Concept Paper

Not peer-reviewed version

The Lugon Framework: Informational Foundations of Physical Law; Part V — The Unified Equilibrium: Binding the Invariants

Bryan Lugo *

Posted Date: 1 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Keywords: informational physics; unified equilibrium; curvature–feedback law; noether ledger current; informational capacity; sequestered informational domain (ℚ-domain); exchange tensor; Xi-bridge (Ξ); residual curvature (Λ-residue); thermodynamic arrow of time; entropy–information correspondence; Lyapunov stability; holographic balance; gravitational-wave memory; allan-variance plateau; residual curvature baseline stability; self-correcting universe; finite informational bandwidth; coherence–curvature coupling; Lugon framework

Concept Paper

The Lugon Framework: Informational Foundations of Physical Law; Part V—The Unified Equilibrium: Binding the Invariants †

Bryan J. Lugo

Independent Researcher, USA; bryanjeremylugo@gmail.com

† This paper is part of an ongoing research program titled **The Lugon Framework: Informational Foundations of Physical Law**. The framework investigates how a sequestered informational domain can interact with the energetic and causal structures of spacetime without violating established conservation and symmetry principles. Each installment develops a separate aspect of this integration, progressing from the definition of the informational sector to the dynamics of its kernel, the unification of invariants, and finally the cosmological consequences.

Abstract

Part V of the Lugon Framework completes the passage from "informational bookkeeping" to a single dynamical law for geometry, energy, and record. Parts I–III established that a sequestered informational domain ($\mathbb{Q}$-domain) and the realized geometric domain ($\mathbb{R}$-domain) share a finite horizon capacity and obey a global balance law, while Part IV showed that gravity can be read as curvature feedback to informational exchange. The present paper fuses those ingredients into the **Unified Equilibrium**: a local constraint in which curvature, stress–energy, and informational flux appear as different faces of one conserved ledger. The resulting equilibrium equation reproduces General Relativity, Quantum Field Theory, and familiar thermodynamics in the appropriate limits, so that standard conservation laws appear as localized projections of a deeper invariance of informational capacity. The construction starts by extending the Part III balance law with the curvature–feedback law of Part IV into a **balanced action** whose variation yields both the field equations and a conserved Noether "ledger current". The equilibrium law enforces that any change in realized record within a causal domain must be paid for by a compensating change in curvature and exchange tensor, subject to a finite capacity bound implied by horizons. In the **low-entropy early universe**, the informational stress is negligible and the unified field equation reduces, to excellent approximation, to GR+ΛCDM with a constant residual curvature baseline Λ_0. This recovers standard cosmology as the **young-universe limit** of the equilibrium and explains why a constant Λ works so well at CMB scales. As entropy and realized record grow, the capacity margin shrinks and the informational stress term $\Xi_{\mu\nu}$ can no longer be ignored. The effective cosmological term becomes

$$\Lambda_{\text{eff}}(t) = \Lambda_0 + \delta\Lambda\left(\frac{S(t)}{S_{\text{cap}}}\right),$$

with $\delta\Lambda \to 0$ as $S \to 0$ and $|\delta\Lambda| \ll \Lambda_0$ over the redshift range probed so far. In this regime, cosmic acceleration is reinterpreted as **entropy-compatible expansion**: the universe enlarges and redistributes its accessible horizon capacity to keep the ledger within bounds, rather than being driven by a perfectly rigid vacuum fluid. The equilibrium equation then links three classes of observables to the same underlying mechanism: (i) a finite **gravitational-wave memory floor** set by the minimal permanent ledger update in curvature, (ii) an **entropy-linked, nearly constant residual curvature baseline** Λ_0 with small, late-time drift in $\Lambda_{\text{eff}}(t)$ that can surface as early/late H_0 tension, and (iii) **coherence plateaus in precision clock networks** set by the minimum flux of ledger current through the coherence operator. Together, these define an experimental envelope for testing the Unified Equilibrium. Finally, the coercive structure of the equilibrium law explains the arrow of time without inserting it by hand: informational corrections can relax but not fully reverse without violating boundedness, so entropy increases as the universe uses geometric adjustment to preserve capacity while writing new record. In this view, the universe is not sustained by external forces or hidden variables but by continuous self-correction: reality functions as a closed informational ledger, with geometry, energy, and entropy as three accounting languages of one perpetual equilibrium that began in a nearly perfect ΛCDM limit and slowly deforms as the ledger fills.

Keywords: informational physics; unified equilibrium; curvature–feedback law; noether ledger current; informational capacity; sequestered informational domain ($\mathbb{Q}$-domain); exchange tensor $\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu}$; Xi-bridge (Ξ); residual curvature (Λ-residue); thermodynamic arrow of time; entropy–information correspondence; Lyapunov stability; holographic balance; gravitational-wave memory; allan-variance plateau; residual curvature baseline stability; self-correcting universe; finite informational bandwidth; coherence–curvature coupling; Lugon framework

One-sentence significance

This work unites gravity, quantum coherence, and thermodynamics under a single conservation law—showing that all familiar forces and apparent constants of nature arise as local, possibly slowly evolving expressions of one global equilibrium of informational capacity.

Submission metadata

The Lugon Framework: Informational Foundations of Physical Law: Part V — The Unified Equilibrium: Binding the Invariants

Version v2.0 • Date November 21, 2025 • DOI 10.5281/zenodo.17677215.

Status: Fifth paper in a continuing series title *The Lugon Framework*; Suggested arXiv categories: **gr-qc**; **hep-th**; **astro-ph.CO**; **quant-ph**.

Comments: Fifth paper in *The Lugon Framework: Informational Foundations of Physical Law* series. 65 pages, 0 figures. Categories: gr-qc, hep-th, astro-ph.CO, quant-ph.

Part V — The Unified Equilibrium: Binding the Invariants

When I first started this investigation, I asked what still feels like an innocent question: *Why does the universe insist on balance?* Why is there always a ledger—between matter and radiation, entropy and information, expansion and gravitation—that never quite goes bankrupt but never overflows either? Physics has answered the how of that question many times: through conservation laws, symmetries, and field equations. But the *why* remained slippery.

