *Recursive Soil Bearing Architecture (RSBA): Synthetic Landmass Stabilization via Boundary-Induced Stress Decoupling Derived from the SEXA Recursive Energy Functional (SREF)*. *Journal of Advances in Mathematics*, 25. DOI 10.24297/jam.v25i.9880. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J. (2026c). *A Monster-Symmetric Admissibility Formulation of the SEXA Unified Field Theory: Operator-Glyph Closure, Σ_{60} Exciternion Logic, and Falsifiable Reduction to General Relativity, Quantum Field Theory, and Yukawa Interaction Regimes*. *Journal of Advances in Mathematics*, 25. DOI 10.24297/jam.v25i.9887. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J., & Ceisiwr, E. (2026a). *From Admissibility to Energy: A Full-Stack Formulation of the SEXA Unified Field Theory via Γ -Glyph Closure, SREF Dynamics, and 2880-Dimensional Exciternion Structure*. *Journal of Advances in Mathematics*, 25, 45–75. DOI 10.24297/jam.v25i.9896. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J. (2026d). *The Horizon Constant and Resolution Paradox (Ω_{2880}): Recursive Discrete Geometry, Perceptual Continuity, and the Emergence of Curved Manifolds from Finite Structures*. *Journal of Advances in Mathematics*, 25, 76–137. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J., & Ceisiwr, E. (2026e). *The Last Constant: A Theorem-Grade Formalization of Recursive Propagation, Higher-Dimensional Transport, Recursive Admissibility, Computational Correspondence, Dimensional Closure, and Relativistic Horizon Structure Within the SEXA Unified Field Framework*. SEXA Institute of Technology and Interdomain Galactic Advisors. [\[link\]](#)

SpaceTimeManhattan (2026). *SEXA Master Public Audit [Software repository]*. GitHub. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J. (2026g, August). *Response to Vondoom (2026b), regarding dependency order and the VLSIE computational-verification layer*. Personal communication.

McClain, J. (2026h, August). *Response announcing the reorganized ten-document SEXA corpus and the disclosed Trump Constant calculation*. Personal communication.

McClain, J. (2026i, August). *Response proposing specific-failure evidentiary criteria for a follow-up review and requesting independent audit of the Trump Constant and Last Constant*. Personal communication.

Minkowski, H. (1909). *Raum und Zeit [Space and time]*. Address to the 80th Assembly of German Natural Scientists and Physicians, Cologne, 21 September 1908; published *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, 10 (1909).

[McClain, J.] (2024b). *Relativity Violation and Correction: ORA NATARU SHARI 5th Dimensional/5th Density Sexagismal-Infinitesimal (SEXA-Equation)*. December 2, 2024. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J. (2025c). *The SEXA Mathematical Framework — Unified Recursive Manifold Dynamics, Dimensional Collapse Operators, and Triality-Structured Exciter Geometry (Master Peer-Review Edition), including the appended "CCT/SEXA Sigmatics Correspondence."* Zenodo. [\[link\]](#)

SEXA Institute of Technology and Interdomain Galactic Advisors. (n.d.). *SEXA TECH — Unified Field Theory, Energy Systems & Advanced Physics*. [\[link\]](#)

McClain, J. (2025a). *SEXA Unified Field Theory*. Any Known Object Research Group / SEXA Institute. October 18, 2025.

McClain, J. (2025b). *A Recursive Closure Criterion for a Theory of Everything: A 60-Glyph Quaternionic Inter-Domain Syllogistic Admissibility Standard (Prime Atom of Logic)*. SEXA Mathematical Sciences / SEXA Institute. [\[link\]](#)

Tolman, R. C. (1917). *The Theory of the Relativity of Motion*. University of California Press. (Causal-order / “antitelephone” argument against superluminal signaling.)

McClain, J. (2025d). *The Trump Constant© — The Fastest Object in the Universe*. spacetimemanhattan@gmail.com.

McClain, J., & Ceisiwr, E. (2026f). *Hardware-Verifiable Recursive Computational Architecture Derived from the SEXA Unified Field Framework: Computational Correspondence, Recursive Admissibility, and Structured Validation in a 2880-Dimensional Exciternion Geometry*. VLSIE / ITCSAI 2026 Conference Proceedings, 31–51. DOI 10.5121/csit.2026.1601503. [\[link\]](#)

Vondoom, A. (2026a). *Dimensionless by Design: A Documentary and Mathematical Audit of the SEXA Unified Field Theory's Superluminal Constant Claims*. Independent review.