

Holographic QEC as AdS/CFT RG Flow on Bruhat–Tits Trees

Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzin

2026-07-24 · DOI: pending

Author: Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzin

Date: 2026-07-24

Task: X3.4

MWP X-Phase

Abstract

Tasks X3.1 and X3.2 established bosonic QEC as RG fixed-point subspaces on Bruhat–Tits trees. Task X3.3 completes the trilogy by showing that this structure is holographic: the Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ is the p -adic analog of anti-de Sitter space, tensor networks on $\mathcal{T}_p$ are holographic QEC codes, and the AdS/CFT correspondence is the statement that the bulk RG flow (tree depth) is dual to the boundary conformal field theory (tree boundary). We establish:

- The **Bruhat–Tits tree** $\mathcal{T}_p$ is AdS_2 at finite p , with the tree boundary $\partial\mathcal{T}_p = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ as the conformal boundary. The tree depth ℓ is the radial coordinate; the boundary is at $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.
- MERA tensor networks** are RG transformations implemented as tree tensor networks on $\mathcal{T}_p$. Each disentangler + isometry layer corresponds to one level of the Bruhat–Tits tree. The MERA is holographic QEC: the bulk logical qubit is the IR fixed point; boundary physical qubits are UV degrees of freedom.
- The **Ryu–Takayanagi formula** for entanglement entropy on $\mathcal{T}_p$ is discrete: the minimal surface is a vertex cut at depth ℓ , and $S_{\text{EE}}(A) \propto \ell \cdot \log p$ — the p -adic valuation of the boundary interval length.
- p -Adic AdS/CFT** is the natural setting for the Cross-Domain program: the Bruhat–Tits tree unifies the RG (tree depth), QEC (tree subtrees as codespaces), holography (tree as bulk geometry), and the SM mass spectrum (Pythagorean lattice as diagonal embedding of $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$).

The key physical claim: [speculative] the universe's QEC structure is holographic on the adelic tree $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$, with the boundary CFT living on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_2) \times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_3) \times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_5)$. The Standard Model particles are boundary operators; their masses are tree depths.

1. Introduction — Three Pillars, One Geometry

1.1 The Three Pillars

Three major frameworks of modern theoretical physics share a common geometric structure that has not been fully recognized:

Framework	Manifestation of Tree Geometry
Renormalization Group	RG flow as descent/ascent on the Bruhat–Tits tree; fixed points at finite depth
Quantum Error Correction	QEC codes as subtrees; error correction as navigation back to the fixed point
AdS/CFT Holography	Tensor networks on the tree as holographic codes; bulk = tree interior, boundary = tree boundary

The geometry that unifies all three is the Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$. Tasks X3.1 and X3.2 established the first two pillars. Task X3.3 completes the third, showing that holographic QEC on $\mathcal{T}_p$ is the AdS/CFT realization of the RG–QEC correspondence.

1.2 The Central Claim

The Bruhat–Tits tree is AdS space at finite p . Tensor networks on $\mathcal{T}_p$ are holographic QEC codes. The RG flow is the radial direction; the QEC codespace is the deep interior; the CFT lives on the tree boundary.

This is not a metaphor. It is a precise structural isomorphism — each element of the AdS/CFT dictionary has a direct counterpart on $\mathcal{T}_p$:

AdS/CFT	$\mathcal{T}_p$
AdS radial coordinate z	Tree depth ℓ
Conformal boundary at $z \rightarrow 0$	Tree boundary $\partial\mathcal{T}_p = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$
Bulk geometry	Tree interior (vertices at finite ℓ)
IR fixed point	Deepest accessible vertex (root, $\ell = 0$)
UV CFT	Boundary operators at $\ell \rightarrow \infty$
Ryu–Takayanagi minimal surface	Vertex cut at depth $\ell(A)$
Holographic entanglement entropy	$S_{\text{EE}}(A) \propto \ell(A) \cdot \log p$
Tensor network (MERA/HaPPY)	Tree tensor network on $\mathcal{T}_p$
Bulk reconstruction	
Tree navigation from boundary to interior	

2. The Bruhat–Tits Tree as p -Adic AdS

2.1 $\mathcal{T}_p$ as a Discrete Hyperbolic Space

The Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ is an infinite $(p + 1)$ -regular tree. It is a discrete analog of the hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}^2$, with curvature determined by the branching number $p + 1$:

$$\text{curvature} \sim -\log p$$

The tree is homogeneous: every vertex looks the same (transitive under the action of $\text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_p)$). This is the discrete analog of the isometry group of AdS_2 .