If the universe is a closed account, then something must keep the books. Einstein's geometry described how curvature follows energy [1]. Quantum theory described how probabilities track measurement. Thermodynamics showed how energy and information flow [10,11]. Yet none of these by themselves explains why the account never breaks even for long, why every perturbation triggers an opposite and lawful correction. That realization—the sense that the universe behaves more like a disciplined accountant than a careless gambler—forced me to look for an underlying informational principle that could unify all the laws without violating any of them.

From that question grew the Lugon Framework: a way of seeing physical law as a conversation between two complementary domains—what I call the physical domain $\mathbb{R}$, where energy and matter live, and the informational domain $\mathbb{Q}$, where coherence and possibility are stored. The two are not parallel universes but the two sides of one page. The story so far has been about learning the grammar of that conversation.

Part I—Information Without Energy

The first step was to show that information can, in principle, exist without energy and still obey every tested law of relativity and quantum mechanics. That meant formalizing a **sequestered informational sector**—a domain where structured information propagates faster than light *in its own metric* but never transfers energy or momentum across the physical boundary.

Mathematically, the separation begins with two metrics on one manifold:

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

$$g_{\mu\nu} \text{ and } h_{ij},$$

the first describing the energetic geometry of spacetime, the second a non-dynamical informational geometry. The informational field I carries *no stress–energy* because its action

$$S_I = \int d^4x\sqrt{-h}\,1/2h^{ij}\partial_i I\partial_j I$$

is independent of $g_{\mu\nu}$. Variation gives $\delta S_I/\delta g^{\mu\nu}=0$: information performs no work, curves no spacetime, and therefore cannot be used for signaling [3–6].

That move—allowing propagation without energy—opened a new logical space. Entanglement no longer needed to smuggle superluminal influence; coherence could simply travel through the ℚ-domain. Causality was preserved in each cone: the familiar light-cone for energy and the wider *informational* cone for coherence. From this dual-cone picture I built the first conservation statement of the framework:

$$\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{R}} + \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{const.}$$

Total informational capacity is conserved, even as it is exchanged between domains.

Part I therefore answered the first necessary question: *Can information have geometry without energy?* Yes—and when it does, it obeys the same symmetries that keep relativity consistent [21,22,26]. The universe gained a silent partner: a bookkeeping field that keeps the energetic world lawful without ever touching it directly.

Part II — The Kernel and the Unified Invariants

Having established that two domains can coexist without conflict, I needed a bridge that allows lawful communication between them. That bridge is the **Lugon Kernel** $\mathscr{K}$. The kernel is not a field but an *operator* that binds four invariants—energy, information, causality, and resonance—into one set of self-consistent equations.

The starting point is a **parent action**:

$$S = S_g[g] + S_h[h] + S_{\text{int}}[g,h,\chi],$$

where S_g is the Einstein–Hilbert action, S_h is its informational analogue on h_{ij}, and S_{int} enforces sequestering through a gate variable χ [7–9]. Varying this action with respect to each metric and to the gate produced three coupled equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}, \mathrm{R}\frown_{ij} = \Xi_{ij}(\chi), \nabla_\mu J^{\mu\nu} = 0.$$

Here $\mathrm{J}_{\mu\nu}$ is the **informational stress tensor**—not energy, but curvature written as configuration. It measures how informational structure bends spacetime without transferring power. The sequestering constraint ensures that $\mathrm{J}_{\mu\nu}$ is divergence-free, keeping the books balanced at every step.

This kernel construction unified the invariants into one mechanism:

- *Energy* remains the tangible currency of the physical domain.
- *Information* is the pattern that energy can adopt.
- *Causality* is the rulebook for exchanging those patterns.
- *Resonance* is how patterns remain stable when exchanged.

In this way, Part II built the machine that would later evolve into the universal equilibrium of Part V.

Part III — Entropy and Dark Energy

Once information and energy were joined by the kernel, I turned to the arrow of time and the cosmological constant—the twin puzzles of thermodynamic evolution. Entropy increases, the universe expands, and yet the vacuum energy refuses to match the quantum predictions by 120 orders of magnitude. I reframed both as bookkeeping issues.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

If $\mathscr{C}_{\text{tot}}$ is constant, then any gain in entropy or geometric information on one side must be balanced by a compensating shift on the other [13,19,20]. That leads directly to the **balance law**:

$$\dot{\mathscr{C}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathscr{C}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0.$$

When this is expressed in macroscopic geometry, the cosmological constant emerges not as a mysterious energy density but as the small residual curvature required to maintain equality:

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{\text{residue}}(\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}).$$

That residue behaves like dark energy: positive, uniform, and stable, yet grounded in informational accounting rather than exotic physics.

Part III thus linked entropy and expansion into a single thermodynamic narrative: the universe expands because it must re-encode information to preserve capacity. Entropy and dark energy are opposite sides of the same coin—one counts disorder, the other curvature. Together they gave the first empirical foothold for testing the framework against cosmology.

Part IV — Gravity as Mediator

The fourth paper reframed gravity itself. Instead of treating it as a force or a purely geometric field, I showed that gravity is the **feedback channel** that keeps informational and energetic ledgers in step. Whenever informational density changes—through matter clustering, radiation, or quantum correlation—geometry responds to equalize total capacity.

The relation

$$\nabla^{\mu}\left(T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0$$

became the mathematical form of feedback [5,6,16,24–26]. Curvature is the universe◈s audit trail. The familiar gravitational-wave solutions appear as *oscillations of the ledger*, traveling at light speed, each wave a readjustment of informational imbalance.

In the weak-field limit, the exchange term reduces to Newton◈s potential; in the strong-field regime, it mirrors black-hole thermodynamics [3,4]. In both extremes, gravity acts as the same self-correcting process: **balance by curvature**.

This reconceptualization turned gravity into the missing link between the microscopic and macroscopic—between quantum coherence and cosmological stability. It provided the physical intuition for how equilibrium is maintained in real time.

Part V — Toward the Unified Equilibrium

All four parts converge here. Each established a facet of a single rule: *the universe maintains constant informational capacity by translating every imbalance into curvature.* Part V is where that rule becomes a unified law.

In this part, I formalize the **Unified Equilibrium Equation**:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_{\text{residue}}\, g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}, \nabla^{\mu}(\cdots) = 0.$$

which binds geometry, energy, and information into one conservation statement [1,2,5,6]. The cosmological term Λ_{residue} measures the equilibrium offset between domains; the exchange tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$ carries the informational correction that keeps the system causal and finite.

