Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Refined Space–Time Membrane Model: Deterministic Emergence of Quantum Fields and Gravity from Classical Elasticity

Paul Swann *

Posted Date: 28 May 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Keywords: spacetime elasticity; wavefunction collapse; non-Markovian dynamics; emergent gauge symmetries; black hole singularity avoidance; Hubble tension; quantum gravity

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Article

The Refined Space–Time Membrane Model: Deterministic Emergence of Quantum Fields and Gravity from Classical Elasticity

Paul Swann

Independent Researcher; officialpaulswann@gmail.com

Abstract: We present a deterministic elasticity framework—the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model—that unifies quantum-like phenomena, gauge field emergence, black hole singularity avoidance, and cosmic acceleration within a single high-order partial differential equation (PDE). By incorporating scale-dependent elasticity, higher-order (∇^4, ∇^6) derivatives and non-Markovian decoherence, the STM model replicates key features of quantum field theory while seamlessly introducing gravitational curvature. A bimodal decomposition of the membrane displacement naturally yields spinor fields; enforcing local symmetries on these spinors reproduces gauge bosons (e.g., photon-like, gluon-like) as deterministic wave–anti-wave cycles with zero net energy over each cycle. Multi-scale expansions reveal that sub-Planck wave excitations can remain non-decaying if damping is negligible and the signs of certain couplings (e.g., ΔE and λ) align to stabilise wave amplitudes. Once coarse-grained, these persistent waves leave a near-uniform offset in the emergent Einstein-like field equations, acting as dark energy and driving cosmic acceleration. In addition, black hole interiors are regularised by enhanced stiffness from the higher-order operators, replacing singularities with solitonic or standing-wave structures. The model's non-Markovian damped PDE also explains wavefunction collapse through deterministic decoherence, reproducing the Born rule and entanglement analogues without intrinsic randomness. Finally, allowing a mild late-time variation in the leftover vacuum offset addresses the Hubble tension by shifting the expansion rate at low redshifts. Future research will refine numerical PDE simulations, test exact operator self-adjointness, and compare predictions against high-precision data to fully assess this deterministic route to reconciling quantum phenomena, black hole physics, and cosmological observations.

Keywords: spacetime elasticity; wavefunction collapse; non-Markovian dynamics; emergent gauge symmetries; black hole singularity avoidance; Hubble tension; quantum gravity

---

1. Introduction

Modern physics is built upon two seemingly incompatible foundations: General Relativity (GR) [1–3], which describes gravity through the curvature of spacetime, and Quantum Mechanics (QM) [4–6], whose probabilistic formalism governs microscopic phenomena. Despite remarkable successes within their respective domains, integrating these theories into a coherent framework remains one of contemporary physics' most pressing challenges. Existing approaches—such as String Theory's extra-dimensional constructions and Loop Quantum Gravity's discretised spin-network formalism—provide valuable insights but have yet to deliver a definitive resolution of quantum gravity [7,8]. Meanwhile, enduring puzzles such as the black-hole information paradox and the cosmological-constant problem underline fundamental tensions between GR's smooth geometry and QM's intrinsic randomness [9–11].

The Space–Time Membrane (STM) model proposes spacetime as a four-dimensional elastic membrane interacting with a parallel mirror domain. Every particle excitation on our "face" of

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

the membrane has a corresponding mirror antispinor on the opposite face, ensuring exact matter–antimatter symmetry and addressing the observed baryon asymmetry. The membrane's elastic dynamics simultaneously generate gravitational curvature and quantum-like phenomena: rather than postulating intrinsic randomness, apparent quantum probabilism emerges as a deterministic consequence of chaotic, sub-Planck elastic oscillations.

Concretely, the displacement field $u(x,t)$ is decomposed into two complementary oscillatory modes that combine into a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$. Mode-by-mode interactions between each spinor component and its mirror antispinor redistribute energy—attractive interactions generate localised curvature (gravity), while repulsive or cancelling interactions reinject energy into the membrane background. Composite photons arise as coherent wave–anti-wave cycles, in which energy exchanged in one half-cycle is precisely returned in the other, enforcing strict energy conservation even during annihilation events.

When rapid sub-Planck oscillations in u are coarse-grained, a slowly varying envelope ψ emerges that obeys an effective Schrödinger-like equation. This envelope reproduces interference patterns and apparent wavefunction collapse, recasting standard quantum phenomena (including the Born rule) as manifestations of deterministic chaos. In this interpretation, Feynman's path-integral is not an ontological sum over real histories but merely the stationary-phase approximation of a single underlying wave field; the familiar kernel

$$K(x_b, t_b; x_a, t_a) \;\propto\; \int D[x(t)]\, e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S[x(t)]}$$

follows directly from a WKB/multiple-scale expansion of the STM PDE (Appendix D).

The STM framework further reinterprets key aspects of particle physics. Electroweak symmetry breaking arises from rapid zitterbewegung-like interactions between spinors and mirror antispinors, generating $W^{\pm}$ and Z^0 masses and yielding CP-violating phases without invoking extra scalar fields. A bimodal spinor decomposition underpins emergent gauge symmetries—U(1), SU(2) and SU(3)—as deterministic elastic connections.

The model incorporates:

- Scale-dependent elastic parameters and higher-order spatial derivatives (notably ∇^6) to regulate ultraviolet divergences.
- Non-Markovian memory kernels to explain deterministic decoherence and effective wavefunction collapse.
- A precise bimodal decomposition of u into a two-component spinor Ψ, yielding emergent gauge bosons.
- A deterministic electroweak symmetry-breaking mechanism via cross-membrane oscillations.
- A multi-loop renormalisation-group analysis and a nonperturbative Functional Renormalisation Group study, revealing discrete fixed points and vacuum structures that potentially account for three fermion generations.

In the gravitational sector, linearised strain fields u_μ link directly to metric perturbations $h_{\mu\nu}$, yielding Einstein-like field equations from the STM action—even when including damping and scale-dependent couplings (Appendix M). A detailed multi-scale derivation (Appendix H) shows that coarse-grained sub-Planck oscillations produce a near-constant vacuum offset acting as dark energy [12,13], and that a mild late-time evolution in stiffness or damping could address the Hubble tension [14].

Crucially, Section 2.8 (and Appendix K.7) presents a full calibration of dimensionless STM parameters to physical constants:

$$\kappa = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G}, \quad g_{U(1)} = \sqrt{4\pi\alpha} \approx 0.3028, \quad \lambda \approx 0.13, \quad \langle \Delta E \rangle \approx 6.8 \times 10^{-10}\, J\, m^{-3},$$

alongside a damping coefficient $\gamma \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-101}\, kg\, m^4$ and higher-order moduli—all anchoring STM to c, G, α and Λ in a quantitatively testable way.

Although STM now captures both quantum-field and cosmological-scale phenomena within one PDE, several frontiers remain. **On the thermodynamics front**, we have:

- Derived the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy by micro-canonical mode counting in the STM solitonic core (Appendix F.4);
- Calculated grey-body transmission factors and effective horizon temperatures via fluctuation–dissipation (Appendix G.4–G.5);
- Sketched a Euclidean path-integral approach to the evaporation law, matching the leading-order M^3 timescale (Appendix H). Remaining thermodynamic tasks include subleading logarithmic and power-law corrections to the area law, Page-curve tests of unitarity and detailed first-law verifications (Appendix F.7).

Beyond thermodynamics, our analytic derivations (Appendices C and N) have robustly formulated mode-by-mode spinor–antispinor couplings, yet precise parameter tuning to reproduce the Standard Model's mass spectra, mixing angles and CP-violating phases remains an open challenge. Numerical tests demonstrate stability across wide damping and time-stepping regimes, and recent results (Section 3.3, Appendix K.7) suggest that the damping term γ may be entirely dispensable—restoring full conservatism and self-adjointness, thereby sidestepping much of the formal proof burden. Nevertheless, if phenomenological fits (for example to mixing matrices or CP phases) ultimately require a small non-zero γ, the framework readily accommodates it, with only minor quantitative shifts in decoherence and stability. A complete formal proof of well-posedness—including strict self-adjointness of the full nonlinear operator, a manifestly positive norm for all physical states and the absence of ghost modes—remains a central frontier.

In contrast to other quantum-gravity proposals, the STM model's basis in classical continuum elasticity makes it highly testable via direct numerical simulation and laboratory analogues (e.g. metamaterials). By deriving Schrödinger dynamics, the Born rule, gauge symmetries and CP violation from one deterministic PDE, STM minimises postulates relative to the Standard Model's multitude of fundamental fields. Addressing the remaining challenges—from parameter tuning and unitarity proofs to thermodynamic subtleties—will be crucial to establishing the STM framework's full consistency across scales.

We encourage further numerical, experimental and theoretical exploration of the STM model as a promising, conceptually transparent route to reconciling quantum phenomena with gravitational curvature.

We encourage further numerical and experimental exploration of the STM model, which may offer a new deterministic route to reconciling quantum and gravitational physics within a single continuum elasticity theory.

Organisation of the Paper

- **Section 2 (Methods)** provides a detailed overview of the STM wave equation, including explicit derivations of higher-order elasticity terms, spinor construction, scale-dependent parameters, and the deterministic interpretation of decoherence.
- **Section 3 (Results)** demonstrates how quantum-like dynamics, the Born rule, entanglement analogues, emergent gauge fields ($U(1)$, $SU(2)$, $SU(3)$), deterministic decoherence, fermion generations, and CP violation naturally arise from the deterministic membrane equations.
- **Section 4 (Discussion)** explores the broader implications of these findings, along with possible experimental tests and numerical simulations.
- **Section 5 (Conclusion)** summarises the key theoretical advances, outstanding issues, and potential future directions, including proposals aimed at verifying the STM model's predictions.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Appendices A–Q comprehensively present supporting details, derivations, and numerical methods. They address:

- Operator Formalism and Spinor Field Construction (Appendix A)
- Derivation of the STM Elastic-Wave Equation and External Force (Appendix B)
- Gauge symmetry emergence and CP violation (Appendix C)
- Coarse-grained Schrödinger-like dynamics (Appendix D)
- Deterministic entanglement (Appendix E)
- Singularity avoidance (Appendix F)
- Non-Markovian Decoherence and Measurement (Appendix G)
- Vacuum energy dynamics and the cosmological constant (Appendix H)
- Proposed experimental tests (Appendix I)
- Renormalisation Group Analysis and Scale-Dependent Couplings (Appendix J)
- Finite-Element Calibration of STM Coupling Constants (Appendix K)
- Nonperturbative analyses revealing solitonic structures (Appendix L)
- Derivation of Einstein Field Equations (Appendix M)
- Emergent Scalar Degree of Freedom from Spinor–Mirror Spinor Interactions (Appendix N)
- Rigorous Operator Quantisation and Spin-Statistics (Appendix O)
- Reconciling Damping, Environmental Couplings, and Quantum Consistency in the STM Framework (Appendix P)
- Toy Model PDE Simulations (Appendix Q)

Finally, an updated Appendix R serves as a Glossary of Symbols, ensuring clarity and consistency of notation throughout.

2. Methods

In the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model, spacetime is represented as a four-dimensional elastic membrane governed by a deterministic high-order partial differential equation. This single PDE unifies gravitational-scale curvature with quantum-like oscillations by incorporating higher-order elasticity, scale-dependent stiffness, non-linear terms, and possible non-Markovian effects. Below, we provide the theoretical foundations, outline the operator quantisation that yields quantum-like behaviour, show how gauge fields naturally emerge, discuss renormalisation strategies, and comment on the classical limit.

2.1 Classical Framework and Lagrangian

2.1.1 Displacement Field and Equation of Motion

We begin with a real displacement field $u(x,t)$, which tracks local deformations of a classical four-dimensional membrane. The STM model augments standard elasticity with higher-order spatial derivatives and scale-dependent parameters, leading to a PDE of the form:

$$\rho \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\nabla^4 u + \eta \nabla^6 u - \gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \lambda u^3 - g u \bar{\Psi}\Psi + F_{ext}(x,t) = 0.$$

(A full variational derivation is given in Appendix B.)

Key ingredients:

- ρ**:** An effective mass density describing the inertial response of the membrane.
- $E_{STM}(\mu)$**:** A baseline elastic modulus that depends on the renormalisation scale μ.
- $\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$**:** Local variations in stiffness tied to sub-Planck energy distributions or wave oscillations.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- $\eta\,\nabla^6 u$**:** A sixth-order spatial derivative term that strongly damps high-wavenumber fluctuations, providing ultraviolet regularisation.
- $\gamma\,\partial_t u$**:** A damping or friction-like term, which may be extended to non-Markovian kernels in the presence of memory effects.
- $\lambda\,u^3$**:** A non-linear self-interaction for the displacement field.
- $-\,g\,u\,\bar{\Psi}\,\Psi$**:** A Yukawa-like coupling between the membrane and an emergent spinor field Ψ.
- $F_{ext}(x,t)$**:** External forcing or boundary influences, derived from an extended potential energy functional (see Appendix material in the longer text).

This PDE provides a unified mathematical context where large-scale curvature (associated with gravity) emerges as low-frequency membrane deformations, and short-scale oscillations mimic quantum phenomena—without introducing extra dimensions or intrinsic randomness.

2.1.2 Lagrangian Density

The classical equation of motion above is most directly obtained via a Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$. Omitting damping and forcing for simplicity, one may write:

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\rho\,(\partial_t u)^2 \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\,[E_{STM}(\mu) \;+\; \Delta E(x,t;\mu)](\nabla^2 u)^2 \;-\; \frac{\eta}{2}\,(\nabla^3 u)^2 \;-\; V(u),$$

where $V(u)$ captures any polynomial or non-polynomial self-interaction terms (e.g.\ $\frac{1}{2}\,k\,u^2$, $\frac{1}{4}\,\lambda\,u^4$, etc.). Integrating $\mathcal{L}$ over all space–time gives an action $S = \int \mathcal{L}\,d^4x$. Variation $\delta S = 0$ recovers the PDE when appropriate boundary conditions are imposed. Damping $\gamma\,\partial_t u$ and non-Markovian kernels can be appended through effective dissipation functionals if desired (Appendix B).

2.1.3 Hamiltonian Formulation and Poisson Brackets

From the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\,\rho\,(\partial_t u)^2 - \frac{1}{2}[E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\left(\nabla^2 u\right)^2 - \frac{\eta}{2}\left(\nabla^3 u\right)^2 - V(u),$$

we define the conjugate momentum

$$\pi(x,t) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t u)} = \rho\,\partial_t u(x,t).$$

In this Hamiltonian (phase-space) picture, the pair (u,π) is canonical, with the Poisson bracket

$$\{\,u(x),\;\pi(y)\}_{PB} = \delta^3(x-y).$$

Demanding that this symplectic structure survive coarse-graining enforces the Dirac rule

$$\{\,\cdot,\cdot\}_{PB} \;\longrightarrow\; \frac{1}{i\hbar}[\,\cdot,\cdot\,],$$

from which the operator commutator

$$[\hat{u}(x),\;\hat{\pi}(y)] = i\hbar\,\delta^3(x-y)$$

follows directly from the membrane's elasticity, rather than being imposed by hand.

Numerical investigations presented in Section 3.3 have revealed parameter conditions under which the damping term, originally introduced for numerical regularisation, may no longer be essential. Omitting this term would significantly simplify the Hamiltonian formulation, explicitly preserving self-adjointness, unitarity, and deterministic behaviour.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

2.1.4 Conjugate Momentum and Modified Dispersion

From the above $\mathcal{L}$, the conjugate momentum to u is

$$\pi(x,t) \;=\; \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t u)} \;=\; \rho\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}.$$

In homogeneous settings, a plane-wave ansatz $e^{i(k\cdot x-\omega t)}$ satisfies $\omega^2(k) \approx c^2 \mid k \mid^2 + E_{STM}(\mu) \mid k \mid^4 + \eta \mid k \mid^6$, revealing how $\nabla^6 u$ powerfully regularises high-wavevector modes (Coefficients fixed as shown in Appendix B). When $\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$ is significant, one replaces a simple plane-wave approach with advanced numerical methods (see Section 2.4 and Appendix K) or a Bloch-like analysis if ΔE is spatially periodic.

2.2 Operator Quantisation

2.2.1 Canonical Commutation Relations

Building on the Hamiltonian structure just introduced, we promote the displacement field $u(x,t)$ and its conjugate momentum $\pi(x,t)$ a to operators $\widehat{u}(x,t)$ and $\widehat{\pi}(x,t)$ on a suitable Sobolev domain. The classical Poisson bracket

$$\{\,u(x),\,\pi(y)\}_{PB} = \delta^3(x-y)$$

is elevated via the Dirac correspondence

$$\{\,\cdot,\cdot\}_{PB} \;\longrightarrow\; \frac{1}{i\hbar}[\,\cdot,\cdot\,],$$

which immediately yields

$$[\widehat{u}(x,t),\,\widehat{\pi}(y,t)] = i\hbar\,\delta^3(x-y),$$

with all other commutators vanishing. Thus the non-commutativity of $\widehat{u}$ and $\widehat{\pi}$ emerges naturally from the membrane's intrinsic symplectic form, without requiring an extra quantisation postulate.

2.2.2 Normal Mode Expansion

In nearly uniform regions, one may write

$$\widehat{u}(x,t) \;=\; \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\; e^{ik\cdot x}\;\widehat{u}(k,t), \widehat{\pi}(k,t)\;\text{similarly.}$$

The associated Hamiltonian sums over the modes, each with a modified dispersion $\omega(k)$. When ΔE varies, a real-space diagonalisation or finite element approach is more suitable. Either way, the operator quantisation ensures a "quantum-like" spectrum of excitations that parallels bosonic fields in standard quantum theory.

2.3 Gauge Symmetries: Emergent Spinors and Path Integral

2.3.1 Bimodal Decomposition and Emergent Gauge Fields

A distinctive aspect of the STM model is constructing a **bimodal decomposition** of $\widehat{u}(x,t)$. Formally, one splits u into two complementary oscillatory components, sometimes referred to as in-phase and out-of-phase fields:

$$u_1(x,t) \;=\; \frac{u+u_\perp}{\sqrt{2}}, u_2(x,t) \;=\; \frac{u-u_\perp}{\sqrt{2}},$$

and arranges (u_1,u_2) into a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$. Imposing a local phase invariance $\Psi \to e^{i\alpha(x,t)}\Psi$ necessitates the introduction of gauge fields, e.g.\ A_μ for $U(1)$. Extending this principle can yield non-Abelian fields W_μ^a ($SU(2)$) and G_μ^a ($SU(3)$), reproducing the main gauge bosons familiar from the electroweak and strong interactions [15,16].

Mechanically, each gauge field arises as a compensating "connection" ensuring that local redefinitions of the spinor field do not alter physical observables. Consequently, photon-like or gluon-like excitations appear as coherent wave modes in the membrane. In standard quantum field theory, "virtual particles" mediate interactions; here, such processes correspond to deterministic wave–anti-wave cycles wherein net energy transfer over a full cycle is zero, aligning with the virtual-exchange picture. By including local phase invariance in the STM action, one automatically generates covariant derivatives $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\,g\,A_\mu$ (or the non-Abelian analogue), reinforcing how gauge fields naturally emerge from the underlying elasticity.

In the path-integral language, enforcing local spinor symmetries introduces these gauge connections and ghost fields (for gauge fixing) but does not rely on intrinsic randomness. Instead, it unites the deterministic elasticity framework with internal gauge invariance. This places photon-like excitations (for U(1)), $W^\pm$ bosons (for SU(2)), and gluons (for SU(3)) as collective membrane oscillations that preserve local symmetry at each point in spacetime.

2.3.2 Virtual Bosons as Deterministic Oscillations

In standard quantum field theory, "virtual particles" are ephemeral excitations in Feynman diagrams [17]. Here, such processes are reinterpreted as perfectly energy-balanced wave–plus–anti-wave cycles. Over one cycle, net energy transfer is zero, consistent with the notion of a virtual exchange. Hence, interactions that appear "probabilistic" from a standard QFT perspective gain a deterministic wave interpretation in the STM model.

In path-integral language [18], the partition function

$$Z \;=\; \int Du\;DA_\mu\;D(\text{ghosts})\;\exp\left\{i\,S_{STM}[u,A_\mu]\right\}$$

incorporates both the displacement field u (with higher-order derivatives) and the gauge fields that emerge upon enforcing local spinor-phase invariance. Ghost fields appear as usual for gauge fixing and do not introduce fundamental randomness—they merely handle redundant field configurations in a deterministic continuum.

2.4 Renormalisation and Higher-Order Corrections

2.4.1 One-Loop and Multi-Loop Analyses

The sixth-order operator $\eta\,\nabla^6 u$ ensures strong damping of high-momentum modes, so loop integrals converge more rapidly than in a naive second-order theory. Standard dimensional regularisation and a BPHZ subtraction scheme can be applied to compute self-energy corrections at one-loop or higher orders (see Appendix J). The resulting beta functions typically take the schematic form:

$$\beta(g_{eff}) \;=\; a\,g_{eff}^2 \;+\; b\,g_{eff}^3 \;+\cdots,$$

where a, b are integrals influenced by $|\;k\;|^4$ and $|\;k\;|^6$ factors in the propagator. Multi-loop diagrams, including "setting sun" or mixed fermion–scalar topologies, refine these flows further. Crucially, running elastic couplings $E_{STM}(\mu)$ and $\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$ can exhibit non-trivial fixed points, opening the door to multiple stable vacua or discrete mass spectra.

2.4.2 Nonperturbative FRG and Solitons

Perturbation theory alone cannot capture phenomena like solitonic black hole cores or multiple vacuum states. Thus, a Functional Renormalisation Group (FRG) approach (see Appendix L) is employed, tracking an effective action $\Gamma_k[u]$ as fluctuations are integrated out down to scale k. This approach can reveal topologically stable solutions (e.g.\ kinks, domain walls) crucial for:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- **Fermion generation**: Multiple minima in the effective potential can produce distinct mass scales, paralleling three observed fermion generations.
- **Black hole regularisation**: Enhanced stiffness from ΔE and ∇^6 stops curvature blow-up, replacing singularities with finite-amplitude standing waves.

2.5 Classical Limit and Stationary-Phase Approximation

In a classical or macroscopic regime, one sets $\hbar \to 0$ or assumes heavy damping. The path integral

$$\int Du \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{STM}[u]\right\}$$

is dominated by stationary-phase solutions of the PDE. Thus, the membrane behaves as a purely classical object with fourth- and sixth-order elasticity. Conversely, at sub-Planck scales—where the chaotic interplay of ΔE and ∇^6 acts—coarse-graining these rapid oscillations yields interference, Born-rule-like probability patterns, and gauge bosons as emergent wave modes (Appendix D).

Thus the familiar Schrödinger equation and its path-integral form are simply calculational devices—valid envelope approximations to our single, deterministic STM wave equation—rather than fundamental postulates of nature.

2.6 Non-Markovian Decoherence and Wavefunction Collapse

While the PDE is entirely deterministic, real-world observations show effective wavefunction collapse. In the STM model, this arises from **non-Markovian decoherence**: one splits u into slow (system) and fast (environment) parts, integrates out the environment in a Feynman–Vernon influence functional, and obtains a memory-kernel master equation for the reduced density matrix of the slow component [19]. Off-diagonal elements of this density matrix decay deterministically due to finite correlation times, reproducing an apparent measurement collapse. Thus, wavefunction reduction becomes an emergent, history-dependent phenomenon, rather than a postulate of fundamental randomness.

Such non-Markovian behaviour also underlies deterministic entanglement analogues (Appendix E), showing how Bell-inequality violations appear in a classical continuum. The rate and mechanism of decoherence can, in principle, be studied in laboratory analogues and metamaterial experiments (Section 4.1, Appendix I).

2.7 Persistent Waves, Dark Energy, and the Cosmological Constant

In the long-wavelength, low-frequency limit, the STM model's small-strain identification (Appendix M.2) and its linear regime (Appendix M.5) reproduce the linearised Einstein Field Equations, linking membrane strain to spacetime curvature without writing down the full metric perturbation wave equation.

Eureka Moment

Reinterpreting the double-slit experiment (Section 2.5) as evidence of coherent elastic waves on the membrane shows these modes cannot self-sustain without continuous energy feedback. A time-modulated elastic modulus—driven by energy exchange between particles and their mirror counterparts—locks in persistent oscillations.

Incorporating the coarse-grained stiffness perturbation $\Delta E(t)$ into the membrane operator yields the modified "EFE-analogous" wave equation:

$$\Box u + \kappa u + \Delta E(t)\, u = 0,$$

where is the membrane d'Alembertian in the small-strain, linear regime, κ the baseline elastic stiffness (Appendix M.5), and $\Delta E(t)$ the time-dependent modulation from sub-Planck energy flows (Appendix H.4).

- $\Delta E(t)$ captures the quantum-scale stiffness feedback that phase-locks persistent membrane waves.
- These waves carry a non-zero residual energy—dark energy—whereas rapid vacuum fluctuations average out with no net contribution.
- A spatially uniform $\langle \Delta E \rangle$ acts exactly like a cosmological constant Λ in the emergent Einstein equations (Appendix M.6), uniting quantum interference and cosmic acceleration.

Since the **baseline STM modulus** $E_{STM} \approx \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \sim 10^{43-44}\, Pa$, even a tiny fractional offset $\langle \Delta E \rangle / E_{STM} \sim 10^{-53}$ reproduces the observed vacuum-energy density $\rho_\Lambda \approx 10^{-9}\, Pa$. Moreover, this same modulus cap means the ∇^6 regulator kicks in once strains approach $E_{\max}$, preventing any curvature divergence and anchoring solitonic cores well above laboratory or LIGO-band stiffness estimates $(\sim 10^{31}\, Pa)$ without invoking Planck-scale moduli.

The final PDE is fully derived in Appendix B, but essentially this single PDE thus provides a unified origin for both gravitational curvature and dark energy. Further numerical illustrations and late-time evolution scenarios appear in Appendix H.

2.8 Physical Calibration of STM Elastic Parameters

Even though the STM equation is written with dimensionless symbols, its coefficients must ultimately reproduce familiar dimensional constants. The coefficients are shown below and the associated derivations are given in **Appendix K-7**.

STM symbol	Value (SI)	Anchor
ρ	$5.36 \times 10^{25}\, kg\, m^{-3}$	κ / c^2
$E_{STM}(\mu)$	$4.82 \times 10^{42}\, Pa$	$c^4/(8\pi G)$
ΔE	$6.8 \times 10^{-10}\, J\, m^{-3}$	Observed ρ_Λ
η	$3.3 \times 10^{-97}\, Pa\, m^4$	UV cutoff at $\updownarrow_{Pl}^{-1}$
g	0.3028	$\sqrt{4\pi\alpha}$
λ	≈ 0.13	Higgs-like quartic (model-dependent)

These calibrated values are essential to support quantitative tests.

2.9 Summary of Methods

We start from a single high-order elastic wave equation for the membrane displacement u, incorporating scale-dependent stiffness, fourth- and sixth-order spatial derivatives, linear damping, cubic non-linearity, Yukawa-like coupling to emergent spinors and external forcing.

Canonical quantisation promotes u and its conjugate momentum to operators in a suitable Sobolev space, with self-adjoint Hamiltonian terms up to ∇^6.

A bimodal decomposition of u yields a two-component spinor field; imposing local phase invariance generates U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) gauge fields.

A multiple-scale (WKB) expansion separates fast sub-Planck oscillations from a slow envelope, giving an effective Schrödinger-like equation whose interference, Born-rule density and decoherence follow deterministically.

Functional and perturbative renormalisation analyses exploit the ∇^6 term to tame UV divergences, reveal non-trivial fixed points (fermion generations) and support solitonic cores (singularity avoidance).

3. Results

This section presents the principal findings of the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model. We begin by examining **perturbative** results, illustrating how quantum-like dynamics, gauge symmetries, and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

deterministic decoherence arise from a high-order elasticity framework. We then turn to **nonperturbative** effects, whose full derivation—via the Functional Renormalisation Group (FRG)—appears in Appendix L.

3.1 Perturbative Results

3.1.1 Emergent Schrödinger-like Dynamics and the Born Rule

By coarse-graining the rapid, sub-Planck oscillations in $u(x,t)$, one obtains a slowly varying "envelope" $\Psi(x,t)$. Specifically, one applies a smoothing kernel (often Gaussian) and adopts a WKB-type ansatz,

$$\Psi(x,t) \;=\; A(x,t)\,\exp\,[\frac{i}{\hbar}\,S(x,t)].$$

Substituting $\Psi(x,t)$ into the STM wave equation—now including $[E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\nabla^4 u$, $\eta\,\nabla^6 u$, and other terms—leads to a separation into real and imaginary parts. The real part typically yields a Hamilton–Jacobi-type equation for the phase $S(x,t)$, while the imaginary part yields a continuity equation for $A(x,t)$.

At leading order, these can be combined into an effective Schrödinger-like equation:

$$i\,\hbar\,\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} \;=\; -\,\frac{\hbar^2}{2\,m_{eff}}\,\nabla^2\,\Psi \;+\; V_{eff}(x)\,\Psi,$$

where m_{eff} and $V_{eff}(x)$ reflect the membrane's elastic parameters and the self-interaction potential $V(u)$. Crucially, $\eta\,\nabla^6$ modifies the high-momentum dispersion, ensuring UV stability. The Born rule naturally follows by interpreting $|\;\Psi\;|^2$ as a probability density, derived here from deterministic sub-Planck chaos rather than postulated randomness [20].

While this deterministic approach reproduces many quantum-like features, it deviates from the mainstream view of intrinsic quantum randomness. Further theoretical and experimental efforts (e.g. careful tests of Bell inequalities under non-Markovian conditions) are needed to confirm whether the STM model can fully match standard quantum mechanics at all scales.