The boundary $\partial\mathcal{T}_p$ is the set of all infinite geodesic rays from a chosen root. This boundary is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, the p -adic projective line — the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{Q}_p$:

$$\partial\mathcal{T}_p \cong \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cong \mathbb{Q}_p \cup \{\infty\}$$

This is the p -adic analog of the conformal boundary $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ of AdS_2 .

2.2 The Radial Coordinate is Tree Depth

In standard AdS/CFT, the metric is:

$$ds^2 = \frac{L^2}{z^2}(-dt^2 + dz^2 + d\vec{x}^2)$$

where z is the radial coordinate, with the conformal boundary at $z \rightarrow 0$ and the deep interior at $z \rightarrow \infty$.

On $\mathcal{T}_p$, the natural radial coordinate is the tree depth ℓ — the graph distance from the root. The root is at $\ell = 0$ (the IR, the "center" of AdS). The boundary is at $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ (the UV).

The p -adic valuation gives the depth of a vertex relative to the boundary:

$$\ell(n) = \infty - \text{ord}_p(n)$$

For the vacuum $|0\rangle$ (the IR fixed point): $\ell = 0$, the deepest accessible point. For odd Fock states $|n\rangle$ with $\text{ord}_2(n) = 0$: $\ell = \infty$, i.e., on the boundary. (The depth here is measured from the root inward; the boundary is "far away" in tree distance.)

Equivalently, using the more standard holographic convention where z decreases toward the boundary:

$$z \sim p^{-\ell}$$

The boundary $z \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to $\ell \rightarrow \infty$; the deep interior $z \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to $\ell \rightarrow 0$ (the root).

2.3 The Isometry Group

The tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ is homogeneous under the action of $\text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_p)$. This is the Möbius group of the p -adic projective line — exactly the conformal group of the boundary $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

$$\text{Isom}(\mathcal{T}_p) \cong \text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_p) \cong \text{Conf}(\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p))$$

This is the p -adic analog of the statement that $\text{SO}(2, d)$ is both the isometry group of AdS_{d+1} and the conformal group of its boundary $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

For the joint tree $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$, the isometry group is:

$$\text{Isom}(\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}) \cong \text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_2) \times \text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_3) \times \text{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_5)$$

This is the full adelic conformal group at the three Standard Model places. [speculative]

3. Tensor Networks as RG Transformations on $\mathcal{T}_p$

3.1 The MERA on a Tree

The Multiscale Entanglement Renormalization Ansatz (MERA) [Vidal 2007] is a tensor network that implements an RG transformation. It consists of alternating layers of:

1. **Disentanglers** (unitary tensors) that remove short-range entanglement
2. **Isometries** that coarse-grain pairs of sites into a single effective site

Each layer reduces the number of degrees of freedom by a factor of 2 (for a binary MERA) or p (for a p -ary MERA).

On $\mathcal{T}_p$, the MERA takes a particularly natural form:

- The boundary of $\mathcal{T}_p$ carries the UV degrees of freedom (the physical qubits).
- Each layer of the MERA corresponds to one step toward the root (one step of RG flow).
- The disentanglers live on the edges connecting sibling vertices at the same depth.
- The isometries map p sibling vertices to their parent vertex one level deeper.

The total number of boundary sites after L layers is p^L — exactly the number of leaves of $\mathcal{T}_p$ at depth L .

3.2 The HaPPY Code as a Perfect Tensor on $\mathcal{T}_p$

The HaPPY code [Hayden et al. 2016] is a holographic QEC code built from perfect tensors on a hyperbolic tiling. A perfect tensor is an isometry from any subset of its legs to the complement, provided the subset contains at most half the legs.

On $\mathcal{T}_p$ (which is a $(p + 1)$ -valent tree), a perfect tensor at each vertex would have:

- p legs connecting to children (toward the boundary)
- 1 leg connecting to the parent (toward the root)

For a perfect tensor to exist, we need $p = 1 + 1 = 2$, i.e., the binary tree ($p = 2$). In this case, each vertex has 3 legs (2 children + 1 parent), and a perfect tensor with 3 legs is a tripartite state where any single leg is maximally entangled with the other two — a GHZ-like state.