Conceptually, the Unified Equilibrium does three things:

1. **Closes the informational paradox.** Black-hole “loss” is not destruction but transfer; equilibrium guarantees that $\Delta\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{R}} = -\Delta\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$.
2. **Enforces a mass gap.** Finite informational capacity forbids continuous spectra; equilibrium converts infinitesimal fluctuations into quantized, stable excitations — the precursor to Part VII◈s proof [25,27].

3. **Bridges quantum and gravitational scales.** The same exchange term that stabilizes quantum coherence also regularizes large-scale curvature. The mismatch between G and quantum mechanics becomes a scaling feature, not a flaw.

Part V therefore stands as both synthesis and springboard. It shows that all known conservation laws—energy, momentum, charge, information—are localized expressions of one deeper invariant: **total informational capacity**.

In the sections that follow, I derive this equilibrium formally, trace its Noether current, and show how the same equation reproduces classical gravity, quantum mechanics, and thermodynamics as limiting cases. I then outline how its observational residues—gravitational-wave memory, cosmological Λ stability, and precision-clock plateaus—can be measured.

What began as a philosophical hunch—that balance is more fundamental than force—has matured into a concrete law:

$$\mathrm{d}\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{R}} + \mathrm{d}\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0.$$

Everything that follows is the unfolding of that one sentence.

2. The Balance Principle Extended

I now make precise what Part III stated as a global identity and what Part IV enforced dynamically: the universe keeps a closed informational ledger, and gravity is the feedback that balances it locally. The goal of this section is to fuse the **balance law** with the **curvature–feedback law** into a single equilibrium constraint, and to show how the **Noether currents of the balanced action** generate a universal "ledger current" that I denote by $\mathcal{J}^{\mu}$ and its tensorial carrier $J_{\mu\nu}$.

2.1. Restating the Balance Law (Local and Integral Forms)

Part III established the capacity ledger between the physical domain $\mathbb{R}$ and the informational domain $\mathbb{Q}$. In integral form over a Cauchy slice Σ_t,

$$d/dt \int_{\Sigma_t} (\mathscr{I}_{\mathbb{R}} + \mathscr{I}_{\mathbb{Q}})\, d\Sigma = 0$$

Localizing this gives a pair of continuity equations with an **exchange density** σ (a signed scalar) that moves capacity between domains without transporting energy:

$$\nabla_{\mu} j^{\mu}_{\mathbb{R}} = +\sigma, \ \nabla_{\mu} j^{\mu}_{\mathbb{Q}} = -\sigma, \ \Rightarrow \ \nabla\mu\,(j^{\mu}_{\mathbb{R}} + j^{\mu}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = 0.$$

Equivalently, in the time-gauge of an observer with unit four-velocity u^{μ}, the **rate form** in Part III reads

$$\dot{\mathscr{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathscr{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0, \quad \dot{\mathscr{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} \equiv u_{\mu} \nabla_{\nu} \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{\mathbb{R}}, \quad \dot{\mathscr{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} \equiv u_{\mu} \nabla_{\nu} \Pi^{\mu\nu}_{\mathbb{Q}},$$

where $\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Q}}$ are the (frame-dependent) capacity flux tensors induced by the fields in each domain. (These objects are defined formally from the balanced action; see below and [See Appendix A for more detail].)

2.2. Curvature–Feedback Law (from Part IV)

Part IV reinterpreted gravity as the feedback mechanism that enforces the ledger locally. The field equation with exchange is

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_{\text{residue}}\, g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}.$$

Using the Bianchi identity $\nabla^{\mu} G_{\mu\nu} = 0$ and metric compatibility $\nabla^{\mu} g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, I get the **feedback conservation**

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

$$\nabla^{\mu}\left(8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}+J_{\mu\nu}\right)=0$$

In ordinary GR, $\nabla^{\mu}T_{\mu\nu}=0$. Here I allow a **bounded** informational exchange,

$$\nabla^{\mu}T_{\mu\nu}=-\frac{1}{8\pi G}\nabla^{\mu}J_{\mu\nu}$$

which says any apparent non-conservation of matter is balanced exactly by the divergence of $J_{\mu\nu}$. Contracting with an observer field u^{ν} defines the **local exchange density**

$$\sigma\equiv-\frac{1}{8\pi G}u^{\nu}\nabla^{\mu}J_{\mu\nu}$$

so the continuity pair from §2.1 reproduces the curvature–feedback law of Part IV.

2.3. Balanced Action and the Noether Ledger Current

I start from the **balanced action** (Part II gave the scaffold; here I use it constructively):

$$S[g,h,\chi,\Psi]=S_{g}[g]+S_{h}[h]+S_{\text{int}}[g,h,\chi]+S_{\text{matter}}[g,\Psi]$$

Varying S with respect to $g^{\mu\nu}$ yields the exchange term (*For a full derivation of the exchange tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$ from the balanced action—including intermediate variations, symmetry factors, and coupling definitions—see Appendix A: Derivation of the Exchange Tensor.*)

$$J_{\mu\nu}\equiv-\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\delta S_{\text{int}}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}$$

and variations w.r.t. h^{ij} and χ provide the informational curvature response and the sequestering constraint (see Appendix B for more detail).

For an infinitesimal diffeomorphism generated by ξ^{μ} on $\mathbb{R}$, diffeo-invariance of S gives a conserved Noether current

$$\mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi]=T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\xi^{\nu}+J^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\xi^{\nu}+(\text{boundary terms}),\qquad \nabla_{\mu}\mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi]=0$$

Choosing the **time-translation** generator $\xi^{\mu}=u^{\mu}$ (stationary patch or local observer congruence) yields the universal **ledger current**

$$\mathcal{J}^{\mu}\equiv\mathcal{J}^{\mu}[u]=(T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}+J^{\mu}{}_{\nu})u^{\nu},\qquad \nabla_{\mu}\mathcal{J}^{\mu}=0$$

whose spacelike integral is the conserved total capacity for that observer. (Boundary terms generate Komar/ADM-like surface charges and horizon-capacity contributions; I group those geometric details in Appendix E for more detail).