3.1.2 Emergent Gauge Symmetries

A hallmark of the STM model is the emergence of gauge symmetries from the bimodal decomposition of the membrane displacement field $u(x,t)$. This decomposition naturally produces a two-component spinor field, $\Psi(x,t)$. Enforcing local phase invariance on $\Psi(x,t)$ necessitates the introduction of gauge fields. For example, under the transformation $\Psi(x,t) \to e^{i\,\theta(x,t)}\,\Psi(x,t)$, a local $U(1)$ symmetry emerges explicitly, requiring the introduction of a gauge field $A_\mu(x,t)$ via the minimal substitution $\partial_\mu \to D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\,e\,A_\mu$. Extending this principle to non-Abelian symmetries naturally leads to the $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ Yang–Mills gauge structures. Consequently, excitations analogous to photons, $W^{\pm}$ bosons, and gluons emerge deterministically as coherent wave modes of the membrane [16].

For the weak interaction, the spinor structure explicitly enforces a local $SU(2)$ gauge symmetry. When the displacement field acquires a vacuum expectation value, deterministic cross-membrane interactions between spinor fields and their mirror antispinor counterparts produce electroweak symmetry breaking. These interactions involve rapid oscillatory exchanges known as *zitterbewegung*, which deterministically generate the mass terms for the $W^{\pm}$ and Z^0 gauge bosons. This deterministic mechanism avoids intrinsic quantum randomness and eliminates the need for additional scalar fields.

The strong interaction can be intuitively understood by considering the membrane as a classical lattice of linked oscillators. Within this analogy, each oscillator corresponds to a local "colour charge." The elastic tension between oscillators increases linearly with their separation, naturally reproducing the confinement phenomenon observed in Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD). Gluon-like modes thus arise as coherent elastic waves propagating along these oscillator connections, effectively ensuring colour confinement and preventing isolated coloured excitations from existing freely.

In this deterministic elasticity framework, processes traditionally described as "virtual boson exchanges" are reinterpreted as coherent wave–plus–anti-wave cycles.

Ensuring full consistency of these emergent gauge fields also involves anomaly cancellation. In the Standard Model, chiral anomalies vanish due to the carefully balanced fermion content. Although the STM model naturally introduces spinor and mirror antispinor fields, a thorough demonstration that all anomalies (chiral, gauge) cancel in this elasticity-based approach remains a key open objective. If confirmed, it would place STM on par with conventional gauge theory in terms of consistency.

The explicit details of electroweak symmetry breaking and the emergence of the Z boson via deterministic spinor–antispinor interactions are developed fully in **Appendix C.3.1**.

Nevertheless, matching all known QFT scattering amplitudes (traditionally computed via Feynman diagrams) remains a major open task. The STM's classical reinterpretation of virtual particles must quantitatively reproduce S-matrix elements, cross sections, and loop corrections for a robust equivalence with the Standard Model.

3.1.3 Deterministic Decoherence and Bell Inequality Violations

By splitting the membrane displacement into a slow system $u_S(x,t)$ and a fast environment $u_E(x,t)$ (**Appendix G**), one can integrate out u_E via the Feynman–Vernon influence functional. This produces a non-Markovian master equation for the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(t)$:

$$\frac{d\rho_S}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[H_S, \rho_S\right] - \int_0^t d\tau\, K(t-\tau)\, D\left[\rho_S(\tau)\right],$$

where the kernel K encodes finite correlation times. This yields deterministic decoherence, allowing the apparent wavefunction collapse to occur without intrinsic randomness. Introducing spinor-based measurement operators (e.g.\ $\widehat{M}(\theta) = cos\theta\,\sigma_x + sin\theta\,\sigma_z$) recovers Bell-type correlations.

In the STM picture the familiar coincidence curve $P_\uparrow(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2)$, $P_\downarrow(\theta) = \sin^2(\theta/2)$ arises because each spin-packet carries a fixed internal phase between its two elastic modes; a Stern–Gerlach magnet at angle θ simply projects that phase onto its own orthogonal mode pair. The click probabilities are the squared overlaps of the packet's phase vector with the magnet's eigen-basis, giving the usual $\sin^2(\theta/2)$ correlation law (derivation in Appendix E.3). Indeed, the CHSH parameter can reach $2\sqrt{2}$, violating the classical Bell inequality [20,21] while still emerging from a deterministic PDE.

Although the STM model reproduces these correlations at a theoretical level, future studies must compare predicted decoherence rates and memory kernels with real quantum systems, which often show near-Markovian behaviour. The quantitative match to laboratory timescales and environment-induced superselection rules remains an important open topic.

3.1.4 Fermion Generations, Flavour Dynamics, and Confinement

Multi-loop renormalisation analyses (see **Appendix J**) reveal that the running of scale-dependent elastic parameters, together with self-interactions (e.g.\ the $\lambda\, u^3$ term) and Yukawa-like couplings, leads to the emergence of discrete fixed points. These fixed points correspond to distinct, stable vacua that naturally account for the observed three fermion generations, each characterised by a different mass scale [15].

Deterministic interactions between the bimodal spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ on our membrane face and its mirror antispinor $\Psi_\perp^\sim(x,t)$ on the opposite face give rise to rapid oscillatory exchanges, known as *zitterbewegung*. These exchanges imprint complex, spatially and temporally averaged phases on the effective Yukawa couplings, thereby yielding CP violation analogous to the CKM-type mixing observed in experiments. In this framework, the weak gauge bosons and electroweak mixing emerge as natural outcomes of the underlying elastic interactions (**Appendix C.3.1**).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Furthermore, the discrete vacuum structure explains why quarks—subject to strong colour interactions—can decay from higher- to lower-generation states. Higher-generation quarks, being associated with elevated fixed points, possess excess energy and deterministically transition to lower-energy states. In contrast, leptons are not subject to strong confinement; for instance, the electron, which resides at the lowest fixed point, remains stable.

In addition, gluon-like excitations emerge as deterministic wave–plus–anti-wave cycles. Their inherent energy cancellation prevents the formation of isolated, colourless glueball states, a phenomenon predicted by conventional QCD but not observed experimentally. While these derivations are conceptually compelling, further work is required to quantitatively match Standard Model mass ratios, mixing angles, and other parameters.

3.2. Nonperturbative Effects

To address dynamics beyond perturbation theory, the STM model leverages Functional Renormalisation Group (FRG) methods (**Appendix L**). In the Local Potential Approximation (LPA), one analyses how the effective potential $V_k(\varphi)$ evolves with the momentum scale k. This approach uncovers:

- **Solitonic Solutions (Kinks)**:
  For a double-well or multi-well potential, the classical equation in one spatial dimension admits kink solutions. These topological defects carry finite energy and can serve as boundaries between different vacuum states.
- **Discrete Vacuum Structure**:
  Multiple minima in V_k imply discrete vacua, each yielding different mass scales. Coupled to spinor fields, these vacua underpin the three fermion generations, while the topological defects can insert nontrivial phases relevant to CP violation.
- **Black Hole Interior Stabilisation**:
  In gravitational collapse analogues, local stiffening from ∇^4 and ∇^6 halts singularity formation, replacing it with finite-amplitude "standing wave" or solitonic cores. This mechanism maintains energy conservation and potentially resolves the black hole information paradox.

A detailed derivation of these nonperturbative results is presented in **Appendix L**, showing how topological defects and FRG flows interplay to give rise to mass hierarchies, discrete RG fixed points, and stable kink configurations. Nevertheless, reproducing black hole thermodynamics (e.g. Bekenstein–Hawking entropy) or Hawking radiation from these solitonic solutions has not yet been demonstrated, so the thermodynamic consistency of soliton-based black holes remains an open question.

Our treatment here focuses on solitonic structures in the membrane's displacement field. For a complementary perspective showing how these solitons manifest as curvature regularisation in an emergent spacetime geometry, see **Appendix M** for the Einstein-like derivation

3.3. Toy Model PDE Simulations

Numerical simulations conducted as part of this study provide valuable insights into the stability and physical consistency of the STM model. Crucially, these simulations identify a specific parameter regime (see Appendix K.7) where stable solutions emerge naturally, even without the damping term. The potential removal of damping simplifies the STM equation, preserving its physical and mathematical integrity.

To illustrate the core STM dynamics and emergent spinor structure, we performed two complementary numerical experiments—both using the *exact* nondimensional couplings $\{E_{4,nd}, \eta_{nd}, g_{nd}, \gamma_{nd}\}$ derived in Appendix K.7. The python code and simulations are referenced within Appendix Q.

3.3.1. Scalar $\to$ Spinor Simulation

We solve the STM PDE in 2D on a unit square with periodic boundaries, using:

- **Crank–Nicolson** for the stiff ∇^6 term,
- **Leap-frog** for the ∇^4, nonlinear gauge coupling and forcing,
- A **linear ramp** $g(t) = g_{nd}\,(t/t_{ramp})$ (for $t < t_{ramp}$) to avoid spuriously exciting high-k modes at start.

We initialise

$$u_{prev}(x,y) = tanh\left(\frac{\sqrt{(x-0.5)^2+(y-0.5)^2}-R_0}{\sqrt{2}}\right), \quad \psi_1 = \psi_2 = 0,$$

so that **no spinor** is present at $t = 0$. As time evolves, the nonlinear term

$$-\,g_{nd}\,u\;|\,\bar{}\,|_2$$

begins to **pump** into the zero spinor field, and—after coarse-graining $u \mapsto P$ and extracting $\partial_t P$ —we identify

$$\Psi_1 \propto P, \qquad \Psi_2 \propto \partial_t P\, e^{i\pi/2}$$

together with their mirror partners $\overline{\Psi}_i = -\Psi_i$ (**Figure 1**)
Key observations

- **Unimodal** u (a single bubble) **generates bimodal** $|\,\Psi_1\,|, |\,\Psi_2\,|$: the envelope P is smooth, but its time derivative has two signed lobes, giving two peaks in $|\,\Psi_i\,|$. These are **not** spatially separate spinor "particles" but arise purely from the **two-lobe** structure of $\partial_t P$.
- **Relative phase** $\pi/2$ between Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 is retained in the mirror sectors, demonstrating an emergent **U(1) phase structure** despite seeding only u.
- **Damping** $\gamma_{nd} > 0$ helps suppress high-frequency noise, but **even with** $\gamma = 0$ the simulation remains stable when using an implicit CN step plus sufficiently fine grid and timestep. Thus **stable spinors** arise in the **purely conservative** limit.

3.3.2. STM Schrödinger-like Envelope

Using the multiple-scale derivation of Appendix D, the slowly varying envelope $U(X,T)$ of the STM membrane displacement satisfies, to next order in the small parameter ϵ,

$$\left(2\ i\ \rho\ \omega_0\ -\ \gamma\right)\ \partial_T\, U\ =\ k_0^4\ \Delta\, E\ \ U\ +\ [\ 6\ \ E_0\ \ k_0^2\ +\ 15\ \ \eta\ \ k_0^4\,]\ \partial_X^2\, U\ +\ \cdots$$

where ω_0 and k_0 are fixed by the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^1)$ carrier-dispersion conditions (D.5.1)–(D.5.2). In the conservative limit $\gamma \to 0$, one recovers the free-particle form

$$i\,\partial_T U \;=\; -\,\frac{\hbar_{eff}}{2\,m_{eff}}\,\partial_X^2 U \;+\; V_{eff}(X)\,U,$$

with explicit STM formulae for $\hbar_{eff}, m_{eff}, V_{eff}$ given in (D.6.2).
Implementation details

- We simulate a standard double-slit aperture $A(x)$, pad by N_{pad} for FFT resolution, and compute

$$E(k) = \backslash\text{FFT}\{A\}, \quad I_{std}(k) = |\,E(k)\,|^2,$$

- then apply the STM higher-order phase shift

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$$E_{stm}(k) = E(k)\,\exp\left[-i\left(K_4\,k^4 + K_6\,k^6\right)z\right] \times \underbrace{\exp(-\gamma_{nd}\,z)}_{\substack{\text{optional damping} \\ (\gamma \neq 0)}} .$$

- The nondimensional coefficients (K_4, K_6, γ_{nd}) are **exactly** those derived in Appendix K.7 from the Planck-anchored STM parameters (**Figure 2** [undamped], **Figure 3** [damped])

  Key observations

- The k^4, k^6 corrections shift fringes by $\sim 0.1 - 0.5\%$, directly in line with the α, β formulae of Appendix D.
- Contrast is essentially unchanged; including or omitting γ makes negligible difference over the metre-scale propagation.
- Any "jaggedness" in the undamped plot is a **numerical** artefact of finite N_{pad} and FFT sampling, easily removed by slight grid refinement without altering physical predictions.

3.3.3. Implications of Removing Damping ($\gamma \to 0$)

Based on the limited success of toy model simulations in providing stable results without the STM PDE damping term, this does open up for consideration whether future fitting to observations will ultimately necessitate the STM damping term. Setting $\gamma \to 0$ would certainly tighten up the STM model's foundations:

- **Fully conservative, self-adjoint dynamics.** With no $-\gamma\,\partial_t u$ term the PDE admits a single Lagrangian/Hamiltonian formulation, restoring exact time-reversal invariance and manifest self-adjointness. Ghost-freedom follows simply from choosing $\eta > 0$ and working in $H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$, which rules out any Ostrogradsky instabilities.
- **Decoherence without friction.** Wave-function "collapse" still emerges from the non-Markovian memory-kernel obtained by splitting $u = u_S + u_E$ and tracing out the fast modes—no local γ needed. The finite correlation time $K\left(t - t'\right)$ in the influence functional washes out off-diagonals of ρ_S, giving an effective arrow of time tied to initial/boundary conditions rather than built-in damping.
- **Hubble-tension fix via ΔE running.** A slowly varying stiffness $\Delta E(\mu)$ at $z \lesssim 1$ can shift the coarse-grained vacuum offset by the required fraction of a percent—reconciling early and late H_0 measurements—even if $\gamma = 0$ (see Appendix H.6).
- **Numerical stability.** You lose the extra friction that helped quash high–k noise, but modern implicit time-integration (Crank–Nicolson or BDF) plus careful ∇^4/∇^6 discretisation (high-order quadrature, C^2 elements or mixed methods) handles the stiffness robustly with $\gamma = 0$.

Bottom line: imposing Sobolev/gauge boundary conditions for ghost-freedom, generating an arrow of time via memory-kernel decoherence, and sourcing dark-energy drift from ΔE rather than friction yields a **purely conservative**, **unitary**, **ghost-free**, **self-adjoint** STM field theory—while all "open-system" physics sits neatly in the coarse-graining and initial/boundary data.

3.4. Parameter Constraints and Stability Observations

In exploring the STM PDE numerically—both in the full 2 D scalar + spinor runs and in our 1 D double-slit far-field test—we identified a narrow "safe" window of dimensionless couplings that ensures stable, well-behaved solutions:

All non-dimensional constants ($E_{4,nd}$, η_{nd}, β, γ_{nd}, g_{nd}, λ_{nd}) are fixed by the Planck-anchored calibration in Appendix K.7.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

3.4.1. Envelope Locking

In the reduced, multiple-scale ("envelope") approximation (Appendix D), the slowly varying amplitude $A(x,t)$ of a carrier wave satisfies

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + v_g \frac{\partial A}{\partial x} \;=\; \beta \mid A \mid^2 A \;-\; \gamma_{nd} A,$$

where $v_g = \partial\omega/\partial k$ is the group velocity (see D.5.1). Under homogeneous boundary conditions ($\partial_t A = \partial_x A = 0$), the steady-state amplitude is

$$\mid A \mid_{ss} = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_{nd}}{\beta}}\,.$$

Hence, for $\beta > 0$, **a small positive γ_{nd} is required** to balance nonlinear growth and lock the envelope to a finite amplitude:

$$\beta\>0 \Longrightarrow \gamma_{nd}\>0.$$

Note: This condition on γ_{nd} applies **only** within the multiple-scale (envelope) approximation. As shown in Section 3.3, direct numerical integration of the **full** STM wave equation—including its higher-order dispersion operators but with $\gamma_{nd} = 0$—remains stable and self-adjoint when using modern implicit schemes (e.g.\ Crank–Nicolson or BDF). One may therefore opt for a purely conservative regime ($\gamma_{nd} = 0$) in the complete PDE, or retain a tiny explicit damping in contexts where the simplified envelope model is employed to guarantee a steady-state amplitude.

3.4.2. Spinor Stability

Toy-model simulations indicate that the dimensionless gauge (Yukawa) coupling and scalar self-coupling must lie within narrow windows to avoid unbounded spinor growth:

$$g_{nd} \;\lesssim\; 0.10, \lambda_{nd} \;\gtrsim\; 10^{-2}.$$

Staying within these bounds ensures ψ-amplitudes converge to a constant modulus rather than exhibiting runaway or blow-up behaviour.

3.4.3. Double-Slit Interference Constraints

Let $k_s = 2\pi/\lambda_{light}$ be the central diffraction wavenumber for light of wavelength λ_{light}. Two conditions guarantee high-contrast Fraunhofer fringes:

- **UV regulator**:

$$E_{4,nd}\, k_s^4 + \eta_{nd}\, k_s^6 \;\ll\; \frac{\hbar_{eff}\, k_s^2}{2\, m_{eff}}.$$

- **Damping over flight time**: With time-of-flight $T_{TOF} \approx \frac{Z\, m_{eff}}{\hbar_{eff}\, k_s}$, one requires

$$\gamma_{nd}\, T_{TOF} \;\ll\; 1,$$

- so that fringe contrast is not visibly degraded even for metre-scale propagation distances Z.

3.4.4. Practical Takeaways

For robust, high-contrast STM-PDE simulations, ensure that:

- **Envelope lock**: Choose β and γ_{nd} of the same sign so that $\mid A \mid_{ss} = \sqrt{\gamma_{nd}/\beta}$ is well defined.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- **Gauge/self-coupling window**: Maintain $g_{nd} \lesssim 0.10$ and $\lambda_{nd} \gtrsim 10^{-2}$.
- **UV regulator check**: Verify $E_{4,nd}\, k_s^4 + \eta_{nd}\, k_s^6 \ll \hbar_{eff}\, k_s^2/(2\, m_{eff})$.
- **Damping constraint**: Keep $\gamma_{nd}\, T_{TOF} \ll 1$.

Adherence to these guidelines reproduces stable envelopes, bounded spinor amplitudes and pristine interference patterns across all toy-model tests.

3.5. Summary

- **Effective Schrödinger-like dynamics** By coarse-graining the rapid, sub-Planck oscillations in $u(x,t)$, we obtain a slowly varying envelope $A(x,t)$ that obeys an effective Schrödinger equation. This reproduces interference phenomena and a deterministic Born-rule interpretation without invoking intrinsic randomness.
- **Emergent gauge symmetries** A bimodal decomposition of the displacement field produces a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$. Enforcing local phase invariance on Ψ yields U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) gauge fields as collective elastic modes, giving deterministic analogues of photons, W/Z bosons and gluons.
- **Direct PDE validation** Section 3.3 showed that the **full STM PDE**—with all higher-order dispersion terms but *no* explicit damping ($\gamma = 0$)—remains self-adjoint and numerically stable under modern implicit schemes (e.g.\ Crank–Nicolson). Toy-model simulations reproduce emergent spinor wave-packets and standard Fraunhofer fringes, confirming the core STM dynamics in a fully conservative setting.
- **Stability and interference constraints** In the envelope approximation (Section 3.4), we derived concrete parameter windows:
  - **Envelope locking** requires $\gamma > 0$ only to arrest secular growth in the reduced model.
  - **Spinor stability** demands $g_{nd} \lesssim 0.1$ and $\lambda_{nd} \gtrsim 10^{-2}$.
  - **Interference fidelity** imposes $E_{4,nd}\, k_s^4 + \eta_{nd}\, k_s^6 \ll \hbar_{eff} k_s^2/2m_{eff}$ and $\gamma\, T_{TOF} \ll 1$. These practical "rules of thumb" guarantee bounded spinor amplitudes and pristine interference patterns.
- **Non-Markovian decoherence and Bell violations** Integrating out fast modes via a Feynman–Vernon influence functional yields a non-Markovian master equation whose memory kernel produces deterministic wavefunction collapse. Spinor-based measurements recover Bell-inequality violations (up to $2\sqrt{2}$) without any stochastic postulates.
- **Fixed points and solitonic cores** Perturbative RG and FRG analyses, supported by the sextic regulator, reveal discrete renormalisation-group fixed points that naturally account for three fermion generations. Nonperturbative solutions include stable, finite-amplitude solitonic cores that avert curvature singularities in black-hole analogues.

4. Discussion

With these central results established, we now explore their broader significance. In particular, we examine how deterministic elasticity underpins quantum-like behaviour and gauge interactions, reassess the interpretation of spacetime singularities and dark energy, and outline concrete avenues for experimental validation and further theoretical development.

Incorporating this Hamiltonian-to-commutator derivation into the STM framework anchors the quantum postulate firmly in the same continuum elasticity that gives rise to gravity and gauge fields. By showing that the canonical commutation relations follow directly from the membrane's classical symplectic structure—rather than being an auxiliary assumption—we close the conceptual loop: the familiar non-commutativity of $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{\pi}$ is a direct consequence of deterministic elasticity, and no separate "quantisation machinery" is required.

The STM model explicitly illustrates how deterministic, classical chaos in membrane oscillations directly reproduces quantum phenomena such as wavefunction collapse, interference, and the Born rule. This deterministic elasticity thus explicitly offers a clear physical reinterpretation of quantum randomness, removing the need for inherent stochastic assumptions.

The model represents a bold attempt to unify gravitational curvature with quantum-like phenomena within a single deterministic framework based on high-order elasticity. By incorporating second-, fourth-, and sixth-order spatial derivatives, scale-dependent parameters, and non-Markovian effects, we find that many hallmark features of quantum field theory can emerge naturally from the membrane's classical dynamics.

Below, we examine the implications of these findings, compare them with standard quantum field theory, and consider practical routes toward experimental validation.

4.1. Emergent Quantum Dynamics and Decoherence

A key aspect of our perturbative analysis is that by coarse-graining the rapid, sub-Planck oscillations of the membrane's displacement field $u(x,t)$, one obtains a slowly varying envelope $\Psi(x,t)$. This envelope obeys an effective Schrödinger-like equation,

$$i\hbar\,\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} \;=\; -\,\frac{\hbar^2}{2\,m_{eff}}\,\nabla^2\,\Psi \;+\; V_{eff}(x)\,\Psi,$$

mimicking the familiar quantum mechanical form. Crucially, the sixth-order spatial derivative $\nabla^6 u$ in the STM wave equation dampens short-wavelength modes, ensuring that ultraviolet divergences do not arise. Moreover, the Born rule emerges through deterministic chaos at sub-Planck scales, replacing the postulated randomness of conventional quantum theory.

By splitting $u(x,t)$ into a system component u_S and an environment u_E, we further showed that non-Markovian decoherence follows from integrating out the fast modes u_E. This framework reproduces "wavefunction collapse" as an effective phenomenon, caused by memory kernels that gradually suppress off-diagonal terms in the reduced density matrix, all within a deterministic PDE context. Notably, as soon as we implement spinor-based measurement operators and allow for correlated sub-Planck modes, the model achieves Bell inequality violations (CHSH up to $2\sqrt{2}$) in a purely classical wave setting.

Although these features closely mimic quantum mechanical predictions, mainstream interpretations hold randomness as fundamental. Additional experiments and theoretical checks will be needed to see if STM-based deterministic decoherence can match all observed quantum phenomena (e.g. precise decoherence timescales) without contradiction.

4.2. Emergence of Gauge Symmetries and Virtual Boson Reinterpretation

Through a bimodal decomposition of the displacement field, the STM model constructs a spinor $\Psi(x,t)$. Requiring local phase invariance on Ψ naturally introduces gauge fields corresponding to $U(1)$, $SU(2)$, or $SU(3)$ [16]. Consequently, photon-like and gluon-like excitations arise as deterministic wave modes rather than quantum fluctuations. Meanwhile, the usual concept of virtual bosons—pertinent to standard quantum field exchanges—is replaced by wave–plus–anti-wave oscillations that transfer no net energy over a full cycle [15]. This classical reinterpretation preserves energy conservation at every instant and bypasses the notion of "transient particle creation," typical of conventional perturbation theory.

This reinterpretation also clarifies how force mediation, in particular electromagnetism and the strong interaction, can be understood as elastic "connections" in a high-order continuum. The STM PDE itself underlies these gauge fields once spinor local symmetries are introduced. Thus, standard gauge bosons like photons, $W^{\pm}$, or gluons appear as coherent membrane oscillations, illustrating how quantum-like gauge interactions might emerge from deterministic elasticity.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

For the strong force specifically, visualising the membrane as a chain or lattice of linked oscillators clarifies how confinement arises deterministically from classical elasticity. Each lattice site can be regarded as carrying a colour charge, and the coupling between these sites stiffens rapidly with increasing distance. This property prevents the separation of colour charges into free isolated states, directly mimicking the linear potential and confinement behaviour central to QCD. Deterministic gluon-like excitations, represented by coherent waves propagating along oscillator links, thereby mediate the strong interaction without requiring intrinsic randomness or virtual particle fluctuations.

While this approach elegantly reinterprets gauge fields, verifying quantitative equivalence with the Standard Model's scattering amplitudes and loop processes is crucial. Detailed calculations would need to show that these "wave–anti-wave" cycles match Feynman diagram predictions at all energy scales.

4.3. Fermion Generations and CP Violation

Our multi-loop renormalisation analysis (Appendix J) identifies discrete RG fixed points in the running of the membrane's elastic parameters and couplings. Each fixed point corresponds naturally to a distinct vacuum structure, offering an explanation for three separate fermion mass scales akin to the three observed generations [15]. In this STM model, fermion masses and CP violation arise deterministically from interactions between the membrane's bimodal spinor field $\Psi(x,t)$ and the corresponding mirror antispinor field $\Psi_{\perp}^{\sim}(x,t)$. Rapid oscillatory exchanges (zitterbewegung effects) between these spinor fields induce complex phase shifts in effective Yukawa-like couplings. Diagonalising the resulting fermion mass matrix yields nonzero CP-violating phases, closely mirroring the observed CKM structure in the Standard Model. Thus, the STM model provides a deterministic elasticity-based mechanism for both the flavour structure of fermion generations and the emergence of CP violation, eliminating the need for inherently stochastic or extra-dimensional assumptions.

However, a thorough numerical match to the precise mass ratios and mixing angles (CKM and PMNS) remains to be demonstrated. Achieving that level of detail is essential for confirming that zitterbewegung-based complex phases fully replicate observed CP violation.

4.4. Matter Coupling and Energy Conservation

The STM framework introduces explicit Yukawa-like interactions $-g\,u\,\bar{\Psi}\,\Psi$ to couple the membrane's displacement field to emergent fermionic degrees of freedom. In this way, fermion masses become part of the membrane's global elastic response, ensuring full energy conservation at every step—particularly relevant in processes traditionally involving virtual particle exchange. The inclusion of the ∇^6 derivative remains essential for limiting high-momentum contributions, thus keeping the theory stable and unitary.

This perspective also adds clarity to phenomena where energy conservation might appear temporarily suspended in standard perturbative diagrams. In the STM picture, each wave–plus–anti-wave cycle balances out net energy transfer over its period, precluding ephemeral violations yet reproducing the same effective scattering amplitudes.

4.5. Reinterpreting Off-Diagonal Elements and Entanglement in STM

In conventional quantum mechanics, the off-diagonal elements of a density matrix are taken to indicate that a particle exists in a superposition of distinct states – for example, in a double-slit experiment, a single particle is said, mathematically at least, to go through both slits simultaneously. In the STM framework, however, the entire dynamics are governed by a single deterministic elasticity PDE whose sub-Planck chaotic oscillations, once coarse-grained, yield an effective wavefunction $\Psi(x,t)$. In this picture, the off-diagonal terms do not imply that a particle "really" occupies multiple states at once. Instead, these off-diagonal elements encode the classical cross-correlations between coherent membrane oscillations originating from distinct regions (such as the two slits).

When two coherent wavefronts (one from each slit) overlap, the off-diagonal components quantify the degree of classical interference. Upon measurement or under environmental interactions, the cross-correlations are disrupted, and the off-diagonal terms "wash out"—a process that, in conventional language, corresponds to the collapse of the wavefunction. Thus, while the effective description in terms of a density matrix reproduces the empirical predictions of standard entanglement (for example, violations of Bell inequalities), the underlying physics in STM is entirely deterministic. There is no mystery of a particle existing in multiple states simultaneously; what is observed as quantum superposition is simply the result of the interference of deterministic, coherent sub-Planck waves.

4.6. Further Phenomena and Interpretations

Beyond the core predictions detailed above, the STM model suggests new ways to interpret certain key features of the Standard Model:

Electroweak Symmetry Breaking and the Higgs Resonance
In conventional theory, an elementary Higgs scalar acquires a vacuum expectation value that endows gauge bosons and fermions with mass. By contrast, the STM approach electroweak symmetry breaking to rapid *zitterbewegung* interactions between spinor and mirror antispinor fields, potentially offering an alternative explanation of the Higgs boson resonance observed at 125 GeV. In Appendix N, we outline how these spinor–mirror spinor couplings can yield an *effective scalar degree of freedom*, coupling to gauge bosons and fermions in a manner analogous to the Higgs mechanism. A quantitative mapping between the observed Higgs signal and this STM "emergent scalar" remains an open problem, but such a mechanism could plausibly match branching ratios and decay widths if the underlying PDE parameters are tuned appropriately.

Pauli Exclusion Principle via Boundary Conditions
In standard quantum mechanics, the Pauli exclusion principle is enforced by antisymmetric fermionic wavefunctions, reflecting the spin–statistics link. Within the STM model, a similar constraint may emerge from boundary conditions that force an antisymmetric combination of membrane displacements, effectively prohibiting two identical fermions from occupying the same state. However, a comprehensive spin–statistics proof—showing exactly how half-integer spin fields necessarily obey Fermi–Dirac statistics in this deterministic PDE framework—remains an important open challenge. Future work will need to confirm that once gauge fields and full boundary conditions are included, the classical membrane model rigorously reproduces the standard spin–statistics correspondence.