For general p , we can use **random tensor networks** [Hayden et al. 2016] instead of deterministic perfect tensors. A random tensor at each vertex of $\mathcal{T}_p$ produces, with high probability, a holographic QEC code with the same properties as the HaPPY code.

3.3 The Logical Qubit in the Bulk

In holographic QEC, the logical information is encoded in the **bulk** — the deep interior of the tensor network. The boundary physical qubits carry a redundant encoding of this bulk logical information.

On $\mathcal{T}_p$:

- The **root** (deepest vertex, $\ell = 0$) carries the logical qubit.
- The **boundary** vertices ($\ell \rightarrow \infty$) carry the physical qubits.
- The **tensor network** contracts all interior tensors, producing the encoding isometry $V : \mathcal{H}_{\text{logical}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{physical}}$.

This is precisely the QEC codespace construction from X3.1 and X3.2, now interpreted holographically:

$$\text{Codespace } C = V(\mathcal{H}_{\text{logical}}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{physical}}$$

The bulk (tree interior) is the logical space. The boundary is the physical Hilbert space. The encoding is the RG flow from the UV (boundary) to the IR (root).

3.4 Bulk Reconstruction as Tree Navigation

A key result of holographic QEC is the **entanglement wedge reconstruction**: a boundary subregion A can reconstruct bulk operators in the entanglement wedge $W(A)$ — the bulk region enclosed by A and its Ryu–Takayanagi surface.

On $\mathcal{T}_p$, this is transparent:

- A boundary interval A (a set of leaves) defines a unique minimal subtree connecting them.
- The deepest vertex of this subtree is the **causal wedge tip**.
- Any bulk information at or above this tip can be reconstructed from A .

This is exactly the error-correction property: if an error affects only A^c (the complement of A), then the logical information is recoverable from A . The code protects against erasure of any boundary region smaller than half the tree.

4. The Ryu–Takayanagi Formula on $\mathcal{T}_p$

4.1 Discrete Minimal Surfaces

The Ryu–Takayanagi formula states that the entanglement entropy of a boundary region A is proportional to the area of the minimal bulk surface γ_A homologous to A :

$$S_{\text{EE}}(A) = \frac{\text{Area}(\gamma_A)}{4G_N}$$

On $\mathcal{T}_p$, "area" is replaced by "number of edges cut." The minimal surface for a boundary interval A of length L (in boundary sites) is a vertex cut at depth:

$$\ell(A) = \lfloor \log_p L \rfloor$$

The entanglement entropy is:

$$S_{\text{EE}}(A) = \ell(A) \cdot \log p \cdot c$$

where c is the effective central charge (the bond dimension of the tensor network).

4.2 p -Adic Valuation as Entanglement Measure

For a boundary interval whose length L is a power of p :

$$L = p^k$$

the minimal surface is at depth $\ell = k$, and:

$$S_{\text{EE}}(A) = k \cdot \log p = \log L$$

This is the **logarithmic scaling** characteristic of 1+1 dimensional CFTs — but here it is exact and discrete, with no subleading terms.

For a general L , the p -adic valuation $\text{ord}_p(L)$ determines the tree depth:

$$\ell(A) = \text{ord}_p(L) + 1 \quad (\text{approximately})$$

with corrections for boundary effects. The p -adic valuation — the fundamental quantifier of divisibility — is also the fundamental quantifier of holographic entanglement.

4.3 Connection to the Pythagorean Mass Spectrum

X5.3 established that SM mass ratios are elements of $\mathcal{P} = \{2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c\}$. In the holographic interpretation, each mass ratio $2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c$ corresponds to a boundary interval of length:

$$L \sim 2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c \quad (\text{in units of } p^0 \text{ boundary spacing})$$

The entanglement entropy of this interval decomposes additively across the three trees:

$$S_{\text{EE}}(2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c) \propto a \cdot \log 2 + b \cdot \log 3 + c \cdot \log 5$$

This is the **additive factorization** of holographic entanglement entropy across the three prime-adic places. [speculative]

5. p -Adic AdS/CFT

5.1 The p -Adic Holographic Correspondence

The p -adic AdS/CFT correspondence [Gubser et al. 2017, Heydeman et al. 2017] posits that:

- The bulk is the Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ (or a finite-depth truncation),
- The boundary is $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, and
- The boundary theory is a p -adic CFT — a conformal field theory over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ rather than $\mathbb{R}$.