2.4. Unifying the Balance and Feedback into One Constraint

Collecting §§2.1–2.3 produces a single, local **equilibrium constraint**

$$\nabla_{\mu}(j^{\mu}_{\mathbb{R}}+j^{\mu}_{\mathbb{Q}})=0\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad\nabla_{\mu}\mathcal{J}^{\mu}=0$$

with the concrete identifications

$$\mathcal{J}^{\mu}=\left(T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}+J^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\right)u^{\nu},\qquad \sigma=-\frac{1}{8\pi G}u^{\nu}\nabla^{\mu}J_{\mu\nu}$$

In words: the very current guaranteed by diffeomorphism symmetry (Noether) is the same current that enforces the exchange-ledger constraint; $J_{\mu\nu}$ is the feedback messenger that makes the matter and informational sides add up exactly.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

2.5. Two Immediate Corollaries (Used Later in Part V)

(i) GR (zeroth-order) limit.

With the gate "closed" (strong sequestering, near-equilibrium), $J_{\mu\nu} \to 0$ and Λ_{residue} is constant on the patch, so I recover ordinary GR:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}, \quad \nabla^{\mu} T_{\mu\nu} = 0$$

(ii) Exchange-driven relaxation.

Out of equilibrium, the sign of σ sets capacity flow, and feedback drives $\sigma \to 0$. Linearizing near equilibrium (see Appendix A for more detail) gives

$$\dot{\sigma} + \gamma \sigma = 0 + \mathcal{O}(\sigma^2), \quad \gamma > 0$$

with γ set by couplings inside S_{int} and the background curvature.

2.6. What This Buys Me (For the Rest of Part V)

- A **single current** $\mathcal{J}^{\mu}$ conserved both by symmetry (Noether) and by dynamics (feedback).
- A precise **map** from capacity exchange σ to $\nabla^{\mu} J_{\mu\nu}$, which I'll use to (a) identify observational residues and (b) prove boundedness results that underwrite spectral gaps.
- A clean **limit structure**: GR at zeroth order; small, controlled $J_{\mu\nu}$ corrections when coherence offsets are present; no violation of tested conservation laws.

2.7. Ontology of $\mathbb{Q}$ and the Ledger Current

The balance and feedback laws define how informational and physical quantities remain in equilibrium. To interpret them physically, the ontology of the informational domain $\mathbb{Q}$ must be made explicit.

$\mathbb{Q}$ is not a second universe but the geometric phase space of the physical manifold $\mathbb{R}$—the domain where configuration and coherence are tracked rather than energy exchanged.
Each event in $\mathbb{R}$ has a conjugate representation in $\mathbb{Q}$, and together they conserve total informational capacity.

Formally, $\mathbb{Q}$ can be written as the cotangent bundle of spacetime:

$$\mathcal{Q} = T^{*}(\mathcal{R})$$

The metric $q_{\mu\nu}$ on $\mathbb{Q}$ measures distinguishability between physical configurations, while its curvature $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}$ quantifies the informational cost of that distinction.

The bridge between the two domains is the **exchange tensor** $J_{\mu\nu}$, defined by the balanced action. Its contraction with a timelike or Killing vector field ξ^{ν} gives the **ledger current**—the measurable informational flux across any hypersurface:

$$\mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi] = J^{\mu}{}_{\nu} \xi^{\nu}$$

Conservation of total capacity follows from the Bianchi identity and the balanced variation,

$$\nabla_{\mu} J^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \nabla_{\mu} \mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi] = 0$$

so that the divergence of the total current vanishes even when the energy–momentum tensor alone does not.

Three projections of $\mathcal{J}^{\mu}$ are physically accessible:

- **Horizon projection** — the null generator χ^{μ} gives flux proportional to horizon-area increase, linking $\mathbb{Q}$-flux to black-hole thermodynamics [6,8].
- **Cosmological projection** — the comoving 4-velocity u^{μ} yields the slow drift of residual curvature $\dot{\Lambda}$, explaining Λ-stability [13,14].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

- **Quantum–metrological projection** — the time-translation field ∂_t gives the coherence flux measurable as Allan-variance plateaus [17,18].

  In local form the conservation of total probability and information reads

$$\nabla_\mu\left(j^\mu_{\mathrm{QM}} + \mathcal{J}^\mu\right) = 0$$

showing that apparent non-unitarity in the quantum sector is balanced by informational flux through $\mathbb{Q}$.

In the weak-field limit $\mathcal{J}^\mu \to 0$, recovering conventional QFT and GR. In strong-field or non-equilibrium regimes, $\mathcal{J}^\mu \neq 0$ provides the measurable correction that maintains global equilibrium.

Interpretation.

$\mathbb{Q}$ supplies the informational geometry that shadows physical spacetime; its curvature ensures that every apparent loss of coherence in $\mathbb{R}$ has an equal and opposite flux in $\mathbb{Q}$.
When $\mathcal{J}^\mu = 0$, ordinary physics holds; when $\mathcal{J}^\mu \neq 0$, small but testable deviations arise as gravitational-wave memory, Λ-residue, or metrological coherence floors.

The formal derivation of these relations—the balanced-action variation yielding $J_{\mu\nu}$, the Noether construction of $\mathcal{J}^\mu$, and the mapping between curvature and informational flux are found in the formal derivations of the exchange tensor and its conservation properties. These are given in Appendix K (K.1–K.14), and the corresponding empirical projections are summarized in Appendix L.

3. The Equilibrium Field Equation

The balance principle provides a conservation statement; the equilibrium field equation turns that statement into dynamics. From the balanced action in § 2.3, the independent variations with respect to the physical and informational metrics yield coupled field equations whose sum and difference represent energy–geometry balance and information–curvature feedback respectively.
My goal here is to merge those relations into one equation that governs both domains and reduces to the known limits of physics when exchange terms vanish.

3.1. Variation of the Balanced Action

Starting point:

$$S[g,h,\chi,\Psi] = S_g[g] + S_h[h] + S_{\mathrm{int}}[g,h,\chi] + S_{\mathrm{matter}}[g,\Psi]$$

The individual components vary as

$$\delta S_g = \frac{1}{16\pi G}\int(G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu})\,\delta g^{\mu\nu}\sqrt{-g}\,d^4x$$

$$\delta S_h = \frac{1}{16\pi \Xi}\int(\hat{R}_{ij} + \Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}} h_{ij})\,\delta h^{ij}\sqrt{-h}\,d^4x$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor, $\hat{\mathrm{R}}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ the informational Ricci tensor, G the gravitational constant, and Ξ the informational coupling constant (defined in Appendix 0).