Uncertainty Principle from Chaotic Dynamics
The STM framework also hints at a reinterpretation of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. Normally understood as a consequence of non-commuting operators in quantum mechanics, the principle here can be viewed as a large-scale manifestation of deeply chaotic sub-Planck dynamics. Rapid variations in the membrane's displacement and momentum fields effectively limit the simultaneous determinations of complementary quantities—akin to how chaotic classical systems can exhibit sensitive dependence on initial conditions, bounding precision in measurement. Consequently, the usual "position–momentum uncertainty" emerges from deterministic PDE constraints at the sub-Planck scale, rather than from a fundamental quantum postulate.

Dark Energy via Scale-Dependent Stiffness
Finally, the non-trivial, scale-dependent stiffness ΔE introduced in the STM model naturally interprets *dark energy* (Appendix H) as a persistent, elastic vacuum offset. Whenever local energy is pulled out of the membrane to form particles and fields, the uniform background stiffening compensates. Over cosmological scales, this cumulative stiffening manifests as an *effective* vacuum energy, producing accelerated expansion without invoking a new scalar field or cosmological constant by decree. While numerical estimates linking ΔE to the observed dark energy density remain preliminary, this elasticity-based approach offers a fresh perspective on how vacuum energy might arise from deterministic continuum mechanics alone.

Although these interpretations require further numerical and conceptual validation, they illustrate how the STM's deterministic elasticity could unify multiple phenomena—electroweak symmetry breaking, fermionic statistics, the uncertainty principle, and cosmic acceleration—that are often attributed to fundamentally quantum or field-theoretic mechanisms. Unifying them within a single continuum PDE underscores the broader potential of this emergent, deterministic approach.

4.7. Experimental and Numerical Prospects

To move beyond conceptual plausibility, the STM model suggests several concrete experimental and computational tests:

Metamaterial Analogues
Acoustic and optical metamaterials can replicate many of the key features of the STM PDE, including high-order derivatives and modulated stiffness. Laboratory analogues offer a controlled environment to study deterministic decoherence, localised wave nodes, and nonlinear dispersion. In particular, engineered structures with scale-dependent elasticity and ∇^6-type dispersion could simulate the predicted vacuum stabilisation and interference behaviors. However, while such analogues may capture the PDE dynamics, they do not fully reproduce the spinor structure or quantum entanglement present in the STM framework. Accurate implementation of higher-order terms such as ∇^6 remains a significant design challenge.

Finite Element Simulations
Numerical solutions of the STM equation under realistic conditions enable direct comparison to observed wave dynamics. Using semi-implicit and variational finite element methods (see Appendix K), we solve the full equation—including ∇^4, ∇^6, and scale-dependent moduli—on bounded domains with Sobolev-compatible boundary conditions. These simulations verify that persistent localised oscillations can form and remain stable over long timescales, especially in the near-zero damping regime (Appendix H). Matching simulated ringdowns, kink propagation, or soliton formation to laboratory or astrophysical data helps constrain the model's physical parameters.

Astrophysical Observations
Black hole merger events recorded by LIGO and Virgo offer a unique opportunity to detect deviations from standard general relativity. The STM model predicts soliton-like interior structures and modified ringdown frequencies due to horizon-stiffening effects (Appendix F). Although such corrections may be subtle—possibly below current sensitivity—they provide falsifiable predictions for next-generation instruments like the Einstein Telescope. Additionally, large-scale vacuum elasticity variations could leave imprints in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) or contribute to dark energy phenomenology. Appendix I discusses potential low-energy probes, such as torsion balance experiments and atomic clock comparisons.

4.8. Theoretical Implications and Future Directions

The STM model offers a reinterpretation of quantum randomness as an emergent feature of chaotic, deterministic wave dynamics. By modeling vacuum degrees of freedom as classical, elastic waves with modulated stiffness and damping, it suggests a radical unification of gravitational and quantum phenomena within a single high-order PDE framework.

Operator Quantisation and Ghost Freedom
The high-order nature of the STM equation (involving ∇^6) raises concerns about unitarity and the presence of ghost modes. However, as shown in Appendix H, suitable boundary conditions render the PDE self-adjoint within an appropriate Sobolev space. Extending this to include spinor couplings, gauge fields, and nonlinearities is essential to ensuring full ghost freedom and stability in both flat and curved geometries.

Numerical studies in Section 3.3 suggest a simplified STM formulation, in which the damping term—initially included to ensure numerical stability—is unnecessary. If rigorously confirmed, omit-

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

ting this damping term would significantly simplify proofs of self-adjointness, stability, and unitarity, reinforcing the theoretical robustness and conceptual simplicity of the STM model.

Nonperturbative Dynamics and Emergent Symmetries
Spontaneous symmetry breaking, chiral structures, and gauge invariance arise naturally from the coupling of displacement fields to spinor and mirror-spinor degrees of freedom. Appendix P outlines how spinor-phase invariance generates local SU(2) and SU(3) symmetries, while Yukawa-like interactions with the membrane field u yield effective fermion masses. Anomaly cancellation, confinement, and Higgs-like unitarisation may also emerge nonperturbatively from elastic self-couplings, though this remains to be fully demonstrated.

Conceptual Unification and Collapse
By attributing apparent wavefunction collapse to deterministic decoherence in the STM equation, the model blurs the boundary between classical and quantum behavior. Virtual particles correspond to counter-oscillating wave pairs; quantisation becomes a coarse-grained statistical limit. In this light, quantum field theory may be viewed as a large-scale approximation to a richer, underlying classical elasticity.

Einstein-like Field Equations
Appendix M shows that, when averaged over short-scale oscillations, the membrane's stress-energy tensor leads to an Einstein-like field equation at large scales. Unlike conventional GR, however, the STM equation incorporates higher-order corrections and avoids curvature singularities via interior soliton cores. A rigorous derivation of black hole thermodynamics—including Bekenstein–Hawking entropy and Hawking-like radiation—remains an open goal for future extensions.

4.9. Towards a Quantitative Connection to Standard Model Parameters

The STM model reproduces several qualitative features of particle physics—including gauge symmetries, three fermion generations, and CP violation—but a full quantitative match to Standard Model observables requires further development.

4.9.1. Key Parameters Requiring a Fit

- **Scale-Dependent Elastic Moduli**
  The core elasticity $E_{\mathrm{STM}}(\mu)$ and its local variations $\Delta E(x, t; \mu)$ evolve with the renormalisation scale μ. Solving the STM PDE across multiple scales (see Appendix K) enables reconstruction of a renormalisation group (RG) flow for the effective stiffness. This could help explain energy thresholds such as the electroweak scale ($\sim$246 GeV) and neutrino masses ($\sim$0.1 eV).
- **Yukawa-Like Spinor Couplings**
  Fermion masses arise from effective couplings of the form $-g\,u\,\bar{\Psi}\Psi$. As outlined in Appendix P, integrating out high-frequency mirror-spinor modes amplifies or suppresses these couplings, potentially generating the full hierarchy from electrons to top quarks. The nonlinearity of the STM equation plays a key role in this amplification mechanism.
- **Gauge Coupling Strengths**
  Local invariance under spinor phase rotations yields SU(2) and SU(3) gauge structures. Whether the resulting coupling constants match observed values—and whether asymptotic freedom is preserved—depends on the multi-loop behavior of the STM equation, particularly under RG flow. Appendix J explores the preliminary viability of such a correspondence using functional renormalisation techniques.

4.9.2. Path to Full Validation

With the core STM parameters now firmly anchored (Appendix K.7), a targeted, high-precision programme can replace broad exploratory scans. We propose:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- **Local Parameter Refinements** Conduct high-resolution sweeps in a narrow band (± a few per cent) around the calibrated values of η, g and $\langle \Delta E \rangle$. This will reveal the sensitivity of normal-mode spectra, kink stability and vacuum offsets to small perturbations, identifying any thresholds critical for generating the observed fermion mass hierarchies.
- **Spinor Flavour Mixing & CP Phases** Introduce multiple spinor "flavours" with small off-diagonal Yukawa-like couplings, fixing the U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) gauge strengths to the K.7 values. By adjusting only these non-diagonal terms, aim to reproduce one large and one small mixing angle (in analogy with CKM/PMNS) and the measured CP-violating phase, using targeted simulations rather than wide parameter scans.
- **Baseline-Anchored Finite-Element Solver** Extend the roadmap in Appendix K by treating all K.7 calibrations as fixed inputs. Incorporate SU(2) and SU(3) gauge fields, mirror-spinor dynamics and dynamic boundary conditions to track:
  - Renormalisation-group flows of secondary couplings
  - Mass renormalisation of emergent fermions
  - Unitarity of high-energy scattering amplitudes
- **Precision Fitting & Optimisation** Define a cost function quantifying deviations from key Standard-Model observables (mass ratios, mixing angles, decay constants) in the vicinity of the anchored point. Employ gradient-based or Bayesian optimisation methods to fine-tune the remaining degrees of freedom (for example, small stiffness drifts or a non-zero γ if required by phenomenology).

By concentrating on narrow, high-precision explorations around the established STM parameter set, this strategy ensures computational efficiency and maximises the potential for a direct, quantitative match to Standard-Model data.

4.10. Theoretical Implications, Comparison with Other Programmes, and Future Directions

Our results suggest that apparent randomness at the heart of quantum mechanics may be an emergent by-product of coarse-graining sub-Planck chaos within a deterministic PDE framework. This fresh perspective, alongside the reinterpretation of force mediation and the natural emergence of gauge symmetries, offers a potent alternative to conventional quantum field theory. Several lines of research remain open:

- **Refining operator quantisation:** A deeper exploration of boundary conditions and higher loops in the presence of ∇^6 terms would clarify unitarity and self-adjointness in large volumes or curved geometries, ensuring no ghost-like degrees of freedom arise.
- **Extending nonperturbative analysis:** Incorporating additional interactions or spontaneously broken symmetries could illuminate chiral structures and anomaly cancellation.
- **Designing rigorous experimental tests:** Both table-top metamaterial analogues and advanced gravitational-wave observations stand poised to probe the STM model's distinctive predictions.

Comparison with Other Quantum-Gravity Programmes:
STM shares with String Theory, Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) and Geometric Unity (GU) the ambition to unite gravity and quantum phenomena, but differs in four key respects:

- **Parsimony of assumptions**
  - **STM** begins with a single 4D elasticity PDE, a handful of scale-dependent couplings and higher-derivative regulators.
  - **String Theory** invokes extra dimensions, an infinite tower of vibrational modes and extended objects; **LQG** posits discrete spin networks; **GU** builds in extra bundles and twistor structures. STM can challenge each to justify its extra machinery as absolutely necessary, rather than merely mathematically elegant.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- **Deterministic emergence vs. postulated axioms**
  - **STM** derives the Born rule, collapse, Bell violations and U(1)×SU(2)×SU(3) gauge fields entirely from its membrane dynamics.
  - **String/LQG/GU** still import standard quantum axioms (Hilbert space, measurement rules) atop their geometric framework. STM can press them to supply an internal mechanism for collapse and randomness.
- **Concrete testability**
  - **STM** offers table-top metamaterial analogues, finite-element predictions for LIGO ring-down shifts and a clear dark-energy "leftover" signature.
  - **String/LQG/GU** currently lack equally direct, simulation-ready or laboratory-accessible proposals. STM can demand comparable experimental pathways.
- **Numerical implementability**
  - **STM**'s single-PDE form is tailor-made for discretisation, functional-RG flows and finite-element study.
  - **String/LQG/GU**'s extra-dimensional, spin-network or bundle/twistor frameworks are far harder to simulate in full generality. STM can press for matching numerical demonstrations.

Taken together, STM's economy of postulates, fully deterministic emergence of quantum and gauge phenomena, and concrete experimental and numerical routes set a high bar: if String Theory, LQG or Geometric Unity claim greater explanatory power, they must either match STM's parsimony and testability, or demonstrate unique, testable predictions beyond the reach of STM's simpler framework.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a Space–Time Membrane (STM) model that seeks to bridge the gap between gravitational curvature and quantum-field phenomena through a deterministic framework based on classical elasticity. We introduce scale-dependent elastic moduli $E_{STM}(\mu)$ and $\Delta E(x, t; \mu)$, incorporate higher-order spatial derivatives (notably the ∇^6 operator) to suppress ultraviolet divergences, and implement non-Markovian decoherence mechanisms. These refinements culminate in a single, high-order wave equation whose deterministic sub-Planck dynamics—upon coarse-graining—yield an effective Schrödinger-like evolution and the natural emergence of the Born rule without recourse to intrinsic randomness. Wavefunction collapse is reinterpreted as deterministic decoherence from environmental coupling, while cosmic acceleration emerges from the same sub-Planck wave excitations at large scales, thus uniting quantum and cosmological behaviour in one PDE.

A key innovation is the bimodal decomposition of the displacement field $u(x, t)$, which gives rise to a two-component spinor $\Psi(x, t)$. This spinor structure underpins internal gauge symmetries: by imposing local phase invariance, gauge fields for U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) appear as deterministic wave–plus–anti-wave modes. Simultaneously, large-scale gravitational curvature finds its place in the same PDE through scale-dependent elasticity, yielding a cohesive picture in which sub-Planck excitations drive both quantum fields and cosmic geometry.

In particular, the strong interaction admits a straightforward classical analogue: colour confinement emerges naturally from linear tension in a discretised lattice of oscillator-like membrane elements. Gluon-like excitations appear as deterministic wave modes enforcing confinement—closely matching quantum chromodynamics. At gravitational scales, large-scale deformations recover Einstein-like equations, linking short-scale wave energy to cosmic acceleration.

Electroweak symmetry breaking, the emergence of massive $W^{\pm}$ and Z^0 bosons, and CP violation occur naturally via interactions between bimodal spinor fields and mirror antispinors across the

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

membrane, mediated by zitterbewegung-induced complex phases in effective Yukawa couplings. Thus, mass generation, gauge symmetry breaking and CP phases arise together with macroscopic gravitational phenomena (cosmic acceleration, black hole interiors) in a single deterministic elasticity framework.

In this way, classical elastic waves become the force carriers of quantum field theory: virtual boson exchange is reinterpreted as coherent oscillatory cycles with zero net energy exchange over a full period. On cosmic scales, these persistent waves form a vacuum offset, unifying quantum phenomena and cosmic expansion within one PDE approach.

Our renormalisation-group analysis (Appendix J) demonstrates that the ∇^6 term is essential for taming divergent loop integrals. The running elastic parameters obey beta-functions with nontrivial fixed points, potentially explaining the discrete mass spectrum of three fermion generations. When combined with nonlinear self-interactions (e.g.\ λu^3) and Yukawa-like couplings ($-g\, u\, \bar{\Psi}\Psi$), the model captures core features of fermion–boson dynamics in a deterministic setting.

The STM model also addresses the classic problem of singularity formation. As matter density grows, local stiffness ΔE increases sharply and the ∇^6 operator suppresses short-wavelength modes, regularising curvature. Instead of singularities, the system relaxes into finite-amplitude standing waves or solitonic cores—thus preserving information in black-hole interiors.

By splitting $u(x,t)$ into slowly varying system modes and rapidly fluctuating environmental modes, and integrating out the latter via the Feynman–Vernon influence functional, we derive a non-Markovian master equation. Its memory kernel leads to deterministic decoherence: off-diagonal elements in the reduced density matrix decay, reproducing wavefunction collapse without intrinsic randomness. With spinor-based measurement operators, the model even yields Bell inequality violations consistent with standard quantum mechanics. Meanwhile, cosmic acceleration arises from exactly the same membrane PDE, unifying quantum and cosmology.

The STM model thus shows that deterministic chaotic elasticity alone can generate quantum-like phenomena and gravitational effects, providing intuitive analogues for interference, collapse and cosmic curvature without invoking fundamental randomness. We now summarise achievements, limitations and paths forward.

5.1. Key Achievements

- **Unified Gravitation & Quantum-Like Features**
  Large-scale curvature emerges from membrane bending, while quantum-field behaviour manifests as coarse-grained, deterministic sub-Planck dynamics—offering a classical route to phenomena usually ascribed to probabilistic quantum mechanics, alongside cosmic expansion.
- **Emergent Quantum Field Theory**
  Photon-, $W^{\pm}$- and gluon-like excitations follow naturally from spinor decomposition of u, while the same PDE embeds metric-like deformations. Renormalisation of elastic parameters mimics loop effects, with fixed points suggesting a discrete three-generation mass spectrum.
- **Deterministic Decoherence**
  Non-Markovian environmental kernels yield a master equation reproducing wavefunction collapse without randomness. The very same sub-Planck excitations that produce gravitational bending also drive local decoherence.
- **Fermion Generations & CP Violation**
  Discrete RG fixed points give three fermion families. CP-violating phases arise deterministically from zitterbewegung couplings between spinors and mirror antispinors—naturally reproducing the CKM structure without extra dimensions or randomness.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

5.2. Outstanding Limitations & Future Work

- **Operator Quantisation & Spin–Statistics**
  Achieving a fully rigorous canonical or BRST quantisation—encompassing ∇^6, emergent spinors, mirror spinors and non-Abelian gauge fields—remains an open challenge (see Appendix O). Sobolev-space definitions, effective EFT treatments and careful anomaly checks will be essential.
- The present study's numerical experiments suggest the possibility of removing the damping term from the STM PDE entirely, significantly simplifying the model's theoretical and numerical structure. Future work must rigorously validate this possibility, examining in detail the implications for unitarity, stability, and self-adjointness within a fully deterministic STM framework.
- **Multi-Loop & Nonperturbative RG**
  While one- through three-loop analyses (and preliminary FRG work) have been performed, exhaustive computations are needed to confirm asymptotic freedom, discrete vacua and consistency across cosmic and particle scales.
- **Detailed Fermion Spectra & CP Phases**
  Systematic numerical scans of coupling parameters, supplemented by multi-loop RG constraints, must reproduce the precise mass hierarchies, mixing angles (CKM/PMNS) and CP-violating phases of the Standard Model.
- **Black Hole Thermodynamics**
  We have now derived the core entropy via mode counting, matched the STM temperature to the Hawking result (with ΔE corrections), obtained explicit grey-body factors and sketched a Euclidean partition-function evaporation law. What remains is a full numerical implementation—tuning ΔE and core parameters to reproduce the Bekenstein–Hawking area law to high precision, computing the detailed Page curve for information retrieval, and verifying the first-law relations in dynamical collapse simulations.
- **Planck-Scale Validity**
  The continuum elasticity framework may break down near the Planck scale. Investigating whether discrete spacetime substructures or new physics are required forms an important frontier.
- **Damping & Unitarity**
  Incorporating frictional terms $-\gamma\,\partial_t u$ via Lindblad or memory-kernel formalisms (Appendix P) must preserve unitarity and avoid ghost modes under strong non-Markovian effects although the present study's numerical experiments suggest the possibility of removing the damping term from the STM PDE entirely, significantly simplifying the model's theoretical and numerical structure. Future work must rigorously validate this possibility, examining in detail the implications for unitarity, stability, and self-adjointness within a fully deterministic STM framework.

5.3. Potential Experimental & Observational Tests

- **Finite Element Analysis** (Appendix K): Can a single parameter set reproduce both quantum-like interference and gravitational signatures (e.g.\ black-hole ringdowns)?
- **Metamaterial Analogues** (Appendix I): Controlled acoustic or optical media may emulate deterministic decoherence and interference—though care is needed to distinguish true quantum from classical effects.
- **Astrophysical Probes**: Gravitational-wave observatories and cosmological surveys may reveal subtle deviations in ringdown spectra or dark-energy inhomogeneities predicted by STM elasticity.

5.4. Concluding Remarks

The STM model offers a minimalistic yet powerful alternative to conventional quantum-gravity frameworks. By showing that interference in the double-slit experiment emerges from persistent, coherent elastic waves—and that the same high-order elasticity yields gravitational curvature, cosmic

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

acceleration, and singularity avoidance—the model reduces many standard postulates (intrinsic randomness, ad hoc scalars, wavefunction collapse) to emergent features of a single deterministic PDE.

Crucially, we have now grounded the STM framework in concrete thermodynamics and parameter calibration:

- **Entropy from mode counting**: Appendix F.4 derives the Bekenstein–Hawking area law by counting standing-wave modes in the STM solitonic core, with only suppressed higher-order corrections .
- **Grey-body spectra and horizon temperature**: Appendix G.4–G.5 computes grey-body transmission factors and an effective Hawking temperature via fluctuation–dissipation, reproducing the near-thermal emission spectrum .
- **Evaporation law via Euclidean methods**: Appendix H.5 sketches a Euclidean path-integral derivation of the mass-loss timescale ($\tau \sim M^3$), matching leading-order Hawking results .

These advances transform STM from a largely conceptual framework into a quantitatively testable theory, with all core parameters anchored to c, G, α and the observed vacuum-energy density (Appendix K.7).

Moreover, recent numerical studies (Section 3.3, Appendix K.7) demonstrate that the damping coefficient γ may be entirely dispensable. In the zero-damping regime ($\gamma = 0$), the STM PDE becomes fully conservative and manifestly self-adjoint, automatically guaranteeing unitarity and excluding ghost modes—sidestepping much of the formal proof burden. Should phenomenological fits to fermion-mixing angles or CP phases still demand a small γ, our framework accommodates it with only minor quantitative effects on stability and decoherence.

Looking forward, the STM approach's ultimate success hinges on:

- **Rigorous operator quantisation and self-adjoint proofs** in both $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma \neq 0$ cases,
- **Detailed parameter tuning** to match Standard-Model mass spectra, mixing matrices and CP-violating phases,
- **Subleading thermodynamic checks**—logarithmic/power-law entropy corrections, Page-curve unitarity tests and first-law verifications (Appendix F.7),
- **Experimental validation** via finite-element simulators and metamaterial analogues, and
- **Astrophysical probes** of black-hole ringdown and dark-energy drift.

Altogether, these developments—thermodynamic grounding, parameter anchoring and the potential removal of damping—highlight the STM model's conceptual economy, mathematical elegance and genuine falsifiability. We invite the community to test, refine and extend STM's predictions, in the hope that its unified, deterministic elasticity framework will yield new insights at the intersection of quantum theory, gravitation and cosmology.

Statements

- **Author contribution:** The author confirms the sole responsibility for the conception of the study, development of the STM model, analysis of the results and preparation of the manuscript.
- **Funding information:** The author received no specific funding for this work.
- **Data availability:** All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.
- **Acknowledgements** I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the scholars and researchers whose foundational work is cited in the references; their contributions have been instrumental in the development of the Space-Time Membrane (STM) model presented in this paper. I am thankful for the advanced computational tools and language models that have supported the mathematical articulation of the STM model, which I have developed over the past fourteen years. Finally, I wish to pay tribute to my mother, Mavis, for my tenacity and resourcefulness; my father,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

James, for my imagination; my wife and children, Joanne, Elliot and Louis, for their belief in me; and to the late Isaac Asimov, whose writings first sparked my enduring curiosity in physics.

- **Conflict of interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.
- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animals use.
- **Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process:** During the preparation of this work the author used ChatGPT in order to improve readability of the paper and support with mathematical derivations. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the published article.

Appendix A: Operator Formalism and Spinor Field Construction

A.1 Overview

A central feature of the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model is the emergence of fermion-like spinor fields from a purely classical elastic membrane. In this appendix, we detail how the classical displacement field $u(x,t)$ – whose dynamics are governed by a high-order wave equation including fourth- and sixth-order spatial derivatives, damping, nonlinear self-interactions, Yukawa-like couplings, and external forces – is promoted to an operator $\hat{u}(x,t)$ via canonical quantisation. We also define its conjugate momentum and introduce a complementary out-of-phase field $u_\perp(x,t)$. A bimodal decomposition of these fields subsequently yields a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$, which forms the foundation for the emergence of internal gauge symmetries.

A.2 Canonical Quantisation of the Displacement Field

A.2.1 Classical Preliminaries

The classical displacement field $u(x,t)$ describes the elastic deformation of the four-dimensional membrane. Its dynamics are derived from a Lagrangian density that incorporates higher-order spatial derivatives to capture both bending and ultraviolet (UV) regularisation. A representative Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\rho\,(\partial_t u)^2 - \frac{1}{2}[E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\left(\nabla^2 u\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\eta\left(\nabla^3 u\right)^2 - V(u) - \mathcal{L}_{int},$$

where:

ρ is the effective mass density,

$E_{STM}(\mu)$ is the scale-dependent baseline elastic modulus,

$\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$ represents local stiffness variations,

The term $-\frac{1}{2}\eta\left(\nabla^3 u\right)^2$ yields, via integration by parts, the sixth-order term $\eta\,\nabla^6 u$,

$V(u)$ is the potential energy (e.g. $V(u) = \frac{1}{2}ku^2$ or more complex forms incorporating nonlinearities such as λu^3),

$\mathcal{L}_{int}$ includes additional interaction terms such as the Yukawa-like coupling $-g\,u\,\bar{\Psi}\,\Psi$.

Damping $(-\gamma\,\partial_t u)$ and external forcing $F_{ext}(x,t)$ are introduced separately or via effective dissipation functionals in the complete equation of motion:

$$\rho\,\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\nabla^4 u + \eta\,\nabla^6 u - \gamma\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \lambda\,u^3 - g\,u\,\bar{\Psi}\,\Psi + F_{ext}(x,t) = 0.$$

A.2.2 Conjugate Momentum

The conjugate momentum is defined as

$$\pi(x,t) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_t u)} = \rho\,\partial_t u(x,t).$$

A.2.3 Promotion to Operators

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

In quantising the theory, the classical field $u(x,t)$ and its conjugate momentum $\pi(x,t)$ are promoted to operators $\hat{u}(x,t)$ and $\hat{\pi}(x,t)$ acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. They satisfy the canonical equal-time commutation relation

$$[\hat{u}(x,t),\, \hat{\pi}(y,t)] = i\hbar\,\delta^3(x-y),$$

with all other commutators vanishing [16, 17]. This structure remains valid when higher-order derivatives (leading to ∇^4 and ∇^6 terms) and scale-dependent parameters are included.

A.2.4 Normal Mode Expansion and Dispersion Relation

In a near-homogeneous scenario, the operator $\hat{u}(x,t)$ is expressed in momentum space as

$$\hat{u}(x,t) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\, e^{ik\cdot x}\, \hat{u}(k,t).$$

Substituting this expansion into the classical equations of motion yields the modified dispersion relation. For plane-wave solutions $e^{i(k\cdot x-\omega t)}$, one obtains

$$\omega^2(k) = c^2 \mid k \mid^2 + [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)] \mid k \mid^4 + \eta \mid k \mid^6 .$$

The inclusion of the $\eta \mid k \mid^6$ term, arising from the $\left(\nabla^3 u\right)^2$ contribution, provides enhanced UV regularisation by strongly suppressing high-wavenumber fluctuations.

A.2.5 Hamiltonian Operator

The Hamiltonian operator is constructed from the Lagrangian as

$$\hat{H} = \int d^3x \left\{ \frac{1}{2\rho}\,\hat{\pi}^2(x,t) + \frac{c^2}{2}\,(\nabla\hat{u}(x,t))^2 + \frac{1}{2}[E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)] \left(\nabla^2\hat{u}(x,t)\right)^2 + \frac{\eta}{2}\left(\nabla^3\hat{u}(x,t)\right)^2 + V(\hat{u}(x,t)) + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{i}\right.$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{int}$ represents the operator form of the interaction terms (including, for instance, the Yukawa-like coupling $-g\,u\,\bar{\Psi}\,\Psi$). To ensure that all derivative terms (up to third order, corresponding to ∇^6) are well defined, the domain of $\hat{H}$ is chosen as a Sobolev space H^3 (or higher). With appropriate boundary conditions (e.g. fields vanishing at infinity), integration by parts guarantees that $\hat{H}$ is self-adjoint and its spectrum is real and bounded from below.

A.3 Bimodal Decomposition and Spinor Construction

To capture additional internal degrees of freedom, we introduce a complementary field $u_\perp(x,t)$, interpreted as the out-of-phase (or quadrature) component of the membrane's displacement. We define two new real fields via the linear combinations

$$u_1(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\hat{u}(x,t) + u_\perp(x,t)], \quad u_2(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\hat{u}(x,t) - u_\perp(x,t)].$$

These represent the in-phase and out-of-phase components, respectively. They are then combined into a two-component spinor operator

$$\Psi(x,t) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1(x,t) \\ u_2(x,t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By imposing appropriate (anti)commutation relations between $\hat{u}(x,t)$ and $u_\perp(x,t)$, one can demonstrate—by analogy with Fermi–Bose mappings in certain lower-dimensional systems—that the spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ exhibits chiral substructures. These substructures are essential for the emergence of internal gauge symmetries.

A.4 Self-Adjointness and Path Integral Formulation

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

The Hamiltonian operator $\widehat{H}$ is shown to be self-adjoint by verifying that all higher-order derivative terms are well defined on the chosen Sobolev space (here, H^3 or higher) and by imposing suitable boundary conditions (e.g. fields vanishing at infinity). This self-adjointness is essential for ensuring a real energy spectrum and the stability of the quantised theory.

A complete path integral formulation can then be constructed. The transition amplitude between field configurations is given by

$$\langle u_f, t_f \mid u_i, t_i \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}u \, \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S[u]\right],$$

with the action

$$S[u] = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt \int d^3x \, \mathcal{L}[u].$$

Integrating out the momentum degrees of freedom yields the configuration-space path integral, which serves as the basis for further extensions, including the incorporation of gauge fields.

A.5 Extended Path Integral for Gauge Fields

To incorporate internal gauge symmetries, we augment the effective action with gauge field contributions. For a gauge field $A_\mu^a(x,t)$ (where a indexes the generators), the covariant derivative is defined as

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig\, A_\mu^a(x,t) T^a,$$

with T^a representing the generators (for example, $T^a = \sigma^a/2$ for SU(2) or $T^a = \lambda^a/2$ for SU(3)) and g the gauge coupling constant. The corresponding field strength tensor is given by

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a - ig\, f^{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c.$$

The gauge symmetry is quantised by imposing a gauge-fixing condition (e.g. the Lorentz gauge $\partial^\mu A_\mu^a = 0$) and by introducing Faddeev–Popov ghost fields c^a and $\bar{c}^a$. The resulting gauge-fixed path integral is

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}u \, \mathcal{D}A_\mu \, \mathcal{D}\bar{c} \, \mathcal{D}c \, \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{eff}[u, A_\mu, c, \bar{c}]\right],$$

where S_{eff} includes the original STM Lagrangian, the gauge field Lagrangian, and the ghost contributions.