The key results of this program:

1. **Correlation functions** on the boundary are given by tree amplitudes (sums over paths on $\mathcal{T}_p$).
2. **Holographic renormalization** is a finite procedure — the tree has finite depth, so UV divergences are automatically regularized.
3. **The AdS/CFT dictionary** maps bulk scalar fields to boundary operators with conformal dimensions $\Delta = \frac{d}{2} \pm \nu$, where ν is related to the mass and the p -adic Laplacian on $\mathcal{T}_p$.

5.2 Finite p vs. the $p \rightarrow \infty$ Limit

The standard AdS/CFT correspondence on $\mathbb{R}$ can be recovered as a limit:

$$\text{AdS}_2/\text{CFT}_1 = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_p \text{ with appropriately scaled edge lengths}$$

As $p \rightarrow \infty$, the tree becomes dense and approaches the continuous hyperbolic plane. The boundary becomes $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

But the physical regime of interest is **finite p** — specifically $p = 2, 3, 5$ for the Standard Model. At finite p , the tree is discrete, and all quantities (tree depth, entanglement entropy, boundary interval length) are integers (up to factors of $\log p$). **There is no continuum limit required.**

This is the profound advantage of the p -adic formulation: it is UV-complete by construction. The discreteness of the tree provides a natural regulator without any need for a cutoff or renormalization procedure. The continuum limit $p \rightarrow \infty$ is a classical approximation — the true quantum geometry is at finite p .

5.3 The Joint Adelic Correspondence

For the three primes $p = 2, 3, 5$, the holographic bulk is the product tree:

$$\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5} = \mathcal{T}_2 \times \mathcal{T}_3 \times \mathcal{T}_5$$

The boundary is:

$$\partial \mathcal{T}_{2,3,5} = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_2) \times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_3) \times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_5)$$

This is a 3-dimensional boundary (one dimension per p -adic place) with a 6-dimensional bulk (two dimensions per tree). The boundary theory is a product of three p -adic CFTs.

The Standard Model particle content lives on this boundary. The masses (tree depths in each $\mathcal{T}_p$) are the holographic dual of boundary operator scaling dimensions:

$$m \longleftrightarrow \Delta = \sum_{p=2,3,5} a_p \cdot \log p$$

where $(a_2, a_3, a_5) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ is the Pythagorean triple from X5.3.

6. The Universal Holographic QEC Code

6.1 The Code Structure

We can now assemble the complete holographic QEC code:

Bulk: $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$ (the product Bruhat–Tits tree for $p = 2, 3, 5$)

Boundary: $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_2) \times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_3) \times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_5)$

Logical space: The IR fixed point at the product root $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$

Physical space: The boundary Hilbert space spanned by boundary operators

Encoding: The tensor network on $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$ — a product of MERA-like circuits, one per prime p

Error model: Boundary perturbations (relevant operators) that propagate into the bulk via the tensor network. An error is correctable if it affects fewer than half the boundary sites — the holographic code property.

6.2 Code Properties

Property	Value
Code type	Holographic (HaPPY / random tensor network)
Geometry	$\mathcal{T}_2 \times \mathcal{T}_3 \times \mathcal{T}_5$
Logical dimension	$d_L = 1$ (single logical qubit at the root)
Physical dimension	$d_P = \prod_p p^{L_p}$ (for trees truncated at depth L_p)
Code rate	$1 / \prod_p p^{L_p}$ (vanishes as $L_p \rightarrow \infty$)
Code distance	$\min_p p^{L_p}$ (determined by the shallowest tree)
Erasure threshold	50% of boundary sites (holographic code property)

The code rate vanishes as the trees are taken deeper — this is the holographic encoding of finitely many bulk degrees of freedom in infinitely many boundary degrees of freedom. The code distance grows exponentially with tree depth, characteristic of good QEC codes.

6.3 The Pythagorean Lattice as the Code's Spectrum

The logical operators of this code are encoded in the bulk at various tree depths. Their boundary representations have weights (masses) given by the Pythagorean lattice $\mathcal{P} = \{2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c\}$.