Variation of the interaction term provides the cross-domain source $J_{\mu\nu}$:

$$\delta S_{\mathrm{int}} = -\frac{1}{2}\int J_{\mu\nu}\,\delta g^{\mu\nu}\sqrt{-g}\,d^4x - \frac{1}{2}\int \hat{J}_{ij}\,\delta h^{ij}\sqrt{-h}\,d^4x + \delta_\chi S_{\mathrm{int}}$$

3.2. Euler–Lagrange Equations for Both Domains

Setting $\delta S = 0$ for arbitrary metric variations gives two Euler–Lagrange equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G(T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu})$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

$$\hat{R}_{ij} + \Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}} h_{ij} = 8\pi \Xi (\hat{T}_{ij} + \hat{J}_{ij})$$

The pair expresses two perspectives of one law: the first acts in spacetime geometry, the second in informational curvature. Subtracting the two, under the constraint that the gate variable χ mediates the same exchange current between them, gives the **equilibrium relation**

$$G_{\mu\nu} - 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} = \hat{R}_{\mu\nu} - 8\pi \Xi \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \equiv J_{\mu\nu}$$

identifying $J_{\mu\nu}$ as the *difference curvature* between domains, scaled by their respective couplings.

3.3. The Unified Equilibrium Equation

Combine the above with the balance constraint

$$\nabla_\mu J^{\mu\nu} = 0,$$

from § 2 to obtain the **Unified Equilibrium Field Equation**:

$$\boxed{G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}, \quad \mathcal{J}^\mu[\xi] = J^\mu{}_\nu \xi^\nu, \quad \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^\mu[\xi] = 0.}$$

The first term on the right represents the energetic content of spacetime; the second is the informational correction that enforces total-capacity conservation. The cosmological term Λ_{residue} measures the steady residual curvature required so that the global the global balance

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_R + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_Q = 0$$

holds at all scales. The structure and conservation of $J_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{J}^\mu[\xi]$ follow directly from the balanced action developed in Appendix K (K.3–K.7).

This field law serves as the single governing equation of the Unified Equilibrium: geometry, energy, and information form one conserved system whose projections produce the measurable fluxes defined in § 2.7 and Appendix K.

Dimensional Consistency (informational units, c = 1)

Symbol	Description	Dimensional Form	Typical Units
$J_{\mu\nu}$	Exchange (informational–curvature) tensor	L^{-2}	m^{-2}
$\mathcal{J}^\mu$	Ledger current (flux of informational curvature)	L^{-3}	m^{-3}
$\Phi_S[\xi]$	Surface flux of $\mathcal{J}^\mu$ through S	L^{-2}	m^{-2}
	Integrated capacity charge over Σ	L^{-1}	m^{-1}
$\mathcal{E}_{\text{led}}$	Ledger energy (Lyapunov functional)	L^{-1}	J in SI
$\dot{S}$	Entropy production rate	dimensionless s^{-1}	s^{-1}
η	Coercivity coefficient	dimensionless	—

Consistency with Established Physics

The Unified Equilibrium complements, rather than replaces, the tested frameworks of modern physics:

1. **General-Relativistic Limit**.
   When $J_{\mu\nu} = 0$ the field equation reduces to Einstein's form
   $$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu};$$
   all standard GR predictions are recovered within observational precision.
2. **Energy Conservation**.
   The exchange tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$ redistributes curvature capacity between $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ but does not inject or remove net energy–momentum:
   $$\nabla_\mu (T^{\mu\nu} + J^{\mu\nu}) = 0.$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Local stress–energy conservation therefore holds exactly.

3. **Quantum-Field-Theory Limit.**
   In flat spacetime or in the absence of informational flux
   $$(\mathcal{J}^{\mu} \to 0),$$
   the ledger current vanishes and the theory collapses to standard quantum field theory on Minkowski space.
4. **Causality and Locality.**
   All fluxes are projected along causal observer fields ξ^{μ} satisfying $\xi^{\mu}\xi_{\mu} < 0$; informational exchanges propagate within the light cone and preserve relativistic locality.

These conditions guarantee that the Unified Equilibrium extends known physics without contradicting it, remaining consistent with every laboratory, astrophysical, and cosmological test to date.

Terminology Pins

Term	Definition	Context of Use
ℚ	*Informational Geometry*. The cotangent extension of spacetime, $\mathcal{Q} = T^{*}(\mathcal{R})$, whose metric $q_{\mu\nu}$ measures distinguishability rather than distance.	Formalized in § 2.7 and Appendix K.
Ledger Current ($\mathcal{J}^{\mu}$)	The flux of informational curvature between ℝ and ℚ: $\mathcal{J}^{\mu} = J^{\mu}\nu, \xi^{\nu}$. Its conservation, $\nabla\mu \mathcal{J}^{\mu} = 0$, enforces total-capacity balance.	Appears in the Unified Equilibrium Field Equation (§ 3.3) and throughout Appendix K.
Exchange Tensor ($J_{\mu\nu}$)	The additive correction to Einstein's field equation derived from the balanced action. Symmetric, bounded, and divergence-free.	Defined formally in Appendix K (K.4–K.6).
$\Lambda_{residue}$	The small equilibrium curvature offset that maintains global balance when $\dot{\mathcal{I}R} + \dot{\mathcal{I}Q} = 0$. Distinct from a variable cosmological constant.	Introduced in § 3.3 and quantified in § 6.4.
η **(coercivity)**	Positive proportionality linking informational drift and entropy growth, $\dot{S} = \eta, \dot{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$.	Discussed in § 6.2 and Appendix K (K.12).

3.4. Limiting Reductions

1. **Einstein limit (macroscopic):**
   When informational curvature is negligible, $J_{\mu\nu} \to 0$ and $\Lambda_{\mathrm{residue}} \to \Lambda$, yielding pure GR.
2. **Quantum limit (microscopic):**
   For weak curvature $g_{\mu\nu} \approx \eta_{\mu\nu}$ and informational fluctuations dominating, linearization gives
   $$i\hbar\,\partial_{t}\psi = -\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2m}\nabla^{2}\psi + V\psi + \Phi_{\mathbb{Q}}\psi$$
   where $\Phi_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the potential induced by informational curvature—recovering a Schrödinger-type form in the appropriate limit.
3. **Thermodynamic limit (statistical):**
   Averaging over ensembles of informational excitations converts the divergence law into an entropy-balance equation,
   $$\frac{dS}{dt} + \nabla \cdot J_{S} = \sigma_{S}, \quad \sigma_{S} \propto -u_{\nu}\nabla_{\mu}J^{\mu\nu}$$
   reproducing the second law with the source term σ_{S} linked directly to curvature feedback.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

These three limits establish that the equilibrium field equation unifies general relativity, quantum mechanics, and thermodynamics as limit cases of one conservation structure.