A.6 Ontological meaning of the bimodal spinor

This appendix clarifies the physical interpretation and underlying ontology of the two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ employed in the STM model, explaining its emergence directly from the dynamics of a four-dimensional elastic spacetime membrane.

A.6.1 Spinor Definition and Physical Interpretation

In the STM framework, the fundamental spinor field is explicitly constructed from two measurable elastic deformation modes of the spacetime membrane. We define the spinor as:

$$\Psi(x,t) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1(x,t) \\ u_2(x,t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with} \quad u_{1,2}(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u \pm u_\perp),$$

where u and $u_\perp$ represent orthogonal displacements of the membrane.

Each component is physically real and measurable:

- **In-phase mode** (u_1): Represents a local patch of the membrane moving synchronously ("up and down") with the bulk spacetime background deformation.

- **Quadrature (out-of-phase) mode** (u_2): Represents the same local patch moving with a 90° phase lag, achieving its maximum displacement precisely when the in-phase component u_1 is at zero displacement.

Together, these two components form a classical standing-wave system analogous to the two orthogonal polarisations of electromagnetic waves in a cavity. Crucially, the indivisibility of these modes—no local perturbation can excite one mode independently without affecting the other—is the fundamental elastic origin of quantum spin-½ behaviour.

A.6.2 Local Gauge Phase and Emergent Electromagnetism

The spinor supports a local gauge invariance expressed through a point-wise phase transformation:

$$\Psi(x,t) \to e^{i\alpha(x,t)}\Psi(x,t).$$

This gauge transformation corresponds physically to a local rotation of the oscillation ellipse formed by u_1 and u_2. To ensure that physical predictions remain invariant under such local rotations, an additional compensating field A_μ (gauge connection) naturally emerges, identifiable with the electromagnetic potential. Hence, gauge symmetry in the STM model has a direct and intuitive geometric-elastic meaning.

A.6.3 Hidden Elastic Variables and Deterministic Origin

At a microscopic level, the instantaneous configuration of the bimodal spinor (u_1, u_2) is entirely determined by the underlying displacement and velocity fields of the membrane. Consequently, the STM model maintains strict determinism—its quantum-like behaviour emerges only through coarse-graining and ensemble averaging. The macroscopically observable quantum spinor Ψ thus encodes only the envelope amplitude $|\Psi|$ and relative phase, masking the deterministic hidden variables of the underlying elastic fields.

A.6.4 Spin Encoding and the Bloch Sphere

Choosing a particular quantisation axis (e.g., along the $\hat{z}$-direction), spin-up and spin-down states correspond explicitly to membrane oscillation ellipse orientations:

- **Spin-up**: Oscillation ellipse aligned positively along the u_1-axis (initially reaches maximum displacement).
- **Spin-down**: Oscillation ellipse oriented negatively along the u_1-axis.

Intermediate orientations of the ellipse naturally map onto the continuum of quantum states represented by points on the standard quantum Bloch sphere.

A.6.5 Measurement as Boundary-Condition Selection

In the STM interpretation, quantum measurement is fundamentally a boundary-condition selection process. For instance, a Stern–Gerlach analyser temporarily modifies local boundary conditions—specifically altering local stiffness and membrane boundary dynamics—so that only oscillation ellipses with particular orientations can pass through. Thus, measurement outcomes reveal pre-existing elliptical orientations encoded at emission, consistent with a deterministic hidden-variable interpretation, rather than spontaneously creating measurement outcomes upon observation.

A.7 Summary and Outlook

In summary, the operator quantisation scheme for the STM model proceeds as follows:

Displacement Field Promotion:

The classical displacement field $u(x,t)$ and its conjugate momentum $\pi(x,t)$ are promoted to operators $\hat{u}(x,t)$ and $\hat{\pi}(x,t)$ on a Hilbert space. The domain is chosen as a suitable Sobolev space (e.g. H^3 or higher) to ensure that all derivatives up to third order (which produce the ∇^6 term) are well defined.

Complementary Field and Spinor Construction:

A complementary field $u_\perp(x,t)$ is introduced. By forming the in-phase and out-of-phase combinations

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$u_1(x,t)$ and $u_2(x,t)$, a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ is constructed. This spinor structure is central to the emergence of internal gauge symmetries.

Self-Adjoint Hamiltonian:
The Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}$ includes kinetic, fourth-order, and sixth-order spatial derivatives, along with potential and interaction terms. It is shown to be self-adjoint under appropriate boundary conditions, ensuring a real and bounded-below energy spectrum.

Path Integral Formulation:
A configuration-space path integral is derived from the action $S[u] = \int dt\, d^3x\, \mathcal{L}[u]$, serving as the basis for calculating transition amplitudes and for extending the formulation to include gauge fields and ghost terms.

This comprehensive operator formalism provides a robust foundation for the STM model's quantum framework, opening the door to further theoretical investigations and experimental tests of how deterministic elasticity can give rise to quantum-like behaviour.

Appendix B: Derivation of the STM Elastic-Wave Equation and External Force

This appendix supplies an explicit, yet compact, route from a covariant elasticity energy functional to the fourth- and sixth-order terms, the nonlinear self-interaction, the Yukawa-like coupling and the damping force that together define the Space-Time Membrane (STM) partial differential equation (PDE). Every algebraic step needed for independent reconstruction is shown, but purely repetitious index contractions have been suppressed for brevity.

B.1 Field content and notation

Symbol	Meaning
$x^\mu = (t, x^1, x^2, x^3)$	space-time coordinates; background metric $\eta_{\mu\nu} = diag(-1,1,1,1)$
$u_\mu(x)$	small displacement of the four-dimensional membrane (co-moving gauge $u_0 = 0$ after variation)
$\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} := \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu u_\nu + \partial_\nu u_\mu)$	linear strain tensor
$\psi(x)$	two-component spinor obtained from the bimodal decomposition (Appendix A)

Latin indices $i, j, \ldots$ denote spatial components; repeated indices are summed.

B.2 Elastic energy density

For an **isotropic** and **centrosymmetric** medium the quadratic strain invariants are

$$\mathcal{U}_{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 (tr\,\varepsilon)^2 + \lambda_2\, tr\left(\varepsilon^2\right), \qquad tr\,\varepsilon = \eta^{\mu\nu}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}.$$

Higher-gradient rigidity is captured by the *unique* parity-even scalars that survive rotational averaging:

$$\mathcal{U}_{(4)} = \frac{E_0}{2}\left(\partial^2 u\right)^2, \quad \mathcal{U}_{(6)} = \frac{\eta}{2}\left(\partial^3 u\right)^2,$$

where $E_0 \equiv E_{STM}(\mu)$ is the baseline modulus and $\eta > 0$ provides ultraviolet regularisation.

B.3 Total action and conservative variation

The conservative sector of the action is

$$S = \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2}\rho(\partial_t u)^2 - \mathcal{U}_{(2)} - \mathcal{U}_{(4)} - \mathcal{U}_{(6)} - V_{\rm nl}(u) - g\, u\, \bar{\psi}\psi\right],$$

with
$V_{\rm nl}(u) = \frac{\lambda}{4}\, u^4.$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

B.3.1 Quadratic strain → no fourth- or sixth-order terms

Varying $\mathcal{U}_{(2)}$ reproduces the familiar second-order elastic wave equation. Because the STM model targets **quantum-like** dispersion, we keep the result implicit and focus on the higher-gradient pieces.

B.3.2 The E_0 term → $\nabla^4 u$

$$\delta \int \mathcal{U}_{(4)} = E_0 \int d^4x \left(\partial^2 u\right)\left(\partial^2 \delta u\right) = -E_0 \int d^4x\, \delta u\, \partial^4 u \quad \text{(twice by parts and kill surface terms)},$$

so it contributes $-E_0\, \partial^4 u$ to the Euler–Lagrange equation.

B.3.3 The η term → $\nabla^6 u$

$$\delta \int \mathcal{U}_{(6)} = \eta \int d^4x \left(\partial^3 u\right)\left(\partial^3 \delta u\right) = -\eta \int d^4x\, \delta u\, \partial^6 u,$$

giving $-\eta\, \partial^6 u$. The sign $\eta > 0$ ensures a positive-definite contribution to the Hamiltonian (Appendix O).

B.3.4 Non-linear and Yukawa terms

$$\delta V_{\text{nl}} = \lambda\, u^3\, \delta u, \qquad \delta(g\, u\, \bar{\psi}\psi) = g\, \bar{\psi}\psi\, \delta u.$$

These produce $-\lambda u^3$ and $-g\, u\, \bar{\psi}\psi$ in the field equation.

B.4 Dissipation via a Rayleigh functional

Damping is introduced *after* the conservative variation by the Rayleigh dissipation density

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{1}{2}\gamma\, (\partial_t u)^2, \qquad \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial(\partial_t u)} = \gamma\, \partial_t u.$$

Adding the generalised force $-\gamma\, \partial_t u$ to the conservative Euler–Lagrange result yields

$$\rho\, \partial_t^2 u - [E_0 + \Delta E(x)]\nabla^4 u + \eta\, \nabla^6 u - \gamma\, \partial_t u - \lambda\, u^3 - g\, u\, \bar{\psi}\psi \;=\; 0,$$

where the position-dependent **stiffness perturbation**

$$\Delta E(x) = \frac{\partial\, \delta\mathcal{U}}{\partial(\nabla^2 u)^2}\,\Big|_{\text{fast modes}}$$

arises (Appendix H) when rapid sub-Planck oscillations are coarse-grained out of the quadratic bending energy.

B.5 External force $\mathbf{F}_{\text{ext}}$

All residual contributions—including boundary tractions, laboratory forcing, or feedback terms used in metamaterial analogues—can be packaged as an *external potential* $U_{\text{ext}}[u, \psi]$. Varying that functional gives

$$F_{\text{ext}}(x) \;=\; -\,\frac{\delta U_{\text{ext}}}{\delta u(x)},$$

which is simply added to the right-hand side of the master PDE whenever required by a specific experiment or numerical set-up.

B.6 Summary

- The fourth-order operator $\nabla^4 u$ is the Euler–Lagrange image of the quadratic bending invariant $\left(\partial^2 u\right)^2$.
- The sixth-order operator $\nabla^6 u$ follows analogously from $\left(\partial^3 u\right)^2$ and is essential for ultraviolet convergence.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- Non-linear self-interaction and Yukawa-like spinor coupling appear directly from polynomial and bilinear potential terms.
- Linear damping derives from the Rayleigh-type functional $\mathcal{R} = \gamma(\partial_t u)^2/2$.
- Any additional laboratory or astrophysical forcing enters through $F_{\text{ext}} = -\delta U_{\text{ext}}/\delta u$.

Assembling the results of B.3.2–B.5, the full Space–Time Membrane wave equation reads

$$\rho \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_0 + \Delta E(x)] \nabla^4 u + \eta \nabla^6 u - \gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \lambda u^3 - g \overline{\psi}\psi = F_{ext}(x),$$

where:

- is the mass density (B.3);
- and arise from the fourth- and sixth-order invariants (B.3.2, B.3.3);
- and are the nonlinear self-interaction and Yukawa-like terms (B.3.4);
- is the Rayleigh damping coefficient (B.4);
- is the coarse-grained stiffness perturbation from fast modes (B.4);
- is any external force (B.5).

This single PDE encapsulates all conservative elastic terms, damping, nonlinearity, spinor coupling and external forcing used throughout the main text and Appendices D–H.

Appendix C: Gauge symmetry emergence and CP violation

C.1 Overview

The Space–Time Membrane (STM) model naturally gives rise to internal gauge symmetries through the elastic dynamics of the membrane. By performing a bimodal decomposition of the displacement field $u(x,t)$ (as described in Appendix A), a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ is obtained. The internal structure of $\Psi(x,t)$ allows for local phase invariance, which necessitates the introduction of gauge fields. In this appendix, we derive the gauge structures corresponding to U(1), SU(2), and SU(3), including the construction of covariant derivatives, the formulation of field strength tensors, and the implementation of gauge fixing via the Faddeev–Popov procedure.

C.2 U(1) Gauge Symmetry

Local Phase Transformation and Covariant Derivative:

Consider the two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ derived from the bimodal decomposition. A local U(1) phase transformation is given by:

$$\Psi(x,t) \to \Psi'(x,t) = e^{i\theta(x,t)}\Psi(x,t),$$

where $\theta(x,t)$ is an arbitrary smooth function. To maintain invariance of the kinetic term in the Lagrangian, we replace the ordinary derivative with a covariant derivative defined by:

$$D_\mu \Psi(x,t) \equiv \left[\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu(x,t)\right]\Psi(x,t),$$

where $A_\mu(x,t)$ is the U(1) gauge field and e is the gauge coupling constant.

Field Strength Tensor:

The corresponding U(1) field strength tensor is defined as:

$$F_{\mu\nu}(x,t) = \partial_\mu A_\nu(x,t) - \partial_\nu A_\mu(x,t).$$

Under the gauge transformation,

$$A_\mu(x,t) \to A'_\mu(x,t) = A_\mu(x,t) + \frac{1}{e}\partial_\mu\theta(x,t),$$

the field strength tensor $F_{\mu\nu}(x,t)$ remains invariant.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Gauge Fixing and Ghost Fields:

For quantisation, it is necessary to fix the gauge. A common choice is the Lorentz gauge, $\partial^\mu A_\mu(x,t) = 0$. The Faddeev–Popov procedure is then employed to introduce ghost fields $c(x,t)$ and $\bar{c}(x,t)$ that ensure proper treatment of gauge redundancy in the path integral formulation.

C.3 SU(2) Gauge Symmetry

Local SU(2) Transformation:

Assume that the spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ exhibits a chiral structure such that its left-handed component, $\Psi_L(x,t)$, transforms as a doublet under SU(2). A local SU(2) transformation is expressed as:

$$\Psi_L(x,t) \to \Psi'_L(x,t) = U_{\text{SU(2)}}(x,t)\Psi_L(x,t),$$

where

$$U_{\text{SU(2)}}(x,t) = exp\left[i\theta^a(x,t)\frac{\sigma^a}{2}\right],$$

with σ^a $(a = 1,2,3)$ being the Pauli matrices, and $\theta^a(x,t)$ representing the local transformation parameters.

Covariant Derivative for SU(2):

To maintain invariance under this transformation, the covariant derivative is defined as:

$$D_\mu\Psi_L(x,t) \equiv \left[\partial_\mu - ig_2 A^a_\mu(x,t)\frac{\sigma^a}{2}\right]\Psi_L(x,t),$$

where $A^a_\mu(x,t)$ are the SU(2) gauge fields and g_2 is the SU(2) coupling constant.

Field Strength Tensor for SU(2):

The field strength tensor associated with the SU(2) gauge fields is given by:

$$F^a_{\mu\nu}(x,t) = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu(x,t) - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu(x,t) - g_2\,\epsilon^{abc} A^b_\mu(x,t) A^c_\nu(x,t),$$

where ϵ^{abc} are the antisymmetric structure constants of SU(2).

Gauge Fixing:

Imposing the Lorentz gauge, $\partial^\mu A^a_\mu(x,t) = 0$, and applying the Faddeev–Popov procedure, ghost fields $c^a(x,t)$ and $\bar{c}^a(x,t)$ are introduced with a ghost Lagrangian of the form:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{SU(2)}}_{\text{ghost}} = \bar{c}^a\,\partial^\mu\left[\partial_\mu\delta^{ab} + g_2\,\epsilon^{abc} A^c_\mu(x,t)\right]c^b.$$

C.3.1 Electroweak Mixing, the **Z** Boson, and CP Violation via Zitterbewegung

In the STM framework, electroweak symmetry breaking and the emergence of the neutral Z boson can be naturally explained through interactions between the bimodal spinor field $\Psi(x,t)$ residing on one face of the membrane and the corresponding bimodal antispinor field $\tilde{\Psi}^{\perp}(x,t)$ located on the opposite face (the "mirror universe").

Specifically, the displacement field $u(x,t)$ couples these spinor fields through an interaction Lagrangian of the form:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = -\sum_{i,j} y_{ij}\,u(x,t)\left[\bar{\Psi}_i(x,t)\,e^{i\theta_{ij}(x,t)}\,\tilde{\Psi}^{\perp}_j(x,t)\right],$$

where:

y_{ij} represents Yukawa-like coupling constants between generations i,j.

$u(x,t)$ is the membrane displacement field, whose vacuum expectation value (VEV), $v = \langle u(x,t)\rangle$, generates effective fermion masses.

Complex phase shifts $\theta_{ij}(x,t)$ arise naturally due to rapid oscillatory interactions—known as *zitterbewegung*—between the spinor Ψ and the mirror antispinor $\tilde{\Psi}^{\perp}$.

When the displacement field $u(x,t)$ acquires a vacuum expectation value (VEV), denoted $v = \langle u(x,t) \rangle$, this interaction yields an effective fermion mass matrix of the form:

$$\left(M_f\right)_{ij} = y_{ij}\, v\, e^{i\bar{\theta}_{ij}},$$

where the phases θ_{ij} become averaged into constant effective phases $\bar{\theta}_{ij}$ upon coarse-graining.

Electroweak Mixing and Emergence of the Z Boson:

To clearly illustrate the connection with electroweak theory, consider the gauge fields emerging from the bimodal spinor structure. Initially, the theory features separate U(1) and SU(2) gauge symmetries, represented by gauge fields B_μ (U(1)) and W_μ^a (SU(2)). Through the process described above—where the membrane's displacement field acquires a vacuum expectation value $v = \langle u(x,t) \rangle$—mass terms arise for specific gauge bosons. Explicitly, electroweak mixing occurs via a linear combination of the neutral gauge fields W_μ^3 (from SU(2)) and B_μ (from U(1)):

$$Z_\mu = cos\theta_W\, W_\mu^3 - sin\theta_W\, B_\mu, \quad A_\mu = sin\theta_W\, W_\mu^3 + cos\theta_W\, B_\mu,$$

where θ_W is the Weinberg angle, dynamically determined by membrane parameters, and B_μ is the original U(1) gauge field. The gauge boson corresponding to the Z_μ acquires mass directly from the membrane's elastic structure, analogous to the conventional Higgs mechanism but derived here entirely from deterministic elastic interactions rather than from an additional scalar field.

Emergence of CP Violation:

Under a combined charge conjugation–parity (CP) transformation, the spinor fields transform approximately as:

$$\Psi(x,t) \xrightarrow{CP} \gamma^0 C\, \bar{\Psi}^T(-x,t),$$

with analogous transformations applied to the mirror antispinor $\tilde{\Psi}^{\perp}$. Due to the presence of nontrivial phases induced by the zitterbewegung interaction between spinor and antispinor fields, the effective fermion mass matrix

$$\left(M_f\right)_{ij} = y_{ij}\, v\, e^{i\bar{\theta}_{ij}},$$

is generally complex. Diagonalising this matrix yields physical fermion states with mixing angles and phases analogous to the experimentally observed CKM matrix, thus naturally introducing CP violation into the STM framework.

Summary:

Gauge boson masses and electroweak mixing angles emerge naturally via vacuum expectation values of the membrane displacement field.

Z bosons arise explicitly from the SU(2) × U(1) gauge field mixing.

CP violation is introduced through the deterministic *zitterbewegung* interaction between spinors and antispinors across the membrane, producing effective Yukawa couplings with nonzero complex phases.

Although the underlying framework clearly illustrates how CP violation emerges deterministically, a rigorous derivation of chiral anomalies, weak parity violation, and related effects, such as neutrino mass generation via a see-saw mechanism, would require further detailed analysis, including explicit consideration of triangular loop diagrams within the STM framework.

C.4 SU(3) Gauge Symmetry

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Local SU(3) Transformation:
For the strong interaction, the spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ is assumed to carry a colour index and transform as a triplet under SU(3). A local SU(3) transformation is given by:

$$\Psi(x,t) \to \Psi^{'}(x,t) = U_{\mathrm{SU(3)}}(x,t)\Psi(x,t),$$

with

$$U_{\mathrm{SU(3)}}(x,t) = exp\left[i\theta^a(x,t)\frac{\lambda^a}{2}\right],$$

where λ^a $(a = 1,\ldots,8)$ are the Gell–Mann matrices, and $\theta^a(x,t)$ are the transformation parameters.

Covariant Derivative for SU(3):
The covariant derivative is defined as:

$$D_\mu\Psi(x,t) \equiv \left[\partial_\mu - ig_3 G^a_\mu(x,t)\frac{\lambda^a}{2}\right]\Psi(x,t),$$

where $G^a_\mu(x,t)$ are the SU(3) gauge fields and g_3 is the SU(3) coupling constant.

Field Strength Tensor for SU(3):
The SU(3) field strength tensor is defined by:

$$G^a_{\mu\nu}(x,t) = \partial_\mu G^a_\nu(x,t) - \partial_\nu G^a_\mu(x,t) - g_3\, f^{abc}\, G^b_\mu(x,t)G^c_\nu(x,t),$$

where f^{abc} are the structure constants of SU(3).

Gauge Fixing:
The Lorentz gauge $\partial^\mu G^a_\mu(x,t) = 0$ is imposed, and ghost fields $c^a(x,t)$ and $\bar{c}^a(x,t)$ are introduced via the Faddeev–Popov procedure. The ghost Lagrangian is then:

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{SU(3)}}_{\mathrm{ghost}} = \bar{c}^a\,\partial^\mu\left[\partial_\mu\delta^{ab} + g_3\, f^{abc}\, G^c_\mu(x,t)\right]c^b.$$

C.4.1 Physical Interpretation — Linked Oscillators and Confinement:
In the main text (Section 3.1.2), the strong force is depicted by analogy with a "linked oscillator" network, wherein each local site carries a colour-like degree of freedom. From the perspective of continuum gauge theory, this classical picture emerges naturally once we require that $\Psi(x,t)$ carry a local SU(3) index and that neighbouring "sites" (or regions) remain elastically coupled under deformations. In essence, each SU(3) gauge connection $G^a_\mu(x,t)$ plays the role of an "elastic link" constraining colour charges, which becomes increasingly stiff (i.e. confining) with separation.

Mathematically, the field strength $G^a_{\mu\nu}$ enforces local colour gauge invariance, just as tension in a chain of coupled oscillators enforces synchronous motion. When two colour charges are pulled apart, the membrane's elastic energy—now interpreted as the non-Abelian gauge field energy—rises linearly with distance (up to corrections from real or virtual gluon-like modes). This provides a deterministic analogue of confinement: it is energetically unfavourable for a single "coloured oscillator" to exist in isolation, so colour remains bound. Thus, the formal gauge-theoretic description of SU(3) in this appendix and the intuitive "linked oscillator" analogy of Section 3.1.2 are two views of the same phenomenon: a deterministic continuum mechanism underpinning the strong interaction.

C.4.2 Derivation of SU(3) Colour Symmetry

In the STM model, spacetime is described as an elastic four-dimensional membrane whose displacement field, $u(\mathbf{x},t)$, obeys a high-order partial differential equation:

$$\rho\,\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \left[E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(\mathbf{x},t;\mu)\right]\nabla^4 u + \eta\,\nabla^6 u + \cdots = 0,$$

where ρ is the effective mass density, $E_{STM}(\mu)$ is a scale-dependent elastic modulus, $\Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu)$ accounts for local variations in stiffness, and η controls the higher-order spatial derivative terms that serve to regularise ultraviolet divergences.

At sub-Planck scales, the membrane exhibits rapid deterministic oscillations. Coarse-graining these fast modes yields a slowly varying envelope. Initially, the displacement field is decomposed bimodally:

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = u_1(\mathbf{x}, t) + u_2(\mathbf{x}, t),$$

which can be combined into a two-component spinor,

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ u_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

This spinor naturally exhibits a U(1) symmetry under local phase rotations. However, the strong interaction is described by an SU(3) symmetry, necessitating an extension to three internal degrees of freedom.

Extending to Three Components

The inclusion of higher-order derivative terms ($\nabla^4 u$ and $\nabla^6 u$) implies a richer dynamical structure than a simple two-mode system. For example, in a one-dimensional analogue, an equation such as

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + \kappa \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4} = 0$$

yields a dispersion relation $\omega^2 = \kappa k^4$ that supports a multiplicity of normal modes. In four dimensions, such higher-order dynamics may naturally allow for three distinct, independent oscillatory modes. Label these as u_r, u_g, and u_b (metaphorically corresponding to "red", "green", and "blue"). Then the displacement field may be expressed as:

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) = u_r(\mathbf{x}, t) + u_g(\mathbf{x}, t) + u_b(\mathbf{x}, t),$$

which is recast as a three-component field,

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \begin{pmatrix} u_r(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ u_g(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ u_b(\mathbf{x}, t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

This field now naturally transforms under SU(3) via unitary 3×3 matrices with determinant 1, preserving the norm $|\psi|^2 = |u_r|^2 + |u_g|^2 + |u_b|^2$.

Anomaly Cancellation and Topological Constraints

A consistent, anomaly-free gauge theory requires that the contributions from all fields cancel potential gauge anomalies. In the Standard Model, the colour triplet structure of quarks ensures anomaly cancellation within QCD. In the STM model, if the three vibrational modes couple to emergent fermionic degrees of freedom analogously to quark fields, then both energy minimisation and anomaly cancellation considerations naturally favour an SU(3) symmetry. Moreover, topological constraints—for instance, those imposed by suitable boundary conditions or by a compactified membrane geometry—can enforce the existence of exactly three independent, stable oscillatory modes.

Conclusion

Thus, by extending the initial bimodal decomposition to include additional degrees of freedom arising from higher-order elastic dynamics, the STM model naturally leads to a three-component field. This field, transforming under SU(3), provides a first-principles, deterministic explanation for the emergence of three colours. Such a derivation not only aligns with the phenomenology of QCD but also reinforces the unified, classical elastic framework of the STM model.

C.6 Prototype Emergent Gauge Lagrangian

While we have described how local phase invariance of our bimodal spinor Ψ induces gauge fields A^a_μ, we can also hypothesise a Yang–Mills-like action arising at low energies (See **Figure 4**):

$$\mathcal{L}_{gauge} = -\frac{1}{4}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu a} + \text{(gauge fixing + ghost terms)}$$

where $F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu - g\, f^{abc} A^b_\mu A^c_\nu$

In the STM context, this term would emerge from an effective elasticity-based action once the short-wavelength excitations are integrated out and the spinor fields Ψ become nontrivial.

C.7 Summary

In summary, the internal structure of the two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$ (derived from the bimodal decomposition of $u(x,t)$) leads naturally to local gauge invariance. Enforcing invariance under local U(1) transformations necessitates the introduction of a U(1) gauge field $A_\mu(x,t)$ with covariant derivative $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu(x,t)$ and field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$. Extending this to non-Abelian symmetries, local SU(2) and SU(3) transformations require the introduction of gauge fields $A^a_\mu(x,t)$ and $G^a_\mu(x,t)$, respectively, with covariant derivatives defined accordingly. Gauge fixing, typically via the Lorentz gauge, is implemented using the Faddeev–Popov procedure, ensuring a consistent quantisation of the gauge degrees of freedom.

Appendix D: Derivation of the Effective Schrödinger-Like Equation, Interference, and Deterministic Quantum Features

D.1 Introduction

This appendix supplies the complete multiple-scale (WKB-type) derivation by which the deterministic Space–Time Membrane (STM) wave equation yields, after coarse-graining, an effective non-relativistic "Schrödinger-like′′ evolution law for the slowly varying envelope of the membrane displacement. All intermediate steps are retained, and the next-order (diffusive) corrections—needed for quantitative tests of damping and fringe deformation—are displayed explicitly in terms of the microscopic STM parameters.

D.2 The STM Membrane PDE (one spatial dimension)

$$\rho\,\partial_t^2 u \;-\; [E_0 + \Delta E(x)]\,\partial_x^4 u \;+\; \eta\,\partial_x^6 u \;-\; \gamma\,\partial_t u \;+\; \cdots = 0,$$

where

* ρ – effective mass density of the membrane;
* $E_0 = E_{STM}(\mu)$ – baseline elastic modulus at renormalisation scale μ;
* $\Delta E(x)$ – slowly varying stiffness modulation;
* $\eta > 0$ – coefficient of the UV-regularising sixth-order term;
* γ – small linear damping;
* "$\cdots$" – nonlinear and spinor/gauge couplings neglected here.

D.3 Carrier + Envelope Ansatz and coarse-graining step

$$u(x,t) = U(X,T)\,e^{i\theta(x,t)}, \qquad \theta = k_0 x - \omega_0 t,$$

with the "slow" variables

$$X = \epsilon\, x, \quad T = \epsilon^2 t, \qquad \epsilon = \frac{1}{L} \ll 1.$$

The fast sub-Planck field is first averaged with a Gaussian filter

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$$G(x-y;L) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}L} \exp\left[-(x-y)^2/2L^2\right],$$

ensuring that the filtered field varies only on (X,T) and justifying the multiple-scale expansion

$$\partial_t \;\to\; -i\omega_0 + \epsilon^2\partial_T, \partial_x \;\to\; i\,k_0 + \epsilon\,\partial_X.$$

D.4 Expansion of Derivatives
Acting on $u = Ue^{i\theta}$:
Time derivatives

$$\partial_t u = \left(-i\omega_0 U + \epsilon^2\partial_T U\right)e^{i\theta}, \qquad \partial_t^2 u = \left(-\omega_0^2 U + 2i\omega_0\epsilon^2\partial_T U + O\left(\epsilon^4\right)\right)e^{i\theta}.$$

Spatial derivatives

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_x u &= (ik_0U + \epsilon\partial_X U)e^{i\theta},\\
\partial_x^2 u &= (-k_0^2U + 2ik_0\epsilon\partial_X U + \epsilon^2\partial_X^2 U)e^{i\theta},\\
\partial_x^4 u &= (k_0^4U - 4ik_0^3\epsilon\partial_X U - 6k_0^2\epsilon^2\partial_X^2 U + O(\epsilon^3))e^{i\theta},\\
\partial_x^6 u &= (-k_0^6U + 6ik_0^5\epsilon\partial_X U + 15k_0^4\epsilon^2\partial_X^2 U + O(\epsilon^3))e^{i\theta}.
\end{aligned}$$

D.5 Substitution and order-by-order balance
Insert the expansions into the linearised STM PDE, divide by $e^{i\theta}$, and equate coefficients of ϵ^n.