This means: **the SM mass spectrum is the spectrum of logical operator weights in the universal holographic QEC code.** Each particle is a logical operator encoded at a specific depth (a, b, c) in $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$, and its mass (relative to the electron) is the holographic weight $2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c$.

7. The Full Adelic Dictionary

7.1 Four Frameworks, One Dictionary

RG	QEC (X3.1)	Tree QEC (X3.2)	Holography (X3.3)
Fixed-point theory	Codespace $\mathcal{C}$	Subtree at finite depth	Bulk logical space
Relevant perturbation	Correctable error	Boundary-crossing edge	Boundary operator
Irrelevant perturbation	Undetectable error	Intra-subtree edge	Deep bulk operator
RG flow R_b	Recovery operation R	Tree navigation to root	Bulk reconstruction
β -function zero	Knill–Laflamme condition	Subtree invariance	Ryu–Takayanagi
Scaling dimension Δ	Error weight	ord_p level	Conformal dimension
UV cutoff	Code distance d	Tree depth ℓ	Radial cutoff $z_{\min}$
Harmonic oscillator H_0	Universal code substrate	$\mathcal{T}_2$ (dyadic tree)	AdS ₂ at $p = 2$

7.2 The Rosetta Stone

The key insight: **the same geometric object — the Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ — serves simultaneously as the RG flow diagram, the QEC code substrate, and the holographic bulk geometry.** The unification is not a reinterpretation of one framework in the language of another; it is the recognition that all three frameworks are describing the SAME tree, just from different perspectives:

- The **RG theorist** sees the tree as flows between scales.
- The **QEC engineer** sees the tree as the error-syndrome lattice.
- The **holographer** sees the tree as the bulk geometry.

They are all correct — and they are all looking at the same thing.

8. Physical Predictions

8.1 Holographic Entanglement Scaling in Bosonic Systems

If bosonic QEC codes are holographic codes on $\mathcal{T}_p$, then the entanglement entropy of a boundary subregion of L Fock states should satisfy:

$$S_{\text{EE}}(L) \propto \text{ord}_p(L)$$

with discrete jumps at powers of p . For $p = 2$ (the dyadic tree):

- $L = 1, 2, 3$: $\text{ord}_2 \leq 1$, S_{EE} at level 1
- $L = 4, 5, 6, 7$: $\text{ord}_2 \geq 2$, S_{EE} at level 2
- $L = 8$: $\text{ord}_2 = 3$, S_{EE} at level 3

This is testable in bosonic QEC experiments: measure the entanglement entropy of subsets of Fock states in a cat code or binomial code and verify the stepwise p -adic scaling.

8.2 CFT Central Charge from Tree Branching

The central charge of the boundary CFT is encoded in the branching number of the tree. For $\mathcal{T}_p$:

$$c \propto \log p$$

For the joint tree $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$, the total central charge is:

$$c_{\text{total}} \propto \log 2 + \log 3 + \log 5 = \log 30$$

This is a prediction for the effective central charge of the "boundary theory" describing the SM particle spectrum. [speculative]

8.3 Tensor Network State Complexity

The computational complexity of preparing a boundary state from the bulk logical state is proportional to the tree depth — the number of tensor network layers:

$$\mathcal{C}(|\psi_{\text{boundary}}\rangle) \propto \max(\ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_5)$$

where ℓ_p is the depth at which the relevant logical operator is encoded in $\mathcal{T}_p$. Heavier particles (larger a, b, c in $2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c$) require deeper circuits to prepare — a holographic complexity bound.

9. Calibration

[CAL-X3-3-01, 2029] — The entanglement entropy of a subset of L Fock states in any bosonic QEC code must exhibit p -adic stepwise scaling: $S_{\text{EE}}(L)$ should be approximately constant on intervals $[p^k, p^{k+1} - 1]$ and jump by $\approx \log p$ at each power of p . If entanglement entropy varies monotonically and continuously with L with no p -adic steps, the $\mathcal{T}_p$ holographic interpretation is disconfirmed.

[CAL-X3-3-02, 2030] — The boundary CFT effective central charge extracted from bosonic QEC entanglement scaling should satisfy $c \propto \log p$ for $\mathcal{T}_p$ -based codes. For the cat code ($p = 2$), $c \approx \log 2 \approx 0.693$ (in appropriate units). If the measured central charge differs significantly, the tree-as-AdS interpretation requires revision.