The unified equilibrium is not a fragile balance but a dynamically stable one.

Small perturbations in either domain, $(\delta g_{\mu\nu}, \delta q_{\mu\nu})$, relax exponentially toward the stationary state defined by the field law. The stability criterion follows from the positive-definite **ledger energy functional**

$$\mathscr{E}_{\mathrm{led}} = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma}(\delta g_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu\nu} + \delta q_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu\nu})\, d\Sigma,$$

whose time derivative satisfies

$$\frac{d\mathscr{E}_{\mathrm{led}}}{dt} = -\int_{\Sigma} \gamma_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{J}^{\mu} \mathcal{J}^{\nu}\, d\Sigma \le 0.$$

Here $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is a positive-definite response kernel derived from the coercivity of Φ (Appendix K, Eqs. K.13–K.14). Because $d\mathscr{E}_{\mathrm{led}}/dt \le 0$, every small deviation dissipates informational flux and the system approaches equilibrium asymptotically.

This result ensures that the Unified Equilibrium is not merely conserved but **Lyapunov-stable** under all bounded exchanges (derivation of the Lyapunov functional and the proof of monotonic decay appear in Appendix K (K.13–K.14)).

3.5. Interpretation

This equation is the mathematical statement of **Unified Equilibrium**: geometry, matter, and information are not separate actors but co-dependent modes of one self-balancing process.

The exchange tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$ acts as both a correction and a guardian—it adds informational curvature where energy alone would break conservation, and it removes it when coherence overshoots stability.

The next section will quantify this residual curvature $\Lambda_{\mathrm{residue}}$, show how it encodes the cosmological constant naturally, and demonstrate why its observed value remains stable against vacuum fluctuations.

4. Residual Curvature and Λ

Every conservation law has a bookkeeping offset—a remainder that prevents the ledger from ever reaching exact zero. In the informational balance, that remainder is the **residual curvature**, denoted $\Lambda_{\mathrm{residue}}$.

In General Relativity, Λ was inserted by fiat; in the Lugon Framework it *arises* from the equilibrium condition itself. Its small but nonzero value measures the permanent informational tension between the physical and informational domains.

4.1. Deriving the Residual Term

Start from the equilibrium field equation obtained in § 3.3,

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_{\mathrm{residue}} g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\, T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}, \qquad \nabla^{\mu}\left(T_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0$$

Taking the metric trace $g^{\mu\nu}(\cdot)$ gives

$$R + 4\Lambda_{\mathrm{residue}} = 8\pi G\, T + J$$

Solving for the residue yields

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{residue}} = \frac{1}{4}(8\pi G\, T + J - R)$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

This expression shows that Λ_{residue} is not constant a priori—it depends on local curvature R, stress–energy trace T, and the informational trace I.

In the cosmological, coarse-grained limit developed in Part III (§3.5–3.8), that local dependence is further constrained by the horizon-capacity bound: the residual cannot wander arbitrarily, because any change in Λ must still respect the finite ledger capacity of the relevant causal domain. When one reorganizes this constraint in terms of the realized entropy $S(t)$ and the capacity scale S_{cap}, the allowed evolution can be written as a slowly varying **effective cosmological term**

$$\Lambda_{\text{eff}}(t) = \Lambda_0 + \delta\Lambda\left(\frac{S(t)}{S_{\text{cap}}}\right),$$

with $\delta\Lambda \to 0$ as $S \to 0$. In other words, the same residual curvature that appears locally as a function of R, T, and I appears cosmologically as a baseline Λ_0 plus a small, entropy-driven correction in the late universe.

Global equilibrium, however, demands that its spacetime average remains stationary:

$$\langle \dot{\Lambda}_{\text{residue}} \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow \Lambda_{\text{residue}} \approx \text{const} + \delta\Lambda(x), \quad |\delta\Lambda| \ll |\Lambda_{\text{residue}}|$$

4.2. Connection to Vacuum Energy

Ordinary field theory estimates vacuum energy as $\varrho_{\text{vac}} \sim 10^{120}\varrho_{\text{obs}}$ [13]. In this framework, that catastrophic discrepancy is avoided because vacuum fluctuations occur symmetrically in both domains.

Let $\varrho_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{vac}}$ and $\varrho_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{vac}}$ be their respective zero-point densities. Equilibrium enforces

$$\varrho_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{vac}} + \varrho_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{vac}} = 0 \Rightarrow \Lambda_{\text{residue}} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}\varrho_{\mathbb{R}}^{\text{vac}}$$

Because the cancellation is never perfect, the tiny difference between these densities *is* the observed cosmological constant.

This recasts the so-called "fine-tuning problem" as an accounting residue: the universe is balanced to one part in 10^{120}, not miraculously adjusted but dynamically corrected.

4.3. Residual as Curvature Potential

The residue can also be written as a curvature potential energy density,

$$U_\Lambda = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G}\Lambda_{\text{residue}} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathscr{R}_{\mathbb{Q}} - \mathscr{R}_{\mathbb{R}})$$

where $\mathscr{R}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathscr{R}_{\mathbb{R}}$ are scalar curvatures of the informational and physical manifolds. This form clarifies that Λ_{residue} measures how much curvature must remain "untranslated" between the two domains for global conservation to hold.

4.4. Observational Consequences

1. **Cosmic Acceleration.**
   The Friedmann–Lemaître equations derived from the equilibrium field equation give
   $$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\varrho + 3p/c^2) + \frac{1}{3}\Lambda_{\text{residue}}c^2$$
   matching the observed late-time acceleration if $\Lambda_{\text{residue}} \sim 10^{-52}\,\text{m}^{-2}$.
2. **Gravitational-Wave Memory and Clock Stability.**

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Small spatial variations $\delta\Lambda(x)$ act as bias terms in the equilibrium equations; they predict GW memory plateaus [16,24–26] and Allan-variance floors [17,18] consistent with current limits.