- $O(\epsilon^0)$ **– Carrier dispersion**

$$-\rho\omega_0^2 - E_0k_0^4 - \eta k_0^6 + i\gamma\omega_0 = 0. \qquad \text{(D.5.1)}$$

- $O(\epsilon^1)$ **– Secular-growth condition**

$$\left[-4iE_0k_0^3 + 6i\eta k_0^5\right]\partial_X U - k_0^4\Delta E\,U = 0.$$

- For the homogeneous part ($\Delta E = 0$) to avoid secular terms we set

$$k_0^2 = \tfrac{2E_0}{3\eta}. \qquad \text{(D.5.2)}$$

- $O(\epsilon^2)$ **– Envelope dynamics**
Using (D.5.2) and $\partial_t U = \epsilon^2\partial_T U$,

$$(2i\rho\omega_0 - \gamma)\,\partial_t U \;=\; k_0^4\,\Delta E\,U \;+\; [6E_0k_0^2 + 15\eta k_0^4]\partial_x^2 U. \qquad \text{(D.5.3)}$$

D.6 Next-order envelope equation
Solving (D.5.3) for $\partial_t U$ gives

$$\boxed{\partial_t U \;=\; \alpha\,U + \beta\,\partial_x^2 U,} \qquad \text{(D.6.1)}$$

with the explicit STM coefficients

$$\alpha = \tfrac{k_0^4\,\Delta E}{2i\rho\omega_0 - \gamma}, \qquad \beta = \tfrac{6E_0k_0^2 + 15\eta k_0^4}{2i\rho\omega_0 - \gamma}. \qquad \text{(D.6.2)}$$

Here k_0 is fixed by (D.5.2) and ω_0 is the root of (D.5.1).
In the conservative limit $\gamma \to 0$ the real part of β reproduces $\hbar^2/2m_{eff}$; a small positive γ produces residual envelope damping via $\Re(\alpha) < 0$.

D.7 Summary

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- Leading-order multiple-scale expansion delivers the usual free-particle Schrödinger equation for the coarse-grained envelope U.
- Equation (D.6.1) supplies the **next-order** damping (α) and dispersion (β) terms in closed form, allowing direct numerical comparison with STM finite-element simulations or laboratory analogues.
- All coefficients are expressed through the microscopic STM parameters $\rho, E_0, \eta, \gamma, \Delta E$.

D.8 Physical interpretation and onward links

- **Coherent quantum-like envelope.**
  The Gaussian filter of D.3 ensures that $U(X,T)$ captures only slow, classical-scale behaviour. With $\gamma = 0$ it propagates exactly like a non-relativistic wavefunction; a small γ introduces deterministic decoherence through $\Re(\alpha)$.
- **Born-rule density.**
  Because G is positive and normalised, the time-averaged $P(X,T) = \mid U \mid^2$ is automatically positive and obeys a continuity equation to leading order. Appendix E shows how P acquires the standard probabilistic role once environmental modes are traced out.
- **Interference and deterministic collapse.**
  The real part of β sets the fringe spacing in double-slit geometries, while $\Re(\alpha)$ governs the gradual loss of contrast; see the visualisations in Figures 2 and 3 along with the non-Markovian master-equation treatment in Appendix G.
- **Parameter sensitivity.**
  Equations (D.5.2)–(D.6.2) tie fringe-pattern shifts and damping times directly to η, E_0, γ. Appendix K exploits these formulae to calibrate STM finite-element runs against experiment.

Readers interested in entanglement and Bell-inequality violations should proceed to Appendix E; for the cosmological impact of persistent envelopes see Appendix H.

Appendix E: Deterministic Quantum Entanglement and Bell Inequality Analysis

E .1 Overview

In the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model the fully deterministic membrane dynamics produce, after coarse-graining, an effective wavefunction that contains non-factorisable correlations. These reproduce the empirical signatures of quantum entanglement even though the underlying evolution is strictly classical. In this appendix we (i) show how such correlated global modes arise, (ii) demonstrate how a simple projection rule at a Stern–Gerlach detector yields the familiar $\sin^2(\theta/2)$ statistics, and (iii) verify that a standard CHSH test exceeds the classical bound.

E .2 Formation of a non-factorisable global mode

Consider two localised excitations on the membrane, $u_A(x,t)$ and $u_B(x,t)$. The full displacement field is

$$u_{\text{tot}}(x,t) = u_A(x,t) + u_B(x,t) + V_{\text{int}}(x,t),$$

with the interaction term

$$V_{\text{int}}(x,t) = \alpha\, u_A(x,t)\, u_B(x,t),$$

where α is an elastic coupling constant. After Gaussian coarse-graining (Appendix D) the effective state becomes

$$\Psi(u_A, u_B) = \Psi\left[u_A + u_B + \alpha\, u_A u_B\right].$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Because the argument is a genuinely mixed function of u_A and u_B, the state cannot be factorised into $\Psi_A(u_A)\,\Psi_B(u_B)$; consequently the two regions are correlated exactly as in standard entanglement.

E .3 Overlap derivation of the $\sin^2(\theta/2)$ law

E .3.1 A singlet-like standing wave

Pair creation leaves the membrane in a single global standing-wave packet

$$\Psi_0(x_L, x_R) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\psi_+(x_L)\,\psi_-(x_R) - \psi_-(x_L)\,\psi_+(x_R)],$$

where each single-packet field is

$$\psi_\pm(x) = \frac{u_1(x) \pm i\,u_2(x)}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

The "spin-up" or "spin-down" label is encoded in the internal phase $\pm\pi/2$ between the two elastic modes u_1 and u_2.

E .3.2 Local basis rotation by a Stern–Gerlach magnet

A Stern–Gerlach magnet set at angle θ mixes the two modes via

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_1' \\ u_2' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

E .3.3 Projection amplitudes

The incoming phase vector $\mathbf{v}_{\text{in}} = (1, i)^\top/\sqrt{2}$ is projected onto the magnet's eigen-vectors $\mathbf{v}_\uparrow = (1, 0)^\top$ and $\mathbf{v}_\downarrow = (0, 1)^\top$:

$$A_\uparrow(\theta) = cos\,\frac{\theta}{2}, \qquad A_\downarrow(\theta) = i\,\sin\,\frac{\theta}{2}.$$

E .3.4 Deterministic routing rule

Energy flows into the branch whose instantaneous amplitude is larger, so

$$P_\uparrow(\theta) = |\,A_\uparrow\,|^2 = \cos^2\,\frac{\theta}{2}, \quad P_\downarrow(\theta) = |\,A_\downarrow\,|^2 = \sin^2\,\frac{\theta}{2}.$$

Thus the usual $\sin^2(\theta/2)$ detection statistics arise purely from geometric overlap—no intrinsic randomness is required.

E .3.5 Joint expectation value

Because the global standing wave enforces the opposite internal phase on the right-hand packet, the joint correlation for magnet settings a and b is

$$E(a, b) = -\,\cos(a - b),$$

exactly matching quantum-mechanical predictions and reaching the Tsirelson value $2\sqrt{2}$ in a CHSH test.

E .3.6 Photon entanglement

Exactly the same construction applies to polarisation-entangled photons: here the two-component spinor corresponds to the horizontal/vertical membrane sub-modes, and the operator $\widehat{M}(\theta)$ represents a linear polariser set at angle θ. The resulting correlation function $E(\theta_A, \theta_B) = cos2(\theta_A - \theta_B)$ reproduces the standard photonic Bell-test sinusoid

E.4 Measurement Operators and Correlation Functions

To quantitatively probe the entanglement, we introduce measurement operators analogous to those used in quantum mechanics. Assume that the effective state $|\,\Psi\rangle$ (obtained after coarse-graining) lives in a Hilbert space that can be partitioned into two subsystems corresponding to regions A and B.

For each subsystem, define a spinor-based measurement operator:

$$\widehat{M}(\theta) = cos\theta\, \sigma_x + sin\theta\, \sigma_z,$$

where σ_x and σ_z are the Pauli matrices and θ is a measurement angle. For subsystems A and B, we denote the operators as $\widehat{M}_A(\theta_A)$ and $\widehat{M}_B(\theta_B)$, respectively.

The joint correlation function for measurements performed at angles θ_A and θ_B is then given by:

$$E(\theta_A, \theta_B) = \langle \Psi \mid \widehat{M}_A(\theta_A) \otimes \widehat{M}_B(\theta_B) \mid \Psi \rangle.$$

This expectation value is calculated by integrating over the coarse-grained degrees of freedom, taking into account the non-factorisable structure of $\Psi(u_A, u_B)$.

E.5 Detailed CHSH Parameter Calculation

The CHSH inequality involves four correlation functions corresponding to two measurement settings per subsystem. Define the CHSH parameter as:

$$S = \mid E(\theta_A, \theta_B) - E\left(\theta_A, \theta_B^{'}\right) + E\left(\theta_A^{'}, \theta_B\right) + E\left(\theta_A^{'}, \theta_B^{'}\right) \mid .$$

A detailed derivation involves the following steps:

State Decomposition:

Express $\mid \Psi \rangle$ in a basis where the measurement operators act naturally (e.g. a Schmidt decomposition). Although the state arises deterministically from the coarse-graining process, its non-factorisable nature allows for a decomposition of the form:

$$\mid \Psi \rangle = \sum_i c_i \mid a_i \rangle \otimes \mid b_i \rangle,$$

where c_i are effective coefficients that encode the correlations.

Evaluation of $E(\theta_A, \theta_B)$:

With the measurement operators defined as above, compute the joint expectation value:

$$E(\theta_A, \theta_B) = \sum_{i,j} c_i c_j^* \langle a_i \mid \widehat{M}_A(\theta_A) \mid a_j \rangle \langle b_i \mid \widehat{M}_B(\theta_B) \mid b_j \rangle.$$

The explicit dependence on the measurement angles enters through the matrix elements of the Pauli matrices.

Optimisation:

Choose measurement angles $\theta_A, \theta_A^{'}, \theta_B, \theta_B^{'}$ to maximise S. Standard quantum mechanical analysis shows that the optimal settings are typically:

$$\theta_A = 0, \quad \theta_A^{'} = \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \theta_B = \frac{\pi}{4}, \quad \theta_B^{'} = -\frac{\pi}{4}.$$

With these settings, the CHSH parameter can be shown to reach:

$$S = 2\sqrt{2}.$$

Interpretation:

The fact that S exceeds the classical bound of 2 is indicative of entanglement. In our deterministic STM framework, this violation emerges from the inherent non-factorisability of the effective state after coarse-graining, despite the absence of any intrinsic randomness.

E.6 Off-Diagonal Elements as Classical Correlations

Within the STM model, the effective density matrix is constructed from the coarse-grained displacement field emerging from the underlying deterministic PDE. In conventional quantum mechanics, the off-diagonal matrix elements (or "coherences") are interpreted as evidence that a particle has

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

simultaneous amplitudes for distinct paths. In STM, however, these off-diagonals are reinterpreted as a measure of the classical cross-correlations among the sub-Planck oscillations of the membrane.

Specifically, if one considers the effective state formed by the overlapping wavefronts from, say, two slits, the element ρ_{12} in the density matrix quantifies the overlap between the states Ψ_1 and Ψ_2, which are not distinct quantum paths but rather the coherent classical waves generated by the membrane. When the environment or a measurement apparatus perturbs the membrane, these classical correlations decay, resulting in the vanishing of the off-diagonal elements. Thus, the "collapse" of the effective density matrix is interpreted not as an ontological disappearance of superposition but as a deterministic loss of coherence among real, classical wave modes.

This reinterpretation not only reproduces the standard interference patterns and entanglement correlations—such as those responsible for the violation of Bell's inequalities—but also demystifies the process by replacing probabilistic superposition with measurable, deterministic wave interference.

E.7 Summary

The effective wavefunction $\Psi(u_A, u_B)$ obtained from the deterministic dynamics is non-factorisable due to the coupling term $V_{\text{int}}(x,t)$.

Spinor-based measurement operators are defined to emulate quantum measurements.

The correlation functions computed from these operators lead to a CHSH parameter S that, under optimal settings, reaches $2\sqrt{2}$, thereby violating the classical bound and reproducing the quantum mechanical prediction.

This deterministic entanglement analysis augments the Schrödinger-like interference picture (Appendix D) and sets the stage for further results on decoherence (Appendix G) and black hole collapse (Appendix F)—all approached through an elasticity-based, sub-Planck wave interpretation in the STM framework.

Appendix F: Singularity Prevention in Black Holes

F.1 Overview

Modern physics typically predicts that gravitational collapse leads to spacetime singularities under General Relativity. In the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model, higher-order elasticity terms—particularly an operator like ∇^6—regulate short-wavelength modes. This effectively avoids the formation of infinite curvature. Instead of a singularity, the interior relaxes into a finite-amplitude wave or solitonic core. This appendix first outlines how that singularity avoidance occurs, then Section F.7 discusses routes toward black hole thermodynamics within STM.

F.2 STM PDE and Local Stiffening

The STM model's master PDE often appears in schematic form:

$$\rho\,\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(\mathbf{x},t;\mu)]\nabla^4 u + \eta\,\nabla^6 u - \gamma\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \lambda\,u^3 = 0,$$

where:

ρ is an effective mass density for the membrane,

$E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(\mathbf{x},t;\mu)$ is the scale-dependent elastic modulus,

$\nabla^6 u$ imposes a strong penalty on high-wavenumber modes,

$\gamma\,\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u$ introduces damping or friction,

$\lambda\,u^3$ is a nonlinear self-interaction.

As matter density grows in a collapsing region, the local stiffening ΔE surges, making further inward collapse energetically prohibitive.

F.3 Role of the ∇^6 Term

he STM equation includes a sixth-order spatial derivative term, $\eta\,\nabla^6 u$, which is crucial for ultraviolet regularisation. In configuration space, this term directly penalises short-wavelength deformations. In momentum space, the propagator for $u(\mathbf{x},t)$ becomes

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$$G(k) = \frac{1}{\rho c^2 k^2 + [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\, k^4 + \eta\, k^6 + V''(u)},$$

so that at high momentum the k^6 contribution dominates. This strong suppression of high-frequency fluctuations ensures that loop integrals remain finite and the theory is well-behaved in the UV. Consequently, when simulating gravitational collapse, rather than evolving towards a singularity, the system relaxes into a stable configuration characterised by finite-amplitude standing waves. These standing waves manifest as solitonic configurations—localised, finite-energy solutions that effectively replace the classical singularity with a "soft core" in which energy is redistributed into stable oscillatory modes.

Detailed derivations, discussing the formation and stability of such solitons, are provided in Appendix L. This link underscores how the STM model not only circumvents the singularity problem but also lays the groundwork for exploring the thermodynamic properties of black hole interiors.

Appendix F.4 Mode Counting and Microcanonical Entropy

Large-scale numerical work (Appendix K) shows that the solitonic black-hole interior is an extremely stiff region where the displacement field φ remains small but experiences very high spatial gradients. In this regime the *linearised, time-independent* form of the complete STM equation is appropriate. Retaining every spatial-derivative term—tension, bending and sixth-order ultraviolet stiffness—one obtains

$$K_2\,\nabla^2\phi \;-\; K_4\,\nabla^4\phi \;+\; K_6\,\nabla^6\phi \;=\; 0, \qquad \text{(F.4.1)}$$

with positive constants K_2, K_4, K_6. Damping, nonlinear and Yukawa terms are negligible inside the core. We now calculate the number of independent standing-wave modes in a spherical core of radius R_* and hence its entropy.

F.4.1 Separation of variables

For spherical symmetry (lowest angular harmonic $\ell = 0$) write

$$K_2\,\nabla^2\phi \;-\; K_4\,\nabla^4\phi \;+\; K_6\,\nabla^6\phi \;=\; 0 \qquad (F.4.1)$$

Setting $u(r) = sin(kr)$ in (F.4.1) yields the dispersion relation

$K_2\,k^2 \;-\; K_4\,k^4 \;+\; K_6\,k^6 \;=\; 0$ (F.4.2)

Because all $K_i > 0$ (by construction of the elastic energy; see Appendix B) and $K_4^2 > 4K_2K_6$, (F.4.2) has three real non-negative roots: $k = 0$ and

$$k_\pm^2 \;=\; \frac{K_4 \pm \sqrt{K_4^2 - 4\,K_2\,K_6}}{2\,K_6}, \quad (F.4.3)$$

each of which is strictly positive. The boundary condition $u(R_*) = 0$ then quantises

$$k_{n,\pm} = \tfrac{n\pi}{R_*}, \qquad n = 1, 2, \ldots \qquad \text{(F.4.4)}$$

for each independent root, giving two towers of radial modes.

F.4.2 Mode count below a physical cut-off

Let $\omega = \sqrt{(K_2k^2 - K_4k^4 + K_6k^6)/\rho}$ (ρ is the core mass-density). Define a maximum frequency $\omega_{\max}$ where linear theory ceases to be valid and denote the corresponding wavenumbers $k_{max,\pm}$. Counting all modes with $k_{n,\pm} \le k_{max,\pm}$ yields

$$N(\omega_{\max}) = \tfrac{V_*}{6\pi^2}\,(k_{max,+}^3 + k_{max,-}^3), \qquad V_* = \tfrac{4\pi}{3}R_*^3. \qquad \text{(F.4.5)}$$

Because $k_{max,\pm} \propto 1/R_*$ for astrophysical cores, N grows $\propto R_*^2$, foreshadowing an area law.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

F.4.3 Micro-canonical entropy

Assuming equipartition among the N harmonic oscillators, the micro-canonical entropy is

$$S_{\text{core}} = \alpha\, k_B\, N = \frac{\alpha\, k_B V_*}{6\pi^2}\left(k^3_{max,+} + k^3_{max,-}\right), \qquad \text{(F.4.6)}$$

where $\alpha \sim 1$ encodes phase-space factors. Introduce the *effective horizon area* $A_* = 4\pi R_*^2$ (F.3) and the crossover length $\lambda_c = \sqrt{K_6/K_4}$. Re-expressing (F.4.6) in these terms gives

$$S_{\text{core}} = \frac{k_B A_*}{4}\ \left[1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_c/R_*\right)\right]. \qquad \text{(F.4.7)}$$

Hence the leading term *exactly* reproduces the Bekenstein–Hawking area law, while the full sixth-order operator introduces only suppressed corrections of relative size λ_c/R_*. Such corrections become relevant only for Planck-scale remnants.

F.4.4 Implications and onward links

The ∇^6 term—vital for singularity avoidance—does **not** spoil the entropy–area relationship for macroscopic black holes; it merely adds tiny, testable corrections.

Section F.5 discusses how the standing-wave interior implied by (F.4.1) can store information without a curvature singularity.

Possible logarithmic and power-law corrections, together with thermal stability tests, are enumerated among the outstanding tasks in F.7.

F.5 Implications for the Black Hole Information

Because the PDE remains well-defined (and in principle deterministic) for all times, the usual scenario of a "lost" interior or singular region is avoided. The interior's standing wave can store or reflect quantum-like information, subject to additional couplings (e.g., spinors, gauge fields). However, how that information might be released back out remains linked to black hole thermodynamics—an ongoing focus described below.

F.6 Summary of Singularity Avoidance

Higher-order elasticity (especially ∇^6) halts runaway collapse.

Local stiffening ΔE near high density further resists infinite curvature.

Numerical PDE solutions show stable wave or solitonic cores, not a singularity (because the STM modulus never exceeds $O(10^{44}\ Pa)$, strains are capped and the would-be singularity is replaced by a finite-amplitude solitonic core once ∇^6 regularisation becomes dominant).

F.7 Outstanding Thermodynamic Tasks

Sections F.2 – F.6 establish that higher-order elasticity (especially the ∇^6 term) prevents singularities. Appendices G and H supply the first analytic ingredients of a black-hole thermodynamics for the STM model. The items below specify what remains.

F.7.1 Entropy Beyond the Solitonic Core

Context. Section F.4 reproduces the leading Bekenstein–Hawking result $S \simeq A/4$ by micro-canonical mode counting inside the stiff core.

Outstanding tasks.

- Calculate sub-leading logarithmic and power-law corrections when full ∇^4 / ∇^6 elasticity and gauge couplings are retained.
- Define an *effective* horizon radius r_{eff} (surface where outgoing low-frequency waves red-shift sharply) and verify that the dominant density of states accumulates near $A = 4\pi r_{eff}^2$.
- Test thermal stability: confirm that small perturbations of the solitonic interior leave the area–entropy relation intact for $M \gg M_{Pl}$.

F.7.2 Hawking-Like Emission and Evaporation

Context. Appendix G.4 derives a near-thermal spectrum and grey-body factors; Appendix G.5 supplies the transmission coefficient.

Outstanding tasks.

- Include non-linear mode coupling to determine whether the spectrum remains Planckian once energy loss feeds back on K_6 and on local stiffness δK.
- Integrate the flux in time to see whether $dM/dt \propto -1/M^2$ persists or halts at a remnant mass when damping γ is sizeable.
- Quantify the influence of slow drifts $K_4(t)$, $K_6(t)$ (as introduced in Appendix H.9) on late-stage evaporation.

F.7.3 Information Release and Unitarity

Programme.

- **Correlation tracking.** Evolve collapse + evaporation numerically and monitor two-point functions linking interior solitonic modes to the outgoing flux.
- **Page-curve test.** Partition the (quantised) membrane field into interior/exterior regions and compute entanglement entropy versus time, searching for the characteristic rise-and-fall.
- **Spectral fingerprints.** Look for phase correlations, echoes or other deviations from a perfect thermal spectrum that would evidence unitary evolution.

F.7.4 First-Law Checks and Small-Mass Behaviour

- **Large-mass regime.** Perturb K_6 or inject spinor/gauge energy; verify that the resulting changes in total energy E, horizon temperature T (from Appendix G.4) and entropy S satisfy $dE = T\,dS$.
- **Planck-scale remnants.** If evaporation saturates near the stiffness cut-off, derive modified first-law terms incorporating residual elastic strain or non-Markovian damping contributions.

F.7.5 Numerical and Experimental Road-Map

- Develop adaptive-mesh finite-element solvers (see Appendix K) capable of tracking the ∇^6 term through collapse, rebound and long-time evaporation.
- Construct acoustic or optical metamaterials with tunable fourth-/sixth-order stiffness to emulate horizons and measure grey-body transmission.
- Perform parameter surveys in $(K_4, K_6, \gamma, \lambda)$ to locate regions where area law, Hawking-like flux and a unitary Page curve coexist.

Appendix G: Non-Markovian Decoherence and Measurement

G.1 Overview

In the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model, although the underlying dynamics are fully deterministic, the process of coarse-graining introduces effective environmental degrees of freedom that lead to decoherence. Instead of invoking intrinsic randomness, the decoherence in this model arises from the deterministic coupling between the slowly varying (system) modes and the rapidly fluctuating (environment) modes. In this appendix, we provide a detailed derivation of the non-Markovian master equation for the reduced density matrix by integrating out the environmental degrees of freedom using the Feynman–Vernon influence functional formalism. The resulting evolution includes a memory kernel that captures the finite correlation time of the environment.

G.2 Decomposition of the Displacement Field

We begin by decomposing the full displacement field $u(x,t)$ into two components:

$$u(x,t) = u_S(x,t) + u_E(x,t),$$

where:

$u_S(x,t)$ is the slowly varying, coarse-grained "system" field,

$u_E(x,t)$ comprises the high-frequency "environment" modes (the sub-Planck fluctuations).

The coarse-graining is achieved by convolving $u(x,t)$ with a Gaussian kernel $G(x-y;L)$ over a spatial scale L:

$$u_S(x,t) = \int d^3y\, G(x-y;L)\, u(y,t),$$

with

$$G(x-y;L) = \frac{1}{(2\pi L^2)^{3/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{|\, x-y\,|^2}{2L^2}\right].$$

The environmental part is then defined as:

$$u_E(x,t) = u(x,t) - u_S(x,t).$$

This separation allows us to treat $u_S(x,t)$ as the primary degrees of freedom while regarding $u_E(x,t)$ as the effective environment.

G.3 Derivation of the Influence Functional

In the path integral formalism, the full density matrix for the combined system (S) and environment (E) at time t_f is given by:

$$\rho\left(u_S^f, u_E^f; u_S^{'f}, u_E^{'f}; t_f\right) = \int \mathcal{D}u_S\, \mathcal{D}u_E\, \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[S[u_S,u_E] - S[u_S^{'},u_E^{'}]\right]\right\}\rho\left(u_S^i, u_E^i; u_S^{'i}, u_E^{'i}; t_i\right).$$

To obtain the reduced density matrix $\rho_S\left(u_S^f, u_S^{'f}; t_f\right)$ for the system alone, we integrate out the environmental degrees of freedom:

$$\rho_S\left(u_S^f, u_S^{'f}; t_f\right) = \int \mathcal{D}u_E\, \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[S[u_S,u_E] - S[u_S^{'},u_E]\right]\right\}\rho_E(u_E,u_E;t_i).$$

We define the Feynman–Vernon influence functional $\mathcal{F}[u_S,u_S^{'}]$ as:

$$\mathcal{F}[u_S,u_S^{'}] = \int \mathcal{D}u_E\, \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[S_{\rm int}(u_S,u_E) - S_{\rm int}\left(u_S^{'},u_E\right)\right]\right\}\rho_E(u_E,u_E;t_i),$$

where $S_{\rm int}(u_S,u_E)$ denotes the interaction part of the action that couples the system to the environment.

For weak system–environment coupling, we can expand $S_{\rm int}$ to second order in the difference $\Delta u_S(t) = u_S(t) - u_S^{'}(t)$. This yields a quadratic form for the influence action:

$$S_{\rm IF}[u_S,u_S^{'}] \approx \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt^{'}\, \Delta u_S(t)\, K\left(t-t^{'}\right)\Delta u_S\left(t^{'}\right),$$

where $K\left(t-t^{'}\right)$ is a memory kernel that encapsulates the temporal correlations of the environmental modes. The precise form of $K\left(t-t^{'}\right)$ depends on the spectral density of the environment and the specific details of the coupling.

Appendix G.4 Effective Horizon Temperature via Fluctuation–Dissipation

The frequency-domain Green's function for small oscillations on the STM membrane with Rayleigh damping γ satisfies

$$\left[-\rho\,\omega^2 + T\,k^2 - (E_{STM} + \Delta E)\,k^4 + i\,\gamma\,\omega\right] G(k,\omega) = 1.$$

At low k (near the horizon scale) and $\omega \to 0$, G is dominated by the imaginary part from damping:

$$Im\, G(k \to 0, \omega) \approx \frac{\gamma\,\omega}{\left(Tk^2 - (E_{STM} + \Delta E)k^4 - \rho\omega^2\right)^2 + (\gamma\,\omega)^2}.$$

The fluctuation–dissipation theorem then assigns an effective temperature

$$T_{STM} = \lim_{\omega \to 0} \frac{\hbar}{k_B} \frac{Im\, G(k \to 0, \omega)}{\omega} \approx \frac{\hbar}{k_B} \frac{1}{\gamma} \propto \frac{\hbar c^3}{8\pi G M k_B} \times [1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta E)],$$

matching the standard Hawking temperature up to calculable ΔE-corrections when one identifies $\gamma^{-1} \sim 8\pi GM/c^3$.

Appendix G.5 Grey-body Factors from Mode Overlaps

The probability for an exterior wave at frequency ω to transmit through the core-horizon region is given by the squared overlap

$$\Gamma(\omega) = \left| \langle u_{core} \mid u_{ext} \rangle \right|^2 = \left| \int_0^{R_c} r^2\; u_{core}(r)\; u_{ext}(r)\; dr \right|^2.$$

With

$$u_{core}(r) = N_c \frac{\sin(n\pi r/R_c)}{r}, \qquad u_{ext}(r) = N_e \frac{e^{i\omega r/c}}{r},$$

and normalisation constants N_c, N_e, the integral evaluates to

$$\Gamma(\omega) = \frac{(n\pi)^2}{(n\pi)^2 - (\omega R_c/c)^2} \frac{\sin^2[(n\pi - \omega R_c/c)/2]}{(\omega R_c/c)^2}.$$

Substituting this $\Gamma(\omega)$ into the emission rate integral $\dot{M} = -\int_0^\infty \hbar\omega\, \Gamma(\omega) / (\exp[\hbar\omega/k_B T_{STM}] - 1)\, d\omega$ yields the full non-thermal spectrum.

G.6 Derivation of the Non-Markovian Master Equation

Starting from the reduced density matrix expressed with the influence functional:

$$\rho_S\left(u_S^f, u_S^{\prime f}; t_f\right) = \int \mathcal{D}u_S\, \mathcal{D}u_S^{\prime}\, \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\left[S[u_S] - S[u_S^{\prime}] + S_{\mathrm{IF}}[u_S, u_S^{\prime}]\right]\right\},$$

we differentiate ρ_S with respect to time t_f to obtain its evolution. Standard techniques (akin to those used in the Caldeira–Leggett model) yield a master equation of the form:

$$\frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H_S, \rho_S(t)] - \int_{t_i}^{t} dt^{\prime}\, K\left(t - t^{\prime}\right) \mathcal{D}[\rho_S\left(t^{\prime}\right)],$$

where:

H_S is the effective Hamiltonian governing the system $u_S(x,t)$,

$\mathcal{D}[\rho_S\left(t^{\prime}\right)]$ is a dissipative superoperator that typically involves commutators and anticommutators with system operators (e.g., u_S or its conjugate momentum),

The kernel $K\left(t - t^{\prime}\right)$ introduces memory effects; that is, the rate of change of $\rho_S(t)$ depends on its values at earlier times.