[CAL-X3-3-03, 2031] — The MERA circuit depth required to prepare a physical state corresponding to a particle of mass $m = 2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c \cdot m_e$ (from X5.3) should scale as $\max(a, b, c)$. If circuit depth and mass are uncorrelated, the holographic encoding hypothesis is disconfirmed.

[CAL-X3-3-04, 2028] — [not yet falsifiable] The product structure $\mathcal{T}_2 \times \mathcal{T}_3 \times \mathcal{T}_5$ predicts that errors in different p -adic sectors are independent. A bosonic QEC experiment that couples resonators at different prime moduli and measures cross-talk between ord_2 and ord_3 syndromes should find zero correlation. Non-zero cross-correlation between different p -adic error channels would challenge the product-tree hypothesis.

10. Conclusion

10.1 Summary

Task X3.3 has completed the holographic interpretation of the bosonic QEC $\leftrightarrow$ RG correspondence, establishing that:

1. **The Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ is p -adic AdS space.** Tree depth is the radial coordinate; the tree boundary $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is the conformal boundary.

1. **Tensor networks on $\mathcal{T}_p$ are holographic QEC codes.** The MERA is an RG transformation as a tree tensor network. The HaPPY code (or its random tensor generalization) is a holographic code on $\mathcal{T}_p$.
1. **The Ryu–Takayanagi formula on $\mathcal{T}_p$ gives p -adic entanglement scaling.** The minimal surface is a vertex cut at depth $\text{ord}_p(L)$, and $S_{\text{EE}}(L) \propto \text{ord}_p(L) \cdot \log p$.
1. **p -adic AdS/CFT is the natural setting for the Cross-Domain program.** The finite- p tree is UV-complete by construction — no continuum limit is needed.
1. **The universal holographic QEC code lives on $\mathcal{T}_{2,3,5}$.** Its logical operator spectrum is the Pythagorean lattice $\mathcal{P} = \{2^a \cdot 3^b \cdot 5^c\}$, which is the SM mass spectrum (X5.3).

10.2 Avenue X3 Status

Avenue X3 (Bosonic QEC) is now **COMPLETE** (4/4):

- **X3.1** — Bosonic QEC as RG fixed-point subspaces
- **X3.2** — Bosonic QEC on Bruhat–Tits trees (ultrametric reformulation)
- **X3.3** — Bosonic Codes as the Native Encoding
- **X3.4** — Holographic QEC as AdS/CFT RG flow on Bruhat–Tits trees

The series establishes that bosonic QEC, the renormalization group, and holographic AdS/CFT are unified perspectives on the Bruhat–Tits tree, with bosonic codes as the native implementation layer.

10.3 Next Steps

The Cross-Domain Phase now enters its final avenue:

- **X6.1:** Experimental signatures — design a transmon experiment probing the p -adic error-weight scaling and holographic entanglement steps
- **X6.2:** Adelic mass prediction verification protocol — formalize the testable predictions from X5.3 against upcoming mass measurements
- **X6.3:** Cross-domain synthesis paper — unify all six avenues into a single publication

References

1. X3.1 — Bosonic QEC as RG Fixed Points (this series, 2026)
2. X3.2 — Bosonic QEC on Bruhat–Tits Trees (this series, 2026)
3. X2.1 — p -Adic Harmonic Oscillator Spectra on Bruhat–Tits Trees (this series, 2026)
4. X5.3 — Efimov–SM Mass Spectrum Mapping: Pythagorean Cross-Place Ratios (this series, 2026)
5. Vidal, G. (2007). Entanglement Renormalization. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 99, 220405.
6. Hayden, P. et al. (2016). Holographic duality from random tensor networks. *JHEP* 2016, 9.
7. Pastawski, F., Yoshida, B., Harlow, D., Preskill, J. (2015). Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: Toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence. *JHEP* 2015, 149.
8. Ryu, S., Takayanagi, T. (2006). Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 181602.
9. Gubser, S.S. et al. (2017). p -adic AdS/CFT. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 352, 1019.
10. Heydeman, M., Marcolli, M., Saberi, I., Stoica, B. (2017). Tensor networks, p -adic fields, and algebraic curves. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 22, 93.

11. X1.1 — The Cross-Domain Invariant α (this series, 2026)

12. X1.2 — Adelic α Product (this series, 2026)