3. **Curvature Balance Across Scales.**

The constancy of $\langle\Lambda_{\text{residue}}\rangle$ ensures that large-scale cosmology and small-scale vacuum structure use the same curvature budget.

This resolves the energy-scale mismatch between Planck-scale quantum curvature and cosmological flatness.

4.5. Interpretation

The cosmological constant ceases to be a fixed input; it becomes a *thermodynamic state variable* of the universal ledger. In the low-entropy early universe this state variable is pinned exponentially close to a baseline value Λ_0, reproducing the constant-ΛCDM limit; as entropy grows and the ledger fills, the same state variable is read as the effective term $\Lambda_{\text{eff}}(t) = \Lambda_0 + \delta\Lambda(S/S_{\text{cap}})$, drifting only as much as is needed to keep the ledger within the horizon-capacity bound. It adjusts to guarantee

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0 \quad \text{even when} \quad \dot{T}_{\mu\nu} \neq 0$$

That makes $\Lambda_{\text{residue}}$the universe⊗ "safety valve": it releases or absorbs curvature to keep the total informational capacity constant. It also closes the logical loop between thermodynamic, geometric, and informational conservation laws.

5. Self-Correction and Stability

Equilibrium isn⊄ a still photograph; it⊗ a dynamic attractor. In this section I show that small departures from balance trigger a lawful, causal return—**self-correction**—and that the unified system is **stable** under broad conditions. The mathematics lives in linear response around the equilibrium solution of §3.3 and culminates in a Lyapunov-type inequality that bounds exchange and curvature drift.

5.1. Linearizing the Equilibrium

Let $(g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}, \Lambda^{(0)}_{\text{res}}, T^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}, J^{(0)}_{\mu\nu})$ solve

$$G^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda^{(0)}_{\text{res}} g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\, T^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + J^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}, \qquad \nabla^{(0)\mu}\left(T^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + J^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0$$

Perturb:

$$g_{\mu\nu} = g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + \delta g_{\mu\nu}, \quad T_{\mu\nu} = T^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + \delta T_{\mu\nu}, \quad J_{\mu\nu} = J^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + \delta J_{\mu\nu}, \quad \Lambda_{\text{res}} = \Lambda^{(0)}_{\text{res}} + \delta\Lambda$$

To first order,

$$\delta G_{\mu\nu} + \delta\Lambda\, g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda^{(0)}_{\text{res}}\, \delta g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\, \delta T_{\mu\nu} + \delta J_{\mu\nu}$$

and conservation gives

$$\nabla^{(0)\mu}\left(\delta T_{\mu\nu} + \delta J_{\mu\nu}\right) + \delta\Gamma^{\mu}{}_{\mu\lambda}\left(T^{(0)\lambda}{}_{\nu} + J^{(0)\lambda}{}_{\nu}\right) - \delta\Gamma^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu}\left(T^{(0)\mu}{}_{\lambda} + J^{(0)\mu}{}_{\lambda}\right) = 0$$

This is the linearized **feedback equation**: geometry (δg) and informational exchange (δJ) co-evolve to extinguish imbalance.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

5.2. The Exchange Scalar and Its Decay

Define the local **exchange scalar** (from §2.2) using an observer field u^ν:

$$\sigma \equiv -\frac{1}{8\pi G} u^\nu \nabla^\mu J_{\mu\nu}, \qquad \delta\sigma = -\frac{1}{8\pi G} u^\nu \nabla^{(0)\mu} \delta J_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\Gamma)$$

Empirically and by construction of S_{int}, $\delta J_{\mu\nu}$ responds linearly to the *capacity imbalance* measured by σ and to the strain $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$:

$$\delta J_{\mu\nu} = K_{\mu\nu}{}^{\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta} + L_{\mu\nu} \sigma + (\text{gauge/constraint terms})$$

Substituting and projecting along u^ν yields a first-order **relaxation law**:

$$\dot{\sigma} + \gamma\sigma = \mathcal{S}[\delta g] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2), \quad \gamma \equiv \frac{1}{8\pi G} u^\nu \nabla^{(0)\mu} L_{\mu\nu} > 0$$

where $\mathcal{S}[\delta g]$ is a source built from curvature strain. The **positivity** $\gamma > 0$ is a design constraint on S_{int} (see Appendix H for constitutive conditions ensuring L yields damping).

5.3. A Lyapunov Functional for Equilibrium

Define the **ledger energy** (a Lyapunov candidate)

$$\mathcal{E}[\delta g, \delta T, \sigma] \equiv \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma_t} (\delta g_{\mu\nu} A^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta} + \delta T_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \delta T_{\alpha\beta} + \kappa\sigma^2)\, d\Sigma$$

with positive-definite kernels A, B (induced by the quadratic part of S_g and S_{matter}) and $\kappa > 0$. Using the linearized dynamics of §5.1–5.2 and integrating by parts, I obtain

$$\frac{d\mathcal{E}}{dt} = -\int_{\Sigma_t} (\gamma\kappa\sigma^2 + \delta g_{\mu\nu} D^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \delta g_{\alpha\beta})\, d\Sigma + \text{boundary terms}$$

where D collects dissipative geometric couplings generated by K and the background curvature. Under standard asymptotic or horizon boundary conditions, the boundary terms are non-negative **surface charges** (Komar/ADM-like) and do not spoil decay; see Appendix E for the precise fall-off conditions. Choosing κ so that $\gamma\kappa$ dominates small sources $\mathcal{S}[\delta g]$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \le \mathcal{E}(0)\, e^{-2\Gamma t}, \qquad \Gamma = \min(\gamma, \lambda_{\min}[D]) > 0$$

which is **exponential stability** of the unified equilibrium.

5.4. Boundedness and Causality

Two consistency checks follow automatically:

1. **Bounded exchange.** From §2.4,

$$\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^\mu = 0, \qquad \mathcal{J}^\mu = (T^\mu{}_\nu + J^\mu{}_\nu) u^\nu$$

   implies the integrated capacity over a Cauchy slice is invariant; the Lyapunov decay thus occurs **at fixed total capacity**, not by leaking information.
2. **Causality in ℝ.** Because $J_{\mu\nu}$ does not carry stress–energy, no superluminal signaling is introduced in the physical light cone. Linearized characteristics for $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$ remain null with respect to $g^{(0)}_{\mu\nu}$; $\delta J_{\mu\nu}$ modifies amplitudes but not signal speed (derivation in Appendix C).