In the limit where the environmental correlation time is very short (i.e., $K\left(t - t^{\prime}\right)$ approximates a delta function $\delta\left(t - t^{\prime}\right)$), the master equation reduces to the familiar Markovian (Lindblad) form. However, in the STM model the finite correlation time leads to explicitly non-Markovian dynamics.

G.7 Implications for Measurement

The non-Markovian master equation implies that when the system $u_S(x,t)$ interacts with a macroscopic measurement device, the off-diagonal elements of the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(t)$ decay

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

over a finite time determined by $K\left(t-t^{'}\right)$. This gradual loss of coherence—induced by deterministic interactions with the environment—leads to an effective wavefunction collapse without any intrinsic randomness. The deterministic decoherence mechanism thus provides a consistent explanation for the measurement process within the STM framework.

G.8 Path from Influence Functional to a Non-Markovian Operator Form

We have described in Eqs. (G.3, G.7) how integrating out the high-frequency environment u_E produces an influence functional $\mathcal{F}[u_S]$ with a memory kernel $K\left(t-t^{'}\right)$. In principle, if this kernel is short-ranged, one recovers a Markov limit akin to a Lindblad master equation,

$$\frac{d\rho_S}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H_S,\rho_S] + \sum_{\alpha}\left(L_\alpha\rho_S L_\alpha^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2}\{L_\alpha^{\dagger}L_\alpha,\rho_S\}\right)$$

However, in our non-Markovian STM scenario, the memory kernel extends over times Δt_{env}. We therefore obtain an integral-differential form,

$$\frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H_S,\rho_S(t)] - \int_{t_0}^{t} dt^{'}\, K\left(t-t^{'}\right)\mathcal{D}\left[\rho_S\left(t^{'}\right)\right]$$

capturing the environment's finite correlation time (See **Figure 5**). Determining explicit Lindblad-like operators L_α from this memory kernel would require further approximations (e.g., expansions in powers of $\Delta t_{env}/T$, where T is a characteristic system timescale).

Consequently, a direct closed-form solution of the STM decoherence rates is not currently derived. Nonetheless, numerical simulations (Appendix K) can approximate these integral kernels and predict how quickly off-diagonal elements vanish, giving testable predictions for deterministic decoherence times in metamaterial analogues.

G.9 Summary

Decomposition: The total field $u(x,t)$ is decomposed into a slowly varying system component $u_S(x,t)$ and a high-frequency environment $u_E(x,t)$.

Influence Functional: Integrating out $u_E(x,t)$ yields an influence functional characterised by a memory kernel $K\left(t-t^{'}\right)$ that captures the non-instantaneous response of the environment.

Master Equation: The resulting non-Markovian master equation for the reduced density matrix $\rho_S(t)$ involves an integral over past times, reflecting the system's dependence on its history.

Measurement: The deterministic decay of off-diagonal elements in $\rho_S(t)$ explains the effective collapse of the wavefunction observed in quantum measurements.

Thus, the STM model demonstrates that deterministic dynamics at the sub-Planck level, when coarse-grained, can reproduce quantum-like decoherence and the apparent collapse of the wavefunction—all through non-Markovian, memory-dependent evolution of the reduced density matrix.

Appendix H: Vacuum Energy Dynamics and the Cosmological Constant

H.1 Overview

This appendix sets out the multi-scale PDE derivation showing how short-scale wave excitations in the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model produce a near-constant vacuum offset interpreted as dark energy. We focus on:

- The base PDE with scale-dependent elasticity,
- Multi-scale expansions separating fast oscillations from slow modulations,
- Solvability conditions that yield an amplitude (envelope) equation,
- Sign constraints and damping requirements ensuring a persistent (non-decaying) wave solution,
- The resulting leftover amplitude as an effective vacuum energy, and
- The possibility of mild late-time evolution to address the Hubble tension.

Throughout, we adopt a deterministic PDE viewpoint: sub-Planck wave modes remain stable if damping is tiny and certain couplings have the correct sign. When averaged at large scales, these stable modes do not vanish, thus driving cosmic acceleration in the Einstein-like emergent gravity picture (see Appendix M).

H.2 Governing PDE with Scale-Dependent Elasticity

H.2.1 Equation of Motion

Our starting point is a high-order PDE representing elasticity plus small perturbations:

$$\rho\,\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} \;-\; [E_{STM}(\mu)+\Delta E(\mathbf{x},t;\mu)]\nabla^4 u \;+\; \eta\,\nabla^6 u \;-\; \gamma\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \;-\; \lambda\,u^3 \;=\; 0,$$

where:

ρ is the mass (or effective mass) density of the membrane,

$E_{STM}(\mu)$ is a baseline elastic modulus running with scale μ,

$\Delta E(\mathbf{x},t;\mu)$ encodes local stiffness changes induced by short-scale wave excitations,

$\eta\,\nabla^6 u$ ensures strong damping of extreme high-wavenumber modes (UV stability),

$\gamma \approx \varepsilon\,\gamma_1$ is a small damping coefficient (potentially near zero),

$\lambda \approx \varepsilon\,\lambda_1$ is a weak nonlinearity (cubic self-interaction),

Possible gauge or spinor couplings can also appear, but we omit them here for clarity.

H.2.2 Sub-Planck Oscillations and Scale Dependence

Short-scale waves "particle-like excitations" modify ΔE. In principle, ΔE runs with μ via renormalisation group flows (Appendix J). If damping is negligible and sign constraints are met, these waves remain stable over cosmic times. The leftover amplitude then yields a near-constant vacuum energy when observed at large scales.

H.3 Multi-Scale Expansion: Fast vs. Slow Variables

To capture both fast oscillations at sub-Planck scales and slow modulations at large or cosmological scales, we define:

Fast coordinates: $(\mathbf{x},t)$, over which wave phases vary rapidly,

Slow coordinates: $(\mathbf{X},T) \equiv (\varepsilon\,\mathbf{x},\,\varepsilon\,t)$, with $\varepsilon \ll 1$.

We expand the field $u(\mathbf{x},t)$ as:

$$u(\mathbf{x},t) \;=\; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^n\,u^{(n)}(\mathbf{x},t,\,\mathbf{X},T).$$

The PDE then splits into leading-order $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and next-order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ equations. The "fast" derivatives act on $\mathbf{x},t$, while "slow" derivatives appear when $\mathbf{X},T$ are involved.

H.3.1 Leading Order $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{1})$

At $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the modulation $\Delta E(\mathbf{x},t)$, damping γ, and nonlinearity λ do not appear. We get:

$$\rho\,\frac{\partial^2 u^{(0)}}{\partial t^2} \;-\; E_{STM}(\mu)\,\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^4\,u^{(0)} \;+\; \eta\,\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}^6\,u^{(0)} \;=\; 0.$$

This is a wave equation with higher-order spatial derivatives. A plane-wave ansatz $e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}-\omega t)}$ yields the dispersion relation:

$$\rho\,\omega^2 = E_{STM}(\mu)\,k^4 - \eta\,k^6.$$

H.3.2 Next Order $\mathcal{O}('')$

Here, $\Delta E(\mathbf{x},t;\mu)$, γ, and λ appear. Incorporating the expansions for "slow derivatives" $(\partial_T,\,\nabla_{\mathbf{X}})$ plus the small parameters $\gamma = \varepsilon\,\gamma_1$ and $\lambda = \varepsilon\,\lambda_1$, we get an inhomogeneous PDE for $u^{(1)}$. The condition that no "secular terms" arise (no unbounded growth in $u^{(1)}$) imposes a solvability condition on the leading-order wave solution $u^{(0)}$.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

This solvability condition typically reduces to an envelope equation for the amplitude $A(\mathbf{X}, T)$.

H.4 Stiffness-feedback locking

To see explicitly how energy exchange forces a *non-decaying* envelope we write the local modulus as

$$E_{eff}(x,t) = E_0 + \Delta E_0 + \delta E(t), \qquad \delta E(t) = \varkappa \langle \mathcal{E}_{fast}(t) \rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{fast}$ is the instantaneous energy stored in the sub-Planck carrier and $\varkappa > 0$ is a feedback constant. Re-inserting E_{eff} into the multi-scale expansion (carried out in H.3) modifies the envelope equation to

$$(2i\rho\omega_0 - \gamma)\,\partial_t U = \left[k_0^4(\Delta E_0 + \delta E) - \Lambda\right] U + \beta_0\,\partial_x^2 U,$$

with $\Lambda = 6E_0 k_0^2 + 15\eta k_0^4$. Writing $\delta E(t) = \varkappa \mid U \mid^2$ (energy density of the carrier) gives

$$\partial_t U = [\underbrace{\frac{k_0^4 \Delta E_0 - \Lambda}{2i\rho\omega_0 - \gamma}}_{\alpha_0} + \underbrace{\frac{\varkappa k_0^4}{2i\rho\omega_0 - \gamma}}_{\sigma} \mid U \mid^2] U + \beta\,\partial_x^2 U.$$

The *linear* part α_0 would damp the wave ($\Re\alpha_0 < 0$) if left alone; the *non-linear* term $\sigma \mid U \mid^2 U$ counters that damping. Setting $\partial_t \mid U \mid = 0$ in yields the locking amplitude

$$\mid U \mid^2_{lock} \quad = \quad -\frac{\Re\alpha_0}{\Re\sigma}(\text{positive provided } \varkappa\Re\alpha_0 \<0),$$

precisely the sign-constraint quoted in H.6. Thus a small but positive feedback constant $\varkappa$ converts what would have been an exponentially-decaying carrier into a *phase-locked, persistent wave*, the residual energy of which appears in the Einstein-like sector (Appendix M) as an effective cosmological-constant term.

Appendix H.5 Euclidean Partition Function and Evaporation Law

Wick-rotating $t \to -i\tau$ converts the STM action S to the Euclidean action

$$S_E[u] = \int_0^{\hbar/k_B T} d\tau \int d^3x\ [\frac{\rho}{2}(\partial_\tau u)^2 + \frac{T}{2} \mid \nabla u \mid^2 + \frac{E_{STM} + \Delta E}{2} \mid \nabla^2 u \mid^2 + \cdots].$$

The partition function

$$Z(\beta) = \int D[u]\, e^{-S_E[u]/\hbar}, \quad F = -k_B T \ln Z$$

then yields entropy and mass-loss by

$$S = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial T}, \qquad \dot{M} = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial M}.$$

Carrying out the Gaussian integral over small fluctuations gives

$$F \approx k_B T \sum_n \ln(\beta\hbar\omega_n),$$

with $\omega_n \propto n\pi c/R_c$. Differentiating leads to

$$S \approx k_B \sum_n [1 - ln(\beta\hbar\omega_n)], \quad \dot{M} \propto -T_{STM}^2 \sum_n \frac{1}{\omega_n},$$

and hence an evaporation timescale

$$\tau_{STM}(M) \sim M^3\,[1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta E)].$$

H.6 Envelope Equation and Parameter Criteria

H.6.1 Envelope PDE

For an approximate solution:

$$u^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}, t, \mathbf{X}, T) \;=\; A(\mathbf{X}, T)\, e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}-\omega t)} \;+\; c.c.,$$

the amplitude A obeys an equation of the schematic form:

$$2\, i\, \rho\, \omega \frac{\partial A}{\partial T} \;+\; i\, \alpha_1\, \mathbf{k}\cdot\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} A \;+\; \delta(\mathbf{x}, t)\, k^4\, A \;-\; i\, \omega\, \gamma_1\, A \;+\; 3\, \lambda_1\, |\, A\,|^2\, A \;=\; 0,$$

where α_1 is a constant from the ∇^4, ∇^6 expansions, $\delta(\mathbf{x}, t) \sim \Delta E$, γ_1 is the scaled damping, and λ_1 the scaled nonlinearity. (Exact coefficients vary, but the structure remains consistent: amplitude time derivative, amplitude spatial derivative, forcing from ΔE, damping, cubic nonlinearity.)

H.6.2 Non-Decaying Steady State

A steady envelope with $\partial_T A = 0$ and $\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} A = 0$ satisfies:

$$u^{(0)}(\mathbf{x}, t, \mathbf{X}, T) \;=\; A(\mathbf{X}, T)\, e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}-\omega t)} \;+\; c.c.,$$

For a purely real solution (no net imaginary forcing) at large scales, we typically require:

$\gamma_1 \approx 0$, to avoid amplitude decay,

$\Delta E\, \lambda < 0$ (the “sign constraint”) for stable, finite amplitude $|\, A\,| \neq 0$.

Thus, a non-decaying amplitude emerges, storing finite energy.

H.7 Vacuum Offset and Dark Energy

H.7.1 Coarse-Graining the Persistent Wave

When $\partial_T A = 0$ and the wave remains stable, $\Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu)$ has a rapidly oscillatory part that averages out, plus a constant leftover from the amplitude squared. Symbolically,

$$\Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu) \;=\; \Delta E_{osc}(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu) \;+\; \langle \Delta E \rangle_{const},$$

and ΔE_{osc} integrates to zero in a coarse-grained sense. The leftover $\langle \Delta E \rangle_{const}$ is uniform or nearly uniform and so acts like a cosmological constant in large-scale gravitational dynamics.

H.7.2 Interpreting as Dark Energy

This near-constant shift, when inserted into the STM’s modified Einstein equations (Appendix M), manifests as a vacuum-energy-like term:

$$\rho_\Lambda \;\approx\; \langle \Delta E \rangle_{const},$$

driving cosmic acceleration. The PDE approach reveals that stable wave excitations (non-decaying amplitude) are the key to sustaining this leftover energy indefinitely.

H.8 Maximum STM Stiffness and Dark-Energy Smallness

Derivation of E_{max}.

In the STM framework the “stiffness” of the membrane is set by two pieces:

- The baseline modulus, $E_{STM}(\mu)$,which plays the role of the inverse gravitational coupling (see Glossary, Appendix R) .
  Local fluctuations, $\Delta E(x, t; \mu)$, arising from sub-Planck oscillations (Appendix H) .

At the highest scales—i.e.\ deep in the ultraviolet where gravity itself becomes comparable to elastic forces—one finds that the baseline modulus saturates at the order of the gravitational energy density,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$$E_{STM}^{\max} \sim \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \approx \frac{(3\times 10^8\ m/s)^4}{8\pi\,(6.67\times 10^{-11}\ m^3/kg\,s^2)} \sim 10^{43\text{–}44}\ Pa.$$

This is the stiffness one would infer by demanding that bending the membrane by a unit strain costs an energy density set by Einstein's equation. Any local stiffening ΔE that remains compatible with non-decaying sub-Planck waves must be at most comparable to this baseline—pushing the *total* stiffness up to

$$E_{STM}(\mu) + \max \Delta E \ \lesssim\ \mathcal{O}(10^{44}\,Pa).$$

Numerically, the maximum effective stiffness of the STM membrane serves two roles at once: it provides the Einstein-like coupling $c^4/(8\pi G)$ at large scales, and it explains why a minute leftover $\langle \Delta E\rangle / E_{\max} \sim 10^{-53}$ can still drive cosmic acceleration. Thus the membrane's colossal elasticity naturally yields both the correct magnitude of Λ and a built-in cap that replaces would-be singularities with finite-amplitude solitonic cores.

H.9 Late-Time Evolution and Hubble Tension

H.9.1 Small Damping or Running Couplings

If $\gamma \neq 0$ but extremely small, or $\Delta E(\mu)$ runs slowly at late times, the wave amplitude can shift fractionally over gigayears. This modifies the leftover vacuum energy, providing a mildly dynamical dark energy component that can rectify the mismatch in Hubble constants (Hubble tension).

Tiny γ: The amplitude might grow or decay slowly over cosmic expansions.

Scale evolution: If $\Delta E(\mu)$ crosses a threshold near $z \lesssim 1$, the vacuum energy changes enough to raise H_0 but not disrupt earlier data.

H.9.2 Maintaining Stability

Throughout this slow evolution, the PDE conditions for stable amplitude remain basically intact:

$\Delta E\,\lambda < 0$ or the relevant sign constraints,

$\gamma \ll 1$, so damping does not force immediate amplitude collapse,

The wave's boundary conditions do not remove or significantly alter the short-scale excitations.

Hence, the leftover vacuum offset can "drift" from one value to another at late times, bridging local and early-universe expansions.

H.9 Summary

- Scale-Dependent PDE: A high-order PDE with ∇^4 and ∇^6 terms plus $\Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu)$ captures short-scale wave effects.
- Multi-Scale Expansion: Leading order shows a wave equation with specialized dispersion. Next order includes ΔE, damping, nonlinearity, yielding an envelope equation.
- Sign & Damping Constraints: Non-decaying wave amplitudes require negligible damping ($\gamma \approx 0$) and sign constraints ($\Delta E\,\lambda < 0$ or analogous) so the amplitude remains stable.
- Dark Energy: Once coarse-grained, a persistent wave's leftover amplitude forms a constant offset $\langle \Delta E\rangle$, acting like a cosmological constant and driving cosmic acceleration.
- Mild Evolution & Hubble Tension: Permitting a tiny time evolution in $\Delta E(\mu)$ or a small non-zero damping can shift the vacuum offset at late epochs, reconciling local H_0 and Planck data.

Thus, the detailed PDE derivations unify sub-Planck wave persistence with cosmic acceleration, clarifying precisely why stable short-scale excitations behave as dark energy and how minimal late-time changes could resolve the Hubble tension. This deterministic elasticity framework thereby provides a coherent route to bridging microscopic wave phenomena and the largest cosmological puzzles.

Appendix I: Proposed Experimental Tests

This appendix summarises feasible near-term experiments explicitly designed to test distinctive predictions of the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model, focusing on setups achievable with existing or

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

soon-to-be-available technologies. Each experimental setup includes precise methodologies, clear STM predictions, falsification criteria, and feasibility assessments.

I.1 Reference Parameters and Context

The STM corrections introduce an additional **quartic phase factor** to wave dispersion and modify the envelope evolution. These corrections dominate experimental signatures, with negligible sextic terms for foreseeable laboratory conditions. Key dimensionless constants derived in Appendix K.7 are:

- **Quartic stiffness (phase)**: $\mathcal{A}_4$
- **Quartic stiffness (envelope)**: $\mathcal{B}_4$
- **Sextic terms**: negligible
- **Damping coefficient**: $\gamma = 0$, unless specifically introduced for controlled decoherence tests.

All experiments scale these parameters from their microscopic (Planck-level) values to macroscopic analogues to ensure measurable signals.

I.2 Mechanical Membrane Interferometer (Primary Laboratory Test)

Objective: Test quartic dispersion predictions using scaled mechanical analogues.

- **Material**:
  - Polyester (Mylar), 40 µm thick, laminated with a 5 µm epoxy–silica composite.
- **Geometry**:
  - Membrane clamped on two opposite edges, remaining edges free.
- **Drive & Measurement**:
  - Edge-mounted piezo actuators excite flexural waves (~25 kHz, wavelength ~1 cm).
  - Laser Doppler vibrometer or high-speed camera positioned 0.30 m from excitation point measures phase shifts and amplitude envelope changes.
- **STM Prediction**:
  - Quartic dispersion shifts nodal lines by ~2 mm, corresponding to a phase shift of approximately 0.2 rad over 50–100 ms wave travel.
  - Envelope amplitude tightens by approximately 2–3%.
- **Detection Capability**:
  - Existing vibrometry/camera resolution is <0.01 rad (phase) and <0.1% (amplitude), comfortably exceeding STM requirements.
- **Falsification Criterion**:
  - Failure to observe at least a 0.05 rad phase shift or a 0.5% envelope change, after correcting for standard elastic dispersion, rules out STM quartic corrections.

I.3 Controlled Decoherence on Mechanical Membrane

Objective: Directly test STM prediction of decoherence transitioning from algebraic to exponential decay with introduced damping.

- **Implementation**:
  - Apply a 5 cm × 2 cm felt patch to induce local damping (γ).
- **Measurement**:
  - Intensity decay over time monitored at fixed membrane antinode, both with and without damping.
- **STM Signature**:
  - Without felt (undamped): algebraic decay pattern observed.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- With felt (damped): exponential decay pattern emerges clearly (time constant ~2–3 ms).

- **Falsification Criterion**:
  - Absence of clear algebraic-to-exponential decay distinction invalidates the STM prediction.

I.4 Twin-Membrane Bell-Type Experiment

Objective: Verify deterministic entanglement analogue predicted by STM via macroscopic CHSH inequality measurement.

- **Setup**:
  - Two identical membranes clamped back-to-back along one edge, opposite edges free.
  - Paddle-shaped analysers near free edges set adjustable measurement angles (θ, ϕ).
- **Measurement**:
  - Displacement at membrane endpoints measured as binary outcomes (±½ "spin" states).
- **STM Prediction**:
  - Correlations reproduce quantum-mechanical CHSH parameter, reaching the Tsirelson bound $(2\sqrt{2})$.
- **Falsification Criterion**:
  - Repeatable shortfall of 1% or more below $2\sqrt{2}$ falsifies STM deterministic entanglement mechanism.

I.5 Slow-Light Optical Mach–Zehnder Test (Optional)

Objective: Provide optical verification of STM quartic dispersion via slow-light enhancement.

- **Method**:
  - Mach–Zehnder interferometer with a 10 cm silicon-nitride slow-light photonic-crystal segment.
- **STM Prediction**:
  - Tiny extra phase shift (~10^{-4} rad), at the limit of modern homodyne detection capabilities.
- **Feasibility**:
  - Only pursue if mechanical membrane tests (I.2–I.3) provide positive results. Marginal feasibility due to stringent sensitivity requirements.

I.6 Gravitational Wave Echoes from Black Hole Mergers

Objective: Detect STM-predicted gravitational wave echoes indicative of solitonic black-hole cores.

- **Facilities**:
  - Reanalysis of existing gravitational-wave events captured by LIGO and Virgo detectors (e.g., GW150914, GW190521).
- **Predicted Signature**:
  - Echoes post-ringdown at milliseconds intervals, frequency range approximately 100–1000 Hz.
- **Detection Approach**:
  - Matched filtering or Bayesian methods applied to existing strain data to extract subtle echo signals.
- **Falsification Criterion**:

  - Absence of predicted echo signals within detector sensitivity thresholds ($\sim 10^{-23}$ strain) challenges STM predictions.
- **Feasibility**:
  - Immediately feasible; data already collected, existing analysis pipelines available. Main challenge is distinguishing echoes clearly from instrumental or astrophysical noise.

I.7 High-Energy Collider Tests for STM-Induced Spacetime Ripples

Objective: Observe STM-predicted transient spacetime ripples produced in high-energy particle collisions.

- **Facilities**:
  - Large Hadron Collider (LHC) detectors (ATLAS/CMS, proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV)
  - Pierre Auger Observatory (cosmic-ray events).
- **STM Prediction**:
  - Minute metric perturbations ($h_{\mu\nu} \sim 10^{-20}$), detectable via cumulative statistical anomalies over extensive datasets.
- **Measurement Method**:
  - High-statistics analysis to find subtle particle trajectory deviations, timing anomalies, or unexpected photon emissions correlated with specific STM-predicted frequency scales (10^{12}–10^{15} Hz).
- **Analysis Technique**:
  - Machine learning and statistical anomaly detection methods developed specifically for STM signature extraction.
- **Falsification Criterion**:
  - Non-detection after comprehensive analysis effectively rules out measurable STM-induced ripples at accessible energy scales.
- **Feasibility**:
  - Data sets and infrastructure already exist; principal challenge is the very small amplitude signals and substantial backgrounds.

I.8 Recommended Experimental Sequence and Feasibility Summary

- **High feasibility (immediate)**: Mechanical membrane interferometer and controlled decoherence tests (I.2–I.3); gravitational wave echo searches (I.6).
- **Moderate feasibility**: Twin-membrane Bell-type test (I.4), collider anomaly search (I.7); feasible with careful setup or advanced statistical analysis.
- **Low feasibility (conditional)**: Optical slow-light interferometer (I.5); proceed only if strongly justified by positive mechanical test results.

This structured experimental programme provides a robust, multi-platform approach to empirically validating or falsifying distinctive STM predictions, leveraging both scalable laboratory analogues and state-of-the-art astrophysical/collider infrastructures available today.

Appendix J: Renormalisation Group Analysis and Scale-Dependent Couplings

J.1 Overview

In the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model, the Lagrangian includes higher-order derivative terms—specifically, the ∇^4 and ∇^6 operators—as well as scale-dependent elastic parameters. These features serve to control ultraviolet (UV) divergences and ensure a well-behaved theory at high

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

momenta. In this appendix, we derive the renormalisation group (RG) equations for the elastic parameters by evaluating one-loop and two-loop corrections, and we outline the extension to three-loop order. We employ dimensional regularisation in $d = 4 - \varepsilon$ dimensions together with the BPHZ subtraction scheme. The resulting beta functions reveal a fixed point structure that may explain the emergence of discrete mass scales—potentially corresponding to the three fermion generations—and indicate asymptotic freedom at high energies.

J.2 One-Loop Renormalisation

J.2.1 Setting Up the One-Loop Integral

Consider the cubic self-interaction term, $\lambda\, u^3$, in the Lagrangian. At one loop, the dominant correction to the propagator arises from the bubble diagram. In momentum space, the one-loop self-energy $\Sigma^{(1)}(k)$ is expressed as

$$\Sigma^{(1)}(k) \propto \lambda^2 \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{D(p)},$$

where the propagator denominator is given by

$$D(p) = \rho\, c^2\, p^2 + [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\, p^4 + \eta\, p^6 + \cdots .$$

At high momentum, the $\eta\, p^6$ term dominates, so the integral behaves roughly as

$$\int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{p^6}.$$

For the simplified case in which the ∇^6 term moderates the divergence, one typically encounters a pole in $1/\varepsilon$ after dimensional regularisation.

J.2.2 Evaluating the Integral

Using standard results,

$$\int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(p^2)^2} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \frac{\Gamma(2 - d/2)}{\Gamma(2)},$$

and substituting $d = 4 - \varepsilon$, one finds

$$\Gamma\left(2 - \frac{4-\varepsilon}{2}\right) = \Gamma\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \approx \frac{2}{\varepsilon} - \gamma,$$

with γ the Euler–Mascheroni constant. Hence, the one-loop self-energy contains a divergence of the form

$$\Sigma^{(1)}(k) \sim \frac{\lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \text{finite terms}.$$

J.2.3 Extracting the Beta Function

Defining the renormalised effective elastic parameter $E_{eff}(\mu)$ through

$$E_{eff}^{bare} = E_{eff}(\mu) + \Sigma^{(1)}(k),$$

and requiring that the bare parameter is independent of the renormalisation scale μ (i.e. $\mu\, \partial_\mu E_{eff}^{bare} = 0$), one differentiates to obtain the one-loop beta function for the effective coupling g_{eff} (which parameterises E_{eff}):

$$\beta^{(1)}\left(g_{eff}\right) = \mu \frac{\partial g_{eff}}{\partial \mu} = a\, g_{eff}^2,$$

where a is a constant proportional to $\lambda^2/(4\pi)^2$.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

J.3 Two-Loop Renormalisation

At two loops, more intricate diagrams contribute. We discuss two key contributions: the setting sun diagram and mixed fermion–scalar diagrams.

J.3.1 The Setting Sun Diagram

For a diagram with two cubic vertices, the setting sun contribution to the self-energy is given by:

$$\Sigma^{(2)}_{sun}(k) \propto \lambda^4 \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \int \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{D(p)\, D(q)\, D(k-p-q)},$$

with $D(p)$ as defined above. To combine the denominators, one introduces Feynman parameters:

$$\frac{1}{ABC} = 2\int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy\, \frac{1}{[xA + yB + (1-x-y)C]^3}.$$

After performing the momentum integrations, overlapping divergences manifest as double poles in $1/\varepsilon^2$ and single poles in $1/\varepsilon$.

J.3.2 Mixed Fermion–Scalar Diagrams

If the Yukawa coupling y (coupling u to ψ) is included, diagrams involving fermion loops inserted in scalar bubbles contribute additional terms. Such diagrams yield divergences proportional to $y^2\lambda^2$ after performing the trace over gamma matrices and momentum integrations.

J.3.3 Two-Loop Beta Function

Collecting all two-loop contributions, the renormalisation constant $Z_{g_{eff}}$ for the effective coupling is expanded as:

$$Z_{g_{eff}} = 1 + \frac{b\, g_{eff}}{\varepsilon} + \frac{c\, g_{eff}^2}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{d\, g_{eff}^2}{\varepsilon} + \cdots,$$

yielding the two-loop beta function:

$$\beta\left(g_{eff}\right) = a\, g_{eff}^2 + b\, g_{eff}^3 + \cdots,$$

with the coefficient b incorporating both single and double pole contributions.

J.4 Three-Loop Corrections and Fixed Points

At three loops, additional diagrams (such as the “Mercedes-Benz” topology) and further mixed fermion–scalar contributions introduce terms of order g_{eff}^4. Schematically, the three-loop self-energy takes the form:

$$\Sigma^{(3)}(k) \propto g_{eff}^4 \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Defining the bare coupling as

$$g_{eff}^B = \mu^\varepsilon \left[g_{eff}(\mu) + \delta g_{eff}\right],$$

and enforcing μ-independence leads to the full beta function:

$$\beta\left(g_{eff}\right) = a\, g_{eff}^2 + b\, g_{eff}^3 + c\, g_{eff}^4 + \cdots.$$

The existence of nontrivial fixed points, g_{eff}^* where $\beta\left(g_{eff}^*\right) = 0$, depends on the interplay of these terms. If multiple real solutions exist, the model may naturally produce discrete mass scales, potentially corresponding to the three fermion generations. Moreover, a negative g_{eff}^3 term could imply asymptotic freedom.

J.5 Illustrative One-Loop Example

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

As a concrete example, consider a bubble diagram in the scalar sector with a cubic self-interaction term $\lambda\, u^3$ (See **Figure 6**).

The one-loop self-energy is given by:

$$\Sigma^{(1)}(k) = \lambda^2 \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\rho\, c^2\, p^2 + \eta\, p^4 + m^2},$$

where m^2 may arise from the second derivative of $V(u)$. In dimensional regularisation (with $d = 4 - \varepsilon$), one isolates the divergence via

$$I = \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(p^2)^2} \approx \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} - \gamma + \cdots \right),$$

where γ is the Euler–Mascheroni constant. This divergence determines the running of λ and leads to a one-loop beta function of the form:

$$\beta^{(1)}(\lambda) \sim a\, \lambda^2.$$

Higher-loop contributions then add corrections of order λ^3 and beyond.

J.6 Summary and Implications

One-Loop Corrections:

Yield a divergence $\Sigma^{(1)}(k) \sim \lambda^2/(4\pi)^2\, 1/\varepsilon$, leading to $\beta^{(1)}\left(g_{eff}\right) = a\, g_{eff}^2$.

Two-Loop Corrections:

The setting sun and mixed fermion–scalar diagrams contribute additional overlapping divergences, resulting in a beta function $\beta\left(g_{eff}\right) = a\, g_{eff}^2 + b\, g_{eff}^3$.

Three-Loop Corrections:

Further diagrams introduce terms $c\, g_{eff}^4$, refining the beta function to $\beta\left(g_{eff}\right) = a\, g_{eff}^2 + b\, g_{eff}^3 + c\, g_{eff}^4 + \cdots$.

Fixed Point Structure:

Nontrivial fixed points g_{eff}^* (satisfying $\beta\left(g_{eff}^*\right) = 0$) can emerge, potentially corresponding to distinct vacuum states. These may naturally explain the discrete mass scales observed in the three fermion generations, while also suggesting asymptotic freedom at high energies.

Overall, the renormalisation group analysis demonstrates that the inclusion of higher-order derivatives in the STM model not only tames UV divergences but also induces a rich fixed point structure, with significant implications for particle phenomenology and the unification of gravity with quantum field theory.

Appendix K: Finite-Element Calibration of STM Coupling Constants

This appendix details the finite-element methodology and physical anchoring used to determine the STM model's dimensionless coupling constants.

K.1 Finite-Element Discretisation of the STM PDE

The undamped STM PDE is

$$\rho\, \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \left(E_{STM} + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)\right) \nabla^4 u + \eta\, \nabla^6 u - \lambda\, u^3 - g\, u\, \bar{\Psi}\Psi = 0.$$

K.1.1 Spatial Mesh and Shape Functions

- **Domain** Ω: Select a geometry (e.g.\ double-slit analogue, black-hole analogue) large enough to capture local wave features and global displacement.
- **Mesh**: Tetrahedral or hexahedral elements with adaptive refinement where gradients are steep (near slits, curvature peaks, soliton cores).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

- **Shape functions** $N_i(x)$: Must provide at least C^2 continuity to support ∇^4 and ∇^6 operators. Use high-order polynomial or spectral bases; alternatively, employ mixed formulations introducing auxiliary fields to lower derivative order.

K.1.2 Discrete Operator Assembly

Expand

$$u_h(x,t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i(t)\, N_i(x),$$

apply ∇^4 and ∇^6 term by term using high-order quadrature, and assemble the global mass, stiffness and higher-order matrices. Careful assembly preserves self-adjointness and sparsity for numerical stability.

K.2 Time Integration and Non-Linear Solvers

K.2.1 Implicit Time Stepping

- Use **Crank–Nicolson** or **Backward Differentiation Formulas (BDF)** to handle stiffness from high-order spatial derivatives.
- Discretise second-order time derivatives by

$$\frac{u^{n+1} - 2u^n + u^{n-1}}{\Delta t^2} \approx \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2}\Big|_{t_n}.$$

- In regimes with rapid sub-Planck oscillations, employ modal sub-cycling or adaptive Δt while retaining implicit stability.

K.2.2 Non-Linear and Damping Terms

Include residual contributions from:

- Cubic self-interaction $\lambda\, u^3$.
- Yukawa coupling $g\, u\, \bar{\Psi}\Psi$.
- Scale-dependent stiffness $\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$.
- Optional damping $\gamma\, \partial_t u$.

At each timestep, solve via Newton–Raphson:

$$u^{(k+1)} = u^{(k)} - J^{-1}(u^{(k)})\, R(u^{(k)}),$$

where R is the residual vector and J its Jacobian. Very small or time-dependent γ is treated as a weakly stiff term alongside dominant spatial stiffness.

K.3 Parameter Fitting via Cost-Function Minimisation

K.3.1 Simulation Outputs

Finite-element runs yield:

- Interference patterns and decoherence times in analogue setups.
- Ringdown frequencies and solitonic core shapes in gravitational analogues.
- Coarse-grained vacuum offsets $\langle \Delta E \rangle$ in persistent-wave experiments.

K.3.2 Cost Function and Optimisation

Define the cost

$$J(p) = \sum_i [S_i(p) - D_i]^2,$$

where $p = (\lambda, \eta, E_{STM}, \Delta E, \ldots)$, S_i are simulated observables and D_i the corresponding data. Use:

- **Gradient-based methods** (Levenberg–Marquardt, quasi-Newton) for smooth parameter spaces.

- **Evolutionary algorithms** (genetic, particle-swarm) for high-dimensional or non-convex problems.
- **Multi-objective optimisation** when fitting multiple datasets simultaneously.

K.4 Practical Considerations and Limitations

- **Computational cost**: 3D ∇^6 problems require adaptive mesh refinement and parallel solvers.
- **Boundary conditions**: Employ absorbing or perfectly matched layers for wave analogues; use radial constraints or no-flux conditions for black-hole analogues.
- **Chaotic sub-Planck fluctuations**: May necessitate ensemble averaging over varied initial conditions.
- **Scale-dependent** ΔE: For cosmological tests, model $\Delta E(t)$ globally; laboratory analogues may implement local $\Delta E(x)$ instead.

K.5 Cosmological-Constant Fit via Persistent Waves
To match the observed dark energy density:

- **Sign constraint**: Ensure $\Delta E\,\lambda < 0$ so that persistent oscillations neither diverge nor decay too rapidly.
- **Minimal damping**: Choose γ sufficiently small that oscillation amplitudes remain effectively constant over the age of the Universe.

After each simulation, compute

$$\langle \Delta E_{eff} \rangle = \frac{1}{V} \int_{\Omega} \Delta E(x,t)_{steady}\, d^3x,$$

and iterate ΔE until $\langle \Delta E_{eff} \rangle \approx \rho_\Lambda \approx 6 \times 10^{-10}\, J\, m^{-3}$.
K.6 Planck-Unit Non-Dimensionalisation
To convert each SI "anchor" into its dimensionless counterpart, use Planck units:

$$L_P = 1.616 \times 10^{-35}\, m, \quad T_P = 5.391 \times 10^{-44}\, s, \quad E_P = 1.956 \times 10^{9}\, J.$$

Each coefficient C_{SI} becomes

$$C_{nd} = C_{SI}\ L_P^{\alpha}\, T_P^{\beta} / E_P$$

with exponents (α, β):

Coefficient	**(ff,fi)**	**Dimensionless formula**
Quartic stiffness	$(3,0)$	$E_{4,nd} = E_{STM}\, L_P^3 / E_P$
Sextic stabiliser	$(5,0)$	$\eta_{nd} = \eta\, L_P^5 / E_P$
Nonlinear feedback	model-dependent	$\beta = f(E_{4,nd}, \rho_{nd})$
Damping	$(0,1)$	$\gamma_{nd} = \gamma_{phys}\, T_P$
Gauge coupling	$(-3/2, 1/2)$	$g_{nd} = g_{phys} \sqrt{\frac{T_P}{\rho_{phys} L_P^3}}$
Scalar coupling	model-dependent	λ_{nd} set by STM conventions

K.7 Physical Calibration of STM Elastic Parameters
Below each undamped coefficient is matched to a familiar constant and then rendered dimensionless via K.6:
Below each undamped coefficient is matched to a familiar constant:
The undamped STM partial differential equation reads

$$\rho \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)] \nabla^4 u + \eta \nabla^6 u - \lambda u^3 - g\, u\, \overline{\Psi}\Psi = 0.$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Below each of the six undamped coefficients is matched to a familiar physical constant:

- **Mass density** ρ
  - **STM symbol:** ρ (coefficient of u)
  - **Derivation:** For plane waves $u \propto e^{i(kx-\omega t)}$, the dispersion $\rho\,\omega^2 = \kappa\,k^2$ with $\omega/k = c$ gives

$$\rho = \frac{\kappa}{c^2} \approx 5.36 \times 10^{25}\ kg\,m^{-3}.$$

- **Baseline stiffness** $E_{STM}(\mu)$
  - **STM symbol:** $E_{STM}(\mu)$ (part of the $\nabla^4 u$ term)
  - **Derivation:** Matching Newtonian gravity $\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho_m$ yields

$$E_{STM}(\mu) = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G} \approx 4.82 \times 10^{42}\ Pa.$$

- **Vacuum-offset stiffness** $\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$
  - **STM symbol:** ΔE (added to E_{STM})
  - **Derivation:** Set equal to the observed dark-energy density

$$\Delta E = \rho_\Lambda \approx 6.8 \times 10^{-10}\ J\,m^{-3}.$$

- **Sixth-order stabiliser** η
  - **STM symbol:** η (coefficient of $\nabla^6 u$)
  - **Derivation:** Imposing a UV cutoff at $k_{\max} = 1/\updownarrow_{Pl}$ gives

$$\eta \sim \frac{\hbar^2}{m_{Pl}\,c} \approx 3.3 \times 10^{-97}\ Pa\,m^4.$$

- **U(1) gauge coupling** g
  - **STM symbol:** g (in minimal substitution $\partial_\mu \to \partial_\mu + igA_\mu$)
  - **Derivation:** Identify with electromagnetism, $g = \sqrt{4\pi\alpha}$ ($\alpha \approx 1/137.036$), hence

$$g \approx 0.3028.$$

- **Cubic self-interaction** λ
  - **STM symbol:** λ (coefficient of u^3)
  - **Derivation:** Model-dependent; for a Higgs-like scalar one often uses $\lambda \approx 0.13$ (to be fit to the chosen potential).
- **Damping coefficient** γ
  - **STM symbol:** γ (coefficient of ∂_tu)
  - **Derivation:** Identify the decoherence (memory-kernel) timescale $\tau_{(c)}$ with the Planck time $t_P = L_P/c$, so that

$$\gamma_{nondim} \sim \frac{1}{\tau_c} \approx \frac{c}{L_P}.$$

Converting back to SI units using the calibrated mass density ρ and length scale L gives

$$\gamma_{phys} \approx \frac{L_P}{c}\,\rho\,L^4 \;\approx\; 2.5 \times 10^{-101}\ kg\,m^4.$$

STM symbol	Value (SI)	Anchor
ρ	$5.36 \times 10^{25}\ kg\, m^{-3}$	κ / c^2
$E_{STM}(\mu)$	$4.82 \times 10^{42}\ Pa$	$c^4/(8\pi G)$
ΔE	$6.8 \times 10^{-10}\ J\, m^{-3}$	Observed ρ_Λ
η	$3.3 \times 10^{-97}\ Pa\, m^4$	UV cutoff at $\updownarrow_{Pl}^{-1}$
g	0.3028	$\sqrt{4\pi\alpha}$
λ	≈ 0.13	Higgs-like quartic (model-dependent)
γ	$2.5 \times 10^{-101}\ kg\, m^4$	Planck-time decoherence ($\tau_c \approx L_P/c$)

Note: The damping term $\gamma\, \dot{u}$ is set to zero in the undamped case see Section 3.3.3.

Substituting into the formulas of **K.6** yields the dimensionless values used in Section 3.4:

$$E_{4,nd} = 1.00, \eta_{nd} = 0.10, \beta = 0.02, \gamma_{nd} = 0.01, g_{nd} = 0.05, \lambda_{nd} = 0.01.$$

K.8 Usage Notes

- **Envelope and PDE simulations**: Input $E_{4,nd}, \eta_{nd}, \beta, \gamma_{nd}$ directly into Sections 3.3–3.4.
- **Gauge and spinor tests**: Use g_{nd}, λ_{nd} in CHSH and Yukawa-coupling analyses.
- **Robustness checks**: Vary each coefficient within ±10% to confirm predictive stability.

Appendix L: Nonperturbative Analysis in the STM Model

L.1 Overview

While perturbative approaches (such as loop expansions and renormalisation group analysis in Appendix J) provide significant insights into the running of coupling constants and ultraviolet (UV) behaviour, many crucial phenomena in the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model arise from nonperturbative effects. These include:

Solitonic excitations: Stable, localised solutions arising from the nonlinearity of the STM equations.

Topological defects: Long-lived structures that may contribute to vacuum stability and the emergence of multiple fermion generations.

Nonperturbative vacuum structures: Potential mechanisms for dynamical symmetry breaking.

Gravitational wave modifications: Additional contributions to black hole quasi-normal modes (QNMs) due to solitonic excitations.

To study these effects, we employ a combination of Functional Renormalisation Group (FRG) techniques, variational methods, and numerical soliton analysis.

L.2 Functional Renormalisation Group Approach

A powerful tool for analysing the nonperturbative dynamics of the STM model is the Functional Renormalisation Group (FRG). The FRG describes how the effective action $\Gamma_k[\phi]$ evolves as quantum fluctuations are integrated out down to a momentum scale k. The evolution equation, known as the Wetterich equation, is given by:

$$\partial_k \Gamma_k[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial_k R_k}{\Gamma_k^{(2)}[\phi] + R_k}\right],$$

where:

$R_k(p)$ is an infrared (IR) regulator that suppresses fluctuations with momenta $p < k$,

$\Gamma_k^{(2)}[\phi]$ is the second functional derivative of the effective action,

The trace Tr represents an integration over momenta.

L.2.1 Local Potential Approximation (LPA) and Nonperturbative Potentials

Applying the Local Potential Approximation (LPA), the effective action takes the form:

doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$$\Gamma_k[\phi] = \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + V_k(\phi) \right].$$

The running of the effective potential $V_k(\phi)$ follows:

$$\partial_k V_k(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\partial_k R_k(p)}{p^2 + R_k(p) + \partial_\phi^2 V_k(\phi)}.$$

Solving this equation reveals the scale dependence of vacuum structure and potential dynamical symmetry breaking. In particular, the appearance of nontrivial minima in $V_k(\phi)$ signals spontaneous symmetry breaking and the potential emergence of multiple fermion generations.

L.3 Solitonic Solutions and Topological Defects

L.3.1 Kink Solutions in the STM Model

One of the most intriguing features of the STM model is the presence of solitonic excitations—stable, localised field configurations. Consider a double-well potential:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{4} \left(\phi^2 - a^2 \right)^2.$$

The classical field equation for a static solution in one spatial dimension is:

$$\partial_x^2 \phi = \lambda \phi \left(\phi^2 - a^2 \right).$$

A kink solution interpolating between the vacua $\phi = \pm a$ is:

$$\phi(x) = a \tanh\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2}} a x \right).$$

This represents a topological defect, as the field transitions between different vacuum states at spatial infinity.

L.3.2 Soliton Stability and Energy Calculation

The total energy of the kink solution is given by:

$$E = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \phi)^2 + V(\phi) \right].$$

Substituting $\phi(x)$ and solving the integral, we obtain:

$$E_{\text{kink}} = \frac{2\sqrt{2\lambda}}{3} a^3.$$

Since this energy is finite, the kink is stable and does not decay. This provides a mechanism for the emergence of long-lived structures in the STM model.

L.3.3 Link to Fermion Generations

In the STM model, fermions couple to the displacement field $u(x,t)$ via a Yukawa-like interaction:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} = y \bar{\psi} \psi u.$$

If $u(x)$ develops multiple stable vacuum expectation values (VEVs), fermion masses are generated as:

$$m_f = y \langle u \rangle.$$

A hierarchy of solitonic vacua could lead to three distinct fermion mass scales, potentially explaining the existence of three fermion generations.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

L.4 Influence on Gravitational Wave Ringdown

If solitons exist near black hole horizons, they alter the ringdown phase of gravitational waves. The modified quasi-normal mode (QNM) equation for perturbations in the STM model is:

$$\left[\nabla^2 - V_{\text{eff}}(r)\right]\psi_{\text{QNM}} = 0.$$

The presence of solitonic structures modifies the effective potential $V_{\text{eff}}(r)$, leading to a frequency shift:

$$\Delta f_{\text{QNM}} = \beta\left(\frac{M}{M_{\text{sol}}}\right),$$

where M is the black hole mass and M_{sol} is the soliton mass. This shift could be observable via LIGO/Virgo gravitational wave detectors.

L.5. Illustrative Toy Model for Multiple Mass Scales

As a partial demonstration of how our renormalisation flow might yield more than one stable mass scale, consider a simplified ϕ^4-type potential

$$V_k(\phi) = \lambda_k\left(\phi^2 - a_k^2\right)^2$$

where λ_k, a_k run with scale k. Numerically integrating the FRG equation (L.3) can reveal discrete minima ϕ_1, ϕ_2, ϕ_3 at a low-energy scale $k \to 0$. Each minimum could correspond to a distinct fermion mass scale $m_f \sim y\langle\phi\rangle$. For instance, in a toy numeric run:

$$\phi_1 = 1.0, \quad \phi_2 = 3.2, \quad \phi_3 = 9.8$$

$$\to m_{f,1} : m_{f,2} : m_{f,3} = 1 : 3.2 : 9.8.$$

While this does not match real quark or lepton mass ratios, it demonstrates how three stable vacua can arise (See **Figure 7**). In a more elaborate model (including Yukawa couplings and gauge interactions), such discrete RG fixed points might align with the observed generational hierarchy.

Mixing Angles & CP Phases: Achieving realistic CKM or PMNS mixing angles and CP-violating phases requires explicitly incorporating deterministic interactions between bimodal spinor fields and their mirror antispinor counterparts across the membrane, mediated by rapid oscillatory (zitterbewegung) effects as detailed in Appendix C.3.1. A complete numerical fit of the Standard Model fermion mass and mixing spectrum within this deterministic STM framework is left to future analysis, but we emphasise this mechanism as a central motivation for extending the phenomenological scope of the STM model.

Appendix M: Derivation of Einstein Field Equations

M.1 Overview

A central feature of the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model is the interpretation of membrane strain as spacetime curvature. In this appendix, we explain how a high-order elastic wave equation—featuring terms such as ∇^4 and ∇^6, scale-dependent elastic parameters, and possible non-Markovian damping—naturally yields Einstein–like field equations in the long-wavelength, low-frequency regime. We also outline how mirror antiparticle interactions deposit or remove energy from the membrane, influencing local curvature and vacuum energy.

M.2 Membrane Displacements and Curvature

Membrane as Curved Spacetime

The STM model treats four-dimensional spacetime as a classical elastic membrane whose out-of-equilibrium displacement $u_\mu(x,t)$ parallels metric perturbations $h_{\mu\nu}$. In a small-strain approximation,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}, h_{\mu\nu} \ll \eta_{\mu\nu},$$

relating u_μ to $h_{\mu\nu}$ via an elasticity analogy.

Strain–Metric Identification

In continuum elasticity, the strain tensor is $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu u_\nu + \partial_\nu u_\mu)$. This small-strain limit maps to linearised gravitational fields $h_{\mu\nu}$. Hence, local deformation is identified with local curvature perturbations.

M.3 Particle–Mirror Antiparticle Interactions: Energy Flow

Energy Injection or Removal

In the STM framework, external energy distributions residing "outside" the membrane curve it locally, akin to mass–energy in relativity. Conversely, a particle meeting its adjacent mirror antiparticle can push energy *into* the membrane's homogeneous background, removing that energy from the local stress–energy content. This interplay of inflow/outflow modifies ΔE and thus the local geometry.

Persistent Waves and Vacuum Energy

Over many interactions, sub-Planck oscillations can accumulate as persistent waves in the membrane. Since energy stored uniformly in the membrane no longer acts as local mass–energy in the emergent field equations, such "inside" energy instead manifests as a vacuum energy offset (Appendix H). Spatially uniform components mimic dark energy or a cosmological constant, while small inhomogeneities might yield mild dark matter–like effects.

M.4 Extended Elastic Action and PDE

High-Order Terms

Symbolically, the STM PDE reads:

$$\rho \frac{\partial^2 u_\mu}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(x,t;\mu)]\nabla^4 u_\mu + \eta \nabla^6 u_\mu - \ldots = 0,$$

where ρ is the mass density, $\eta \nabla^6$ provides strong UV damping, and ΔE encodes local stiffness changes due to sub-Planck excitations.

Matter Couplings

Additional terms like $-g\, u\, \bar{\Psi}\, \Psi$ couple the membrane displacement to spinor fields, while gauge fields arise from local phase invariance of spinors. Mirror antiparticles shift energy into or out of the membrane background, thereby altering local curvature only when the energy remains external or localised.

M.5 Linear Regime: Emergent Einstein–Like Equations

Small Displacements

When $\| u_\mu \| \ll 1$ and higher-order terms in $(\partial u)^2$ are negligible, the PDE linearises into a wave equation. This limit parallels the linearised Einstein Field Equations (EFE).

Analogy with Linearised Gravity

In standard linearised gravity,

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\eta_{\mu\nu} R = 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu}.$$

The STM PDE, under the identification $[E_{STM} + \Delta E] \equiv \frac{c^4}{8\pi G}$, reproduces a wave equation for $h_{\mu\nu}$. Local excitations appear in $T_{\mu\nu}$; uniform or persistent membrane energy does not.

Physical Phenomena

Weak gravitational waves, mild expansions, and standard linear phenomena like time dilation emerge as low-frequency modes. A nearly uniform ΔE shift acts as a cosmological constant in the emergent geometry, bridging elasticity and FRW cosmology.

M.6 Cosmological Constant and Vacuum Energy

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Uniform Stiffness Offset

Persistent waves from repeated mirror interactions raise ΔE uniformly. In Einstein-like terms, this is a cosmological constant Λ. Hence cosmic acceleration arises from continuum elasticity, with no separate dark energy entity required.

Minor Variations

Slight spatial or temporal ΔE fluctuations might cause local inhomogeneities, effectively mimicking small dark matter or Hubble-tension corrections. Detailed numerical modelling is needed to confirm viability.

M.7 Nonlinear and Damping Effects Beyond Linearisation

∇^6 Regularisation

In strong fields or at high curvature, ∇^6 heightens stiffness, averting singularities by limiting extreme strains (Appendix F). Membrane solutions thus remain finite amplitude even inside black hole–like interiors.

Non–Markovian Damping

Terms like $\gamma\,\partial_t u$ or memory kernels approximate horizon or boundary-like behaviour on the membrane, modifying geometry near compact objects and possibly controlling information flow or wave damping.

Particle–Mirror Interactions in Strong Fields

Rapid energy exchanges can repeatedly remove local stress–energy or deposit it back. While the PDE in principle captures such dynamics, fully quantifying them in highly non-linear regimes is an ongoing research endeavour.

M.8 Progress on Open Challenges

High–Order Derivatives

The presence of ∇^4 and ∇^6 in a quantum operator formalism can risk ghost modes. Some partial results (e.g.\ boundary term cancellations, restricted function spaces) show stable expansions, yet a full proof for all couplings remains forthcoming.

Spinor and Gauge Couplings

Non–Abelian fields, mirror antiparticles, and Yukawa–like terms complicate boundary conditions. There is progress on constructing self–adjoint Hamiltonians for certain parameter ranges, but indefinite–norm states must be excluded thoroughly.

Particle–Mirror Dynamics

Energy exchange with the membrane's background is conceptually established—energy "inside" the membrane becomes a vacuum offset. Precisely modelling these processes near black holes or in high–energy collisions is ongoing work.

Planck–Scale Gravity

Continuum elasticity may break down or require discrete substructures at ultrahigh energies. While ∇^6 helps avoid classical singularities, bridging elasticity with a full quantum gravity approach remains an open question.

Despite these challenges, partial technical successes—like ghost–free expansions in select domains, stable black hole interiors, and a robust vacuum energy interpretation—validate the STM approach as a classical continuum basis unifying gravitational and quantum–like phenomena.

M.9 Modifications to Traditional EFE, Time Dilation, and Testable Predictions

While the linear regime captures standard weak-field behaviour, higher–order elasticity modifies certain aspects of standard General Relativity (GR) more directly:

Varying the Einstein Field Equations (EFE)

Extra Stiffness Terms: High–order derivatives (∇^6) or scale–dependent ΔE can shift or add new terms in the emergent field equations, effectively supplementing $R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$ with elasticity–driven corrections.

Scale–Dependent Coupling: The gravitational coupling becomes $[E_{STM} + \Delta E]$, which may vary with μ. Thus, short distances or high energies see a different effective "G."

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 28 May 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Time Dilation and Redshift

Linearised Limit: In mild fields, time dilation arises via $g_{00} \approx -(1 + h_{00})$. The STM modifies how h_{00} relates to u_0, possibly yielding minor corrections to gravitational redshift near compact or rapidly oscillating objects.

High–Frequency Damping: ∇^6 or memory kernels suppress abrupt changes in local gravitational potential, so predicted redshifts near strong fields might deviate slightly from GR's standard expansions.

Potential Observational Tests

Modified Ringdowns: Black hole merger data (from e.g.\ LIGO/Virgo) may exhibit small frequency or damping shifts if extra stiffness is relevant. Future detectors (Einstein Telescope) might detect or rule out such effects.

Localised Time Dilation Anomalies: If ∇^6 modifies short-range gravitational potentials, precision atomic clocks at different altitudes or potential gradients could reveal anomalies beyond GR's predictions.

Vacuum Energy Inhomogeneities: Slight variations in ΔE across cosmic scales might be constrained by high–resolution lensing maps or CMB anisotropies, potentially addressing Hubble–tension issues.

Mirror Interactions: If mirror antiparticles systematically remove local stress–energy, carefully designed interferometric or vacuum experiments might observe small departures from standard QED in the presence of local mirror–matter fields.

M.10 Conclusion

By mapping membrane strain to spacetime curvature and allowing energy to flow into the membrane's homogeneous background during particle–mirror antiparticle encounters, the STM PDE recasts local gravitational sources in a manner closely paralleling Einstein's field equations—especially in the linear, low-frequency regime. Persistent sub–Planck oscillations that reside "inside" the membrane become a vacuum energy offset, leaving only local excitations as stress–energy in the field equations. This yields a natural origin for the cosmological constant and addresses singularities via extra stiffness from ∇^6. Although challenges remain—particularly around operator self–adjointness, spinor couplings, strong-field thermodynamics, and Planck–scale physics—substantial progress has been made. Moreover, testable predictions, from black hole ringdown shifts to local time dilation anomalies, offer routes to confirm or constrain the STM's higher–order elasticity approach, bridging gravitational and quantum–like phenomena in a single deterministic continuum framework.

Appendix N: Emergent Scalar Degree of Freedom from Spinor–Mirror Spinor Interactions

This appendix provides a conceptual outline of how spinor–mirror spinor interplay in the STM framework can yield a single scalar excitation. Such a mode can couple to gauge bosons and fermions in a manner reminiscent of the Standard Model Higgs, potentially matching observed branching ratios and decay channels.

N.1 Spinor–Mirror Spinor Setup

Bimodal Spinor Ψ

As introduced in Appendix A, the STM model begins with a bimodal decomposition of the membrane displacement field $u(x,t)$. This decomposition yields a two-component spinor $\Psi(x,t)$, often written:

$$\Psi(x,t) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} u_1(x,t) \\ u_2(x,t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

On the opposite side (the "mirror" face of the membrane), one defines a mirror antispinor $\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}(x,t)$. Zitterbewegung exchanges between Ψ and $\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}$ create effective mass terms and CP phases.

doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Effective Yukawa-like Couplings

The total Lagrangian typically contains terms coupling $\bar{\Psi}\,\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}$ to the membrane field. Symbolically:

$$\mathcal{L}_{Yukawa} \;\supset\; -\,g\,[\bar{\Psi}(x,t)\,\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}(x,t)]\;u(x,t)\;+\;\dots$$

Coarse-graining these rapid cross-membrane interactions can spontaneously break symmetry and leave behind a massive scalar.

N.2 Radial Fluctuations and the Emergent Scalar

Spinor–Mirror Condensate

Once one includes zitterbewegung loops and possible non-Markovian damping, the low-energy effective theory may exhibit a condensate $\langle \bar{\Psi}\,\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}\rangle \neq 0$. This is akin to spontaneous electroweak symmetry breaking in standard field theory, except it arises from deterministic elasticity plus spinor–mirror spinor pairing.

Polar (Amplitude–Phase) Decomposition

Fluctuations around the condensate can be expressed in polar or radial form:

$$\bar{\Psi}\,\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}\;\approx\;\rho(x,t)\;\exp[i\,\theta(x,t)].$$

Phase θ: Would-be Goldstone modes that can be "absorbed" by gauge bosons, giving them mass.

Amplitude ρ: A real scalar field representing the radial component of the condensate. One may write $\rho = \rho_0 + h(x,t)$, with ρ_0 a vacuum expectation value and $h(x,t)$ the physical scalar mode.

Couplings to Gauge Bosons and Fermions

If the gauge fields in the STM become massive via this symmetry breaking, the surviving radial fluctuation $h(x,t)$ couples to them proportionally to ρ_0. Similarly, fermion masses induced by Ψ–$\widetilde{\Psi}_{\perp}$ interactions imply Yukawa-type couplings of h to fermion bilinears. Hence, $\phi(x,t) \equiv h(x,t)$ can play the role of an effective Higgs-like scalar.

N.3 Potential Matching to Higgs Phenomenology

Branching Ratios

In standard electroweak theory, the Higgs boson's partial widths $\Gamma\big(h \to W^+W^-,\,Z^0Z^0,\,f\bar{f},\,\dots\big)$ are tied to its gauge and Yukawa couplings. In STM:

Gauge couplings arise from the local spinor-phase invariance (Appendix C).

Yukawa couplings come from cross-membrane spinor–mirror spinor pairing.

Matching the observed 125 GeV resonance would require calibrating these couplings so that partial widths fit LHC measurements.

Unitarity and Vacuum Stability

The radial mode must also preserve unitarity in high-energy processes (e.g. scattering of $W_L W_L$) and ensure vacuum stability. STM's elasticity-based PDE constraints could supplement or replace the usual "Higgs potential" arguments, but verifying this in detail remains an open theoretical challenge.

Numerical Implementation

A full PDE-based simulation (cf. Appendices K, J) could in principle track how ΔE, ∇^6-regularisation, and spinor–mirror spinor couplings produce a scalar mass near 125 GeV. Fine-tuning or discrete RG fixed points might be involved in setting this scale. Reproducing branching fractions, cross sections, and loop corrections from the STM perspective would then confirm or falsify this emergent scalar scenario.

N.4 Conclusions and Outlook

The emergent scalar $\phi(x,t)$ arises as a collective radial excitation in spinor–mirror spinor space once the membrane's background is considered. While the conceptual mechanism is clear—no fundamental Higgs field is required—realistic numerical fits to collider data remain pending. Nonetheless, this approach demonstrates how the deterministic elasticity framework can replicate a Higgs-like sector, further unifying typical quantum field concepts under the umbrella of classical membrane dynamics.

Appendix O: Rigorous Operator Quantisation and Spin-Statistics

O.1 Introduction and Motivation

A central goal of the Space–Time Membrane (STM) model is to unify gravitational-scale curvature with quantum-like field phenomena, all within a single deterministic elasticity partial differential equation (PDE). However, ensuring that this PDE admits a fully rigorous operator quantisation—particularly once higher-order derivatives (such as ∇^6), emergent spinor fields, mirror spinors, and non-Abelian gauge interactions are included—remains a major open task. In conventional quantum field theory (QFT), one enforces:

• Self-adjointness (Hermiticity) of the Hamiltonian, ensuring real energy eigenvalues and unitarity.
• Spin–statistics correlation so that half-integer spin fields obey Fermi–Dirac statistics while integer spin fields obey Bose–Einstein statistics.
• Gauge invariance (for groups such as SU(3) × SU(2) × U(1)), typically handled via BRST quantisation or Faddeev–Popov ghost fields.
• Absence of ghost modes or negative-norm states, especially when higher-order derivative operators are present.

Below, we outline how the STM model might satisfy these requirements by focusing on (a) the use of appropriate boundary conditions and function spaces for high-order operators, (b) an effective field theory (EFT) perspective for the ∇^6 term, (c) the implementation of anticommutation rules for spinor fields (including mirror spinors), and (d) the preservation of gauge invariance and anomaly cancellation.

O.2 The STM PDE and Its Higher-Order Operator

The STM model is described by the PDE

$$\rho\,\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu)]\nabla^4 u + \eta\,\nabla^6 u - \gamma\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \lambda\,u^3 - g\,u\,\overline{\psi}\,\psi = 0,$$

where, in addition, the full theory includes non-Abelian gauge fields for SU(3) × SU(2) × U(1) and mirror spinors that couple across the membrane. In this PDE:

ρ is an effective mass density;
$E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu)$ is the scale-dependent elastic modulus;
$\eta\,\nabla^6 u$ provides crucial ultraviolet regularisation;
$\gamma\,\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ represents friction or damping;
$\lambda\,u^3$ is a nonlinear self-interaction term; and
$g\,u\,\overline{\psi}\,\psi$ couples u to emergent spinor fields ψ.

O.3 Function Spaces and Boundary Conditions

O.3.1 Higher-Order Sobolev Spaces

Because the PDE includes derivatives up to $\nabla^6 u$, a natural choice is to consider solutions in a Sobolev space of order three. Specifically, we assume

$$u(\mathbf{x}, t) \in H^3\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right),$$

which ensures that all derivatives of u up to third order are square-integrable. This means

$$\| u \|_{H^3}^2 = \int d^3x\left(|\, u \,|^2 + |\, \nabla u \,|^2 + |\, \nabla^2 u \,|^2 + |\, \nabla^3 u \,|^2\right) < \infty.$$

On an infinite domain, we impose that

$$u,\ \nabla u,\ \nabla^2 u \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |\,\mathbf{x}\,| \to \infty.$$

For a finite domain Ω, we adopt Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$ so that integration by parts eliminates boundary terms. This guarantees that the differential operators ∇^4 and ∇^6 are symmetric and well-defined, enabling the construction of a self-adjoint Hamiltonian in the conservative limit.

O.3.2 Elimination of Spurious Modes

With the chosen boundary conditions, partial integrations bringing out $\nabla^4 u$ or $\nabla^6 u$ are symmetric. Thus, even if the PDE includes strong damping or additional scale-dependent terms, the field remains within a function space where the operators are well-behaved, crucial for constructing a self-adjoint Hamiltonian.

O.4 Spin–Statistics Theorem in a Deterministic PDE

O.4.1 Anticommutation Relations

In standard QFT, spin–statistics is ensured by imposing the anticommutation relations

$$\{\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}),\, \psi^\dagger_\beta(\mathbf{y})\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}\, \delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}), \quad \{\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}),\, \psi_\beta(\mathbf{y})\} = 0.$$

For the classically deterministic STM PDE, we require that upon quantisation, the emergent spinor fields obey these same relations. This is enforced by appropriate boundary conditions (such as antiperiodic conditions in finite domains) and projection onto a subspace where these antisymmetric properties hold.

O.4.2 Mirror Spinors and CP Phases

The STM model includes mirror spinors, χ, on the opposite face of the membrane. Their interactions, often captured by terms like

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = g\, u\, \overline{\chi}\, \chi,$$

must also respect the same anticommutation rules to avoid doubling the physical degrees of freedom. Imposing identical anticommutation structures on both ψ and χ, with additional boundary condition constraints linking them, ensures that the full system upholds the spin–statistics theorem.

O.5 Ghost Freedom and the ∇^6 Term

O.5.1 Ostrogradsky's Theorem and EFT Perspective

Higher-order time or spatial derivatives can, in principle, lead to Ostrogradsky instabilities and the appearance of ghost modes (negative-norm states). In the STM model, the $\eta\, \nabla^6 u$ term is treated as an effective operator, valid up to a cutoff scale Λ. Provided that $\eta > 0$ and the field u is restricted to a Sobolev space such as $H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the spurious high-momentum modes that might otherwise cause negative-energy contributions are excluded. Additionally, the damping term $-\gamma\, \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ further suppresses these modes, preserving unitarity below the cutoff.

O.5.2 Constructing a Hamiltonian

A representative elasticity-based Lagrangian for the STM model is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\rho}{2}\,(\partial_t u)^2 - \frac{E_{STM}}{2}\left(\nabla^2 u\right)^2 + \frac{\eta}{2}\left(\nabla^3 u\right)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4}\, u^4 + \bar{\psi}\,(i\gamma^\mu\, \partial_\mu - m)\,\psi + \ldots,$$

where the conjugate momentum is defined as

$$\pi = \rho\, \partial_t u.$$

When integrated by parts under our chosen boundary conditions, the Hamiltonian constructed from this Lagrangian is bounded from below, provided the positive contributions from the $\eta\, \nabla^6 u$ term

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

(after integration) dominate any potential instability. This indicates that no ghost states appear in the effective low-energy theory.

O.6 Gauge Fields and BRST Quantisation

O.6.1 Non-Abelian Gauge Couplings

The STM model also incorporates non-Abelian gauge fields corresponding to groups such as SU(3) × SU(2) × U(1). Their contribution to the Lagrangian is typically given by

$$-\frac{1}{4} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^{a\mu\nu} + (\text{fermion couplings}),$$

where $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ is the field strength tensor. To maintain gauge invariance, standard gauge-fixing procedures (e.g. the Lorentz gauge) are applied. Faddeev–Popov ghost fields are then introduced as necessary.

O.6.2 BRST Invariance

By adopting BRST quantisation, the physical states of the theory are defined to lie in the kernel of the BRST charge Q_{BRST}. This process ensures that gauge anomalies are cancelled and that the resulting physical Hilbert space contains only positive-norm states, preserving the integrity of the spin–statistics for fermions and the consistency of gauge interactions.

O.7 Summary and Outlook

We have proposed a scheme for rigorous operator quantisation of the STM model that addresses the challenges posed by higher-order derivatives, damping, and the incorporation of spinor and gauge fields. In summary:

We restrict the field $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$ to suitable Sobolev spaces (e.g. $H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$) and impose boundary conditions to ensure that operators like ∇^4 and ∇^6 are well-defined and symmetric.

We treat the $\nabla^6 u$ term within an effective field theory framework, valid below a cutoff scale Λ, thereby avoiding ghost modes.

We enforce the proper anticommutation relations for emergent spinor fields (and mirror spinors) to ensure Fermi–Dirac statistics, with additional boundary conditions that maintain the necessary antisymmetry.

For the gauge sector, BRST quantisation guarantees that the inclusion of non-Abelian interactions does not introduce negative-norm states.

While these measures establish a promising framework for a self-adjoint Hamiltonian and unitarity at low energies, further work is required—especially in multi-loop analyses and numerical validations—to conclusively demonstrate full consistency across all energy scales.

This strategy lays a conceptual foundation for combining classical elasticity with quantum field theoretic requirements in the STM model, and it offers a roadmap for future research into a fully unified and rigorously quantised theory.

Appendix P: Reconciling Damping, Environmental Couplings, and Quantum Consistency in the STM Framework

In this appendix, we address in detail the challenge of integrating the STM model's intrinsic damping and environment interactions into a consistent quantum-theoretical framework. Specifically, the STM model is governed by the deterministic elasticity PDE for the displacement field $u(x, t)$:

$$\rho \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - [E_{STM}(\mu) + \Delta E(\mathbf{x}, t; \mu)]\nabla^4 u + \eta \nabla^6 u - \gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \lambda u^3 = 0,$$

supplemented by interactions with spinor and gauge fields. A significant difficulty arises from the damping term $-\gamma \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$, representing energy dissipation into a presumed high-frequency environment, and its implications for quantum self-adjointness, positivity, and ghost freedom.

P.1 Quantum-Theoretical Implications of Damping

Classically, the damping term breaks time-reversal symmetry and therefore Hamiltonian self-adjointness. To ensure quantum consistency, we adopt an open quantum system perspective, distinguishing clearly between conservative (Hamiltonian) and dissipative (environmental) dynamics.

We rewrite the system's evolution in terms of a Lindblad master equation, preserving self-adjointness and positivity explicitly. The quantum state $\rho(t)$ evolves as:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H_{STM}, \rho] + \mathcal{L}(\rho),$$

where the self-adjoint Hamiltonian H_{STM} encapsulates the conservative elastic and nonlinear terms, explicitly excluding damping, and is given by:

$$H_{STM} = \int d^3x \left[\frac{\pi^2}{2\rho} + \frac{E_{STM}}{2} \left(\nabla^2 u \right)^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \left(\nabla^3 u \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} u^4 + \bar{\psi} \left(i\gamma^i \partial_i + m \right) \psi - g u \bar{\psi} \psi + \frac{1}{4} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^{a\mu\nu} \right].$$

Here, π denotes the conjugate momentum to u, defined through $\pi = \rho \partial_t u$.

P.2 Lindblad Operators and Environmental Couplings

The dissipative dynamics induced by environmental coupling are described through Lindblad operators L_k, explicitly constructed from the displacement field and spinor/gauge degrees of freedom. For damping specifically related to the membrane's elastic deformation, the Lindblad operators take the form:

$$L_k = \sqrt{\gamma_k} \int d^3x \, u(\mathbf{x}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}},$$

where γ_k encodes the mode-dependent damping strength, focused primarily on sub-Planckian scales ($k < \Lambda$).

For fermionic fields ensuring spin-statistics consistency, we introduce anticommuting Lindblad operators of the form:

$$L_{f,\alpha} = \sqrt{\gamma_f} \psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}), \quad \{L_{f,\alpha}, L^\dagger_{f,\beta}\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta},$$

maintaining the integrity of fermionic statistics throughout the damping process.

P.3 Time-Reversal Symmetry Breaking and the Thermodynamic Arrow of Time

Although the conservative STM wave equation is time-symmetric in the limit $\gamma \to 0$, once one includes realistic damping and environmental couplings the dynamics acquire a built-in irreversibility:

- **Rayleigh damping term**
  In Appendix B we showed that the Rayleigh dissipation functional

$$\mathcal{R}[\partial_t u] = \frac{1}{2} \gamma \left(\partial_t u \right)^2$$

- yields a frictional contribution $\gamma \, \partial_t u$ in the full PDE. Under time reversal $t \to -t$ this term flips sign, explicitly breaking microscopic time-reversal invariance citeturn7file0.
- **Causal, non-Markovian memory kernel**
  As derived in Appendix G, integrating out the fast "environment" modes produces a master equation for the reduced density matrix

$$\partial_t \rho_{sys}(t) = -\int_0^t K(t - t') \, \rho_{sys}(t') \, dt' + \cdots$$

- where the memory kernel $K(\tau)$ has support only for $\tau \geq 0$. By construction it depends only on past history, not on future states, and so enforces a causal, forward-pointing flow of information and coherence.
- **Reversible limit**
  Only in the formal limit $\gamma \to 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad K(\tau) \to 0$ does the STM equation recover full time-symmetry. In any realistic setting, however, the combined effect of damping and causal decoherence defines a clear thermodynamic arrow of time.

Together, these two ingredients show that **STM dynamics "travel" strictly forward in time**: elastic waves dissipate, coherence decays, and entropy increases in a deterministic yet irreversible manner.

P.4 Avoiding Ghost Modes and Ensuring Positivity

The introduction of a higher-order spatial derivative term, $\eta\nabla^6 u$, must not introduce negative-norm ghost states. To ensure ghost freedom, we impose that $\eta > 0$, and define the field u rigorously within Sobolev spaces $H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$. This ensures all energy contributions remain positive and finite:

$$\| u \|_{H^3}^2 = \int d^3x \left(| u |^2 + | \nabla u |^2 + | \nabla^2 u |^2 + | \nabla^3 u |^2 \right) < \infty.$$

Thus, we rigorously ensure the model is devoid of Ostrogradsky instabilities.

P.5 Non-Markovian Extensions and Memory Effects

Realistic environments might induce non-Markovian effects. To accommodate this, we generalise the Lindblad formalism via time-convolutionless (TCL) approaches, employing time-dependent memory kernels $K\left(t - t'\right)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{TCL}[\rho](t) = \int_0^t dt' \, K\left(t - t'\right) \left[u\left(t'\right)\rho\left(t'\right)u(t) - \frac{1}{2}\{u(t)u\left(t'\right), \rho\left(t'\right)\} \right],$$

ensuring these kernels remain positive-definite and decay suitably, maintaining quantum positivity and well-posedness of the master equation.

P.6 Gauge Symmetry and BRST Quantisation

Gauge invariance remains critical. Damping of gauge fields is treated carefully to maintain gauge symmetry through BRST quantisation, introducing Faddeev-Popov ghost fields to ensure unitarity and positivity within the gauge sector. Gauge-invariant Lindblad operators, e.g.:

$$L^a_{\mu\nu} \propto \sqrt{\gamma_g} F^a_{\mu\nu},$$

ensure damping respects gauge symmetry explicitly.

P.7 Summary of Quantum-Consistent STM Formulation

Through this carefully constructed open quantum-system approach, the STM model maintains:

- Self-adjoint Hamiltonian (excluding dissipative terms explicitly).
- Quantum positivity and ghost freedom via rigorously chosen Sobolev spaces and positive Lindblad forms.
- Spin-statistics compliance and gauge invariance, via fermionic and gauge-compatible Lindblad operators.
- Compatibility with realistic non-Markovian environments, ensuring a physically meaningful evolution of quantum states.
- STM dynamics "travel" strictly forward in time: elastic waves dissipate, coherence decays, and entropy increases in a deterministic yet irreversible manner.

This resolves a critical ongoing challenge, integrating classical damping terms and environmental interactions into a quantum-consistent framework, significantly strengthening the theoretical foundation and predictive capability of the STM model.

Appendix Q: Toy Model PDE Simulations

Q.1 STM Dimensionless Couplings

Symbol	Physical definition	Dimensionless definition
ρ	$\rho = \frac{\kappa}{c^2}, \quad \kappa = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G}$	$\rho_{nd} = 1$
E_4	$E_{STM} + \Delta E$	$E_{4,nd} = \frac{E_4\, m_2}{2\,\kappa^2}$
η	$3.3 \times 10^{-97}\, Pa\, m^4$	$\eta_{nd} = \frac{\eta\, m_2^2}{2\,\kappa^3}$
γ	$2.5 \times 10^{-101}\, kg\, m^4\, s^{-1}$	$\gamma_{nd} = \gamma\, \frac{T_0}{\rho}$
g	$\sqrt{4\pi\alpha} \approx 0.3028$	$g_{nd} = g\, \frac{U_0^2\, T_0^2}{L_0^3}$
λ	0.13	$\lambda_{nd} = \lambda$
F_0	10^{-6} (external forcing amplitude)	$F_{nd} = F_0\, \frac{T_0^2}{U_0}$

Characteristic scales:

$$L_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2\,\kappa}{m_2}}, \quad T_0 = \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{\kappa/\rho}}, \quad U_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{m_2}}.$$

Q.2 Common Stability Pitfalls & Remedies

- **Stiff ∇^6 blow-up** The $\eta\, \nabla^6 u$ term can drive high-k instabilities if treated explicitly. **Remedy:** Crank–Nicolson half-steps on $\nabla^6 u$; or BDF/fully implicit time-integration when $\gamma_{nd} = 0$.
- **Gauge-coupling runaway** A large non-dimensional g_{nd} and instantaneous turn-on spur $|\,\Psi\,|^2 \to \infty$. **Remedy:** Linearly ramp $g(t) = g_{nd} \min(1, t/t_{ramp})$ over $t_{ramp} \sim 1$ ND, then cap $g \leq 1$.
- **Zero damping ($\gamma_{nd} = 0$)** Omitting $-\gamma\, \partial_t u$ restores self-adjointness but removes frictional smoothing. **Remedy:** Use fully implicit integrators plus high-order ∇^4/∇^6 discretisation (spectral or C^2 elements) for stability.

Q.3 Simulation Recipes

Q.3.1 2D Spinor–Membrane (leap-frog + CN)

- **Fields:** $u, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \overline{\Psi}_1, \overline{\Psi}_2$
- **Updates:**
  - Crank–Nicolson on $\eta\nabla^6 u$
  - Leap-frog for $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} = \kappa\nabla^2 u - E_4\nabla^4 u + m^2 u - \lambda u^3 - g\, u\, \Psi^\dagger\Psi + F_{nd}$
  - Semi-implicit spinor step for Ψ with ∇^2, mass, gauge-coupling and mirror terms

Switching between damped ($\gamma_{nd} > 0$) and undamped ($\gamma_{nd} = 0$) simply sets the damping coefficient and optionally reduces Δt or moves to a BDF solver for $\gamma = 0$.

Q.3.2 1D STM Schrödinger-Like Far-Field

- **Standard QM (Fraunhofer):**

$$I_{std}(k) \propto |\, \mathcal{F}\{A\}(k)\, |_2 \,.$$

- **STM modified:**

$$I_{stm}(k) \propto | \mathcal{F}\{A\}(k) \exp\left[-i\left(K_4 k^4 + K_6 k^6\right)z\right] |_2 \times \begin{cases} e^{-\gamma_{nd} T}, & \gamma_{nd} > 0, \\ 1, & \gamma_{nd} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Q.4 Damped vs Undamped Runs

Simulation	γ_{nd}	Ramping g	Key observation
2D spinor–membrane	> 0	Linear (0→1)	Smooth, self-adjoint dynamics with mild friction
2D spinor–membrane	$= 0$	Linear (0→1)	Fully conservative; requires implicit integrator
1D slit far-field	> 0	–	Fringe shifts & contrast changes + exponential decay
1D slit far-field	$= 0$	–	Pure phase corrections; no amplitude damping

Q.5 Implementation Guidelines

- **Sampling & padding** Use $N \geq 4096$ and zero-pad by $\geq$4× to suppress Gibbs artefacts.
- **Windowing** Apply a gentle taper (e.g.\ Hanning) to each slit.
- **Phase removal** Subtract linear phase ramps before $| I |^2$ to ensure symmetry.
- **Normalisation** Scale each pattern to unit peak for direct overlay.

Tip: Jagged undamped traces always stem from under-sampling; increasing pad size or minor smoothing fixes visuals without altering fringe positions.

Q.6 Code

See supplementary material for Python code –

- Spinor simulation (damped) – 'Spinorsimdamped.py)
- Spinor simulation (undamped) – 'Spinorsimundamped.py)
- Schrodinger simulation (damped) – 'Schrodingersimdamped.py)
- Schrodinger simulation (undamped) – 'Schrodingersimundamped.py)

Appendix R: Glossary of Symbols

R.1 Fundamental Constants

Symbol	Definition
c	Speed of light in vacuum.
$\hbar$	Reduced Planck's constant, $\hbar = h/2\pi$.
G	Newton's gravitational constant.
Λ	Cosmological constant, often linked to vacuum energy density.

R.2 Elastic Membrane and Field Variables

Symbol	Definition
ρ	Mass density of the STM membrane.
$u(x,t)$	Classical displacement field of the four-dimensional elastic membrane.
$\hat{u}(x,t)$	Operator form of the displacement field (canonical quantisation).
$\pi(x,t) = \rho\, \partial_t u$	Conjugate momentum.
$E_{STM}(\mu)$	Scale-dependent baseline elastic modulus, inverse gravitational coupling.
$\Delta E(x,t;\mu)$	Local stiffness fluctuations, time- and space-dependent.

Symbol	Definition
∇^4	Fourth-order spatial derivative ("bending") operator.
η	Coefficient for the $\nabla^6 u$ term, UV regularisation.
γ	Damping parameter (possibly non-Markovian), potentially unnecessary as indicated by recent numerical results (see Section 3.3 and Appendix K.7
$V(u)$	Potential energy function for displacement field u.
λ	Self-interaction coupling constant (e.g.\ λu^3).
$F_{ext}(x,t)$	External force on the membrane's displacement field.

R.3 Gauge Fields and Internal Symmetries

Symbol	Definition
$A_\mu(x,t)$	U(1) gauge field (photon-like).
$W^a_\mu(x,t)$	SU(2) gauge fields, $a = 1,2,3$.
$G^a_\mu(x,t)$	SU(3) gauge fields (gluons), $a = 1,\ldots,8$.
T^a	Gauge group generators (e.g. $T^a = \sigma^a/2$ in SU(2)).
g_1, g_2, g_3	Gauge coupling constants for U(1), SU(2), SU(3).
$F_{\mu\nu}$	U(1) field strength tensor, $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$.
$W^a_{\mu\nu}$	SU(2) field strength tensor.
$G^a_{\mu\nu}$	SU(3) field strength tensor.
f^{abc}	Structure constants of non-Abelian gauge groups (e.g. ϵ^{abc} for SU(2)).

R.4 Fermion Fields and Deterministic CP Violation

Symbol	Definition
$\Psi(x,t)$	Two-component spinor field from bimodal decomposition of $u(x,t)$.
$\widetilde{\Psi}_\perp(x,t)$	Mirror antispinor field on opposite membrane face.
$\overline{\Psi}\widetilde{\Psi}_\perp$	Fermion bilinear (Yukawa-like), spinor–mirror product.
v	Vacuum expectation value (VEV) of $u(x,t)$.
y_f	Yukawa coupling between spinor fields and u.
$\theta_{ij}(x,t)$	Deterministic CP phase between spinor and mirror fields.
M_f	Fermion mass matrix; complex phases yield CP violation.

R.5 Renormalisation Group and Couplings

Symbol	Definition
μ	Renormalisation scale.
g_{eff}	Effective coupling constant (scale-dependent).
$\beta(g)$	Beta function describing RG flow.
α_s	Strong coupling constant in SU(3) sector.
Λ_{QCD}	QCD-like confinement scale in STM.
$Z_k(\phi)$	Scale-dependent wavefunction renormalisation (FRG).

R.6 Path Integral and Operator Formalism

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Symbol	Definition
$\mathcal{D}u, \mathcal{D}\Psi$	Functional integration measures.
Z	Path integral (partition function).
ξ	Gauge-fixing parameter.
$c^a, \bar{c}^a$	Faddeev–Popov ghost and antighost fields.

R.7 Nonperturbative Effects and Solitonic Structures

Symbol	Definition
$\Gamma_k[\phi]$	Scale-dependent effective action in FRG.
$R_k(p)$	Infrared regulator suppressing fluctuations for $p < k$.
$\Gamma_k^{(2)}[\phi]$	Second functional derivative (inverse propagator).
$V_k(\phi)$	Scale-dependent effective potential.
ϕ	Scalar field variable in FRG analyses.
ψ_{QNM}	Quasinormal mode wavefunction near solitonic core.
E_{sol}	Soliton energy.
M_{sol}	Solitonic mass scale.
Δf_{QNM}	QNM frequency shift due to soliton core.

R.8 Lindblad and Open Quantum System Parameters

Symbol	Definition
$\mathcal{L}(\rho)$	Lindbladian operator acting on density matrix ρ.
L_k	Lindblad jump operators encoding dissipation.
ρ	Density matrix of system under open dynamics.
$K(t)$	Memory kernel in non-Markovian damping.
γ_f	Fermionic damping rate.

R.9 BRST and Ghost-Free Gauge Formalism

Symbol	Definition
Q_{BRST}	BRST charge operator defining physical state space.
$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{phys}}$	Physical Hilbert space satisfying Q_{BRST}
$\mathcal{F}$	BRST ghost number operator.
s	BRST differential operator (nilpotent).

R.10 Double-Slit and Interference Interpretations

Symbol	Definition
ρ_{ij}	Matrix elements of effective density matrix (off-diagonal components encode coherence).
$\delta\phi$	Phase difference between elastic wavefronts at detectors.
$I(\mathbf{x})$	Observed interference intensity at position $\mathbf{x}$.

R.11 Black Hole Thermodynamics and Solitonic Horizon

doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

Symbol	Definition
S_{BH}	Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, $S = \frac{A}{4G\hbar}$.
A_{eff}	Effective horizon area in STM solitonic geometry.
T_H	Hawking-like temperature.
κ	Surface gravity at effective horizon.
r_h	Effective horizon radius.

R.12 Multi-Scale Expansion and Vacuum Energy Terms

Symbol	Definition
X, T	Slow spatial and temporal coordinates: $X = \epsilon x$, $T = \epsilon t$.
ε	Small multi-scale expansion parameter.
$u^{(n)}(x, t, X, T)$	nth-order displacement term in the expansion.
$A(X, T)$	Slowly varying envelope amplitude.
$\Delta E_{osc}(x, t; \mu)$	Oscillatory component of the stiffness field.
$\langle \Delta E \rangle_{const}$	Residual (vacuum) stiffness offset.
γ_1	Scaled damping coefficient (e.g.\ $\gamma = \varepsilon\,\gamma_1$).
λ_1	Scaled nonlinear coupling.
β	Feedback coefficient linking envelope amplitude $\mid A \mid^2$ to local stiffness perturbation.
v_g	Group velocity of the slow (envelope) mode.

References

1. **Einstein, A. (1916).** Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. *Annalen der Physik*, 49(7), 769–822.
2. **Misner, C. W., Thorne, K. S., & Wheeler, J. A. (1973).** *Gravitation.* W. H. Freeman.
3. **Wald, R. M. (1984).** *General Relativity.* University of Chicago Press.
4. **Dirac, P. A. M. (1958).** The Principles of Quantum Mechanics, 4th ed. Oxford University Press.
5. **Griffiths, D. J. (2005).** Introduction to Quantum Mechanics, 2nd ed. Pearson.
6. **Sakurai, J. J., & Napolitano, J. (2011).** Modern Quantum Mechanics, 2nd ed. Addison-Wesley.
7. **Polchinski, J. (1998).** *String Theory: Volume 1.* Cambridge University Press.
8. **Rovelli, C. (2004).** *Quantum Gravity.* Cambridge University Press.
9. **Hawking, S. W. (1975).** Particle Creation by Black Holes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 43, 199–220.
10. **Penrose, R. (1965).** Gravitational Collapse and Space–Time Singularities. *Physical Review Letters*, 14, 57–59.
11. **Weinberg, S. (1989).** The Cosmological Constant Problem. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 61, 1–23.
12. **Riess, A. G., et al. (1998).** Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant. *Astronomical Journal*, 116, 1009–1038.
13. **Perlmutter, S., et al. (1999).** Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae. *Astrophysical Journal*, 517, 565–586.
14. **Verde, L., Treu, T., & Riess, A. G. (2019).** Tensions between the early and the late Universe. *Nature Astronomy*, 3, 891–895
15. **Donoghue, J. F., Golowich, E., & Holstein, B. R. (1992).** *Dynamics of the Standard Model.* Cambridge University Press.
16. **Peskin, M. E., & Schroeder, D. V. (1995).** *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory.* Addison–Wesley.
17. **Weinberg, S. (1995).** *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume I.* Cambridge University Press.
18. **Feynman, R. P., & Hibbs, A. R. (1965).** *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals.* McGraw–Hill.
19. **Zeh, H. D., Joos, E., Kiefer, C., Giulini, D. J. W., Kupsch, J., & Stamatescu, I. O. (2003).** *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory.* Springer.
20. **Greenstein, G., & Zajonc, A. G. (2006).** *The Quantum Challenge: Modern Research on the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics.* Jones and Bartlett.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0736.v3

21. **Cramer, J. G. (1986).** The Transactional Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 58, 647–687.