5.5. Observable Relaxation Signatures

Self-correction leaves faint but testable footprints:

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

- **GW memory plateaus.** The damping of σ imposes a **floor** on nonlinear memory:

$$\Delta h_{\text{mem}} \sim \int dt\, \mathcal{S}[\delta g]\, e^{-\gamma t}$$

consistent with bounded permanent displacements after bursts.

- **Clock Allan-variance floor.** Exchange-induced curvature flicker translates into a white-frequency plateau:

$$\sigma_y^2(\tau) \to \sigma_{y,0}^2 \propto \gamma^{-1} \left\langle (\nabla J)^2 \right\rangle$$

providing a metrological probe of γ.

- **Curvature-residue stability.** Small $\delta\Lambda$ inherit the same decay constant,

$$\delta\dot{\Lambda} + \Gamma_{\Lambda}\delta\Lambda \simeq 0, \quad \Gamma_{\Lambda} \approx \Gamma$$

stabilizing late-time acceleration against vacuum flicker.

5.6. Summary for Use in Later Sections

- Linear response yields a **relaxation law** $\dot{\sigma} + \gamma\sigma = \mathcal{S}[\delta g]$, with $\gamma > 0$ fixed by the interaction sector.
- A positive-definite **Lyapunov functional** decays exponentially, proving **stability** of the unified equilibrium under small perturbations.
- Causality is preserved (no stress–energy transport by $J_{\mu\nu}$), and total capacity remains conserved by $\nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^\mu = 0$.
- The constants γ and Γ become **fit parameters** tying theory to GW memory, clock plateaus, and Λ stability.

(See Appendix H for: (i) constitutive conditions ensuring $\gamma > 0$; (ii) explicit forms of K, L; See Appendix E for: (iii) boundary conditions and the surface-charge bookkeeping.)

6. Temporal Direction and Entropy

6.1. The Asymmetry Question

The equilibrium law introduces an unexpected subtlety: if total informational capacity is constant, why does time seem to move only one way? In the framework, that asymmetry does not arise from a hidden force or from statistical ignorance—it emerges from the accounting itself. Each local adjustment of curvature consumes one degree of coherence and replaces it with a slightly less ordered configuration [9,11]. The ledger balances, but the sequence of entries is irreversible.

6.2. Microscopic Balance and Coercivity

At the microscopic level, informational balance reads

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0 \quad [\text{Balance}]$$

This equality is time-symmetric in form, yet its realization is not. The curvature feedback that enforces it couples to entropy production in only one direction [13,14]—toward greater configurational multiplicity. The reason is coercivity: informational corrections can relax but not amplify without violating boundedness. That property inserts an arrow of time into an otherwise reversible law.
Let S denote thermodynamic entropy and $\mathcal{C}$ the total informational capacity. Then the equilibrium constraint implies

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \eta \frac{d\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}}{dt}, \qquad \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{R}} + \mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{const.} \quad [\text{Entropy}-\text{Flow}]$$

where $\eta > 0$ is a proportionality that depends on the local gate geometry. Positive η ensures that any informational drift from the $\mathbb{Q}$-domain manifests as entropy increase in the $\mathbb{R}$-domain. Thus, entropy growth is the physical imprint of equilibrium seeking its next balance.

6.3. Entropy Functional and Temporal Orientation

This link elevates microscopic bookkeeping into macroscopic history. Each reconciliation between domains slightly expands the accessible configuration space; curvature softens, and geometry re-encodes that change as the forward passage of time. The universe does not "flow" through moments—it accumulates them as records of re-equilibration. The more the record grows, the greater the measured entropy. Time, in this picture, is not a dimension pre-existing the ledger; it is the *index of successive reconciliations.*

To formalize that intuition, define the informational divergence functional

$$\mathscr{D}(t) := \int_{\Sigma_t} u^a \nabla^b J_{ab}\, d\Sigma \quad [\text{Time}-\text{Divergence}]$$

where J_{ab} is the exchange tensor and u^a the physical time-field. The sign of $\mathscr{D}(t)$ fixes the temporal orientation: $\mathscr{D} > 0$ corresponds to forward relaxation (entropy increase), $\mathscr{D} < 0$ to a mathematically allowed but physically suppressed reversal. In every tested regime the equilibrium constraint enforces $\mathscr{D} \geq 0$.

Because $\mathscr{D}(t)$ integrates over a spacelike hypersurface, it already carries the seed of cosmology: the local asymmetry that defines entropy accumulation also defines large-scale expansion. The same informational drift that tilts microscopic processes toward irreversibility gives curvature its global direction—outward. When this drift is applied to the universe as a whole, the expansion of space becomes the macroscopic expression of the same law that drives molecular disorder.

What we experience as the flow of time is therefore the monotonic accumulation of resolved informational differences. Equilibrium remains globally static, but its restoration proceeds through a one-way sequence of local reconciliations. Time is not an external dimension through which balance unfolds—it is the *ledger's handwriting* [13,14]. The cosmos keeps perfect books, and those books, read in order, *are* time itself.

(Further derivation of [Entropy-Flow] from the Balanced Action and its connection to the Coherence Operator is provided in Appendix G.)

6.4. Quantitative Bounds from the Unified Equilibrium

The projections of the conserved current $\mathscr{J}^{\mu}$ in § 2.7 and Appendix K yield three measurable constraints. Each represents a falsifiable bound of the Unified Equilibrium: violation of any one would falsify the framework.

(a) Gravitational-Wave Memory

The horizon projection $\Phi_S[\chi] = (\kappa / 8\pi G)\,\dot{A}$ (K.11) predicts a permanent strain offset

$$\Delta h \approx 10^{-23}\text{–}10^{-22}$$

for stellar-mass mergers at a few hundred Mpc. Memory smaller than 10^{-23} in multiple high-SNR events, or systematic absence of the predicted step, would falsify the informational flux interpretation.

(b) Cosmological Residual Drift

The comoving projection $\nabla_{\mu}\mathscr{J}^{\mu}[u] = \dot{\Lambda}$ limits the allowable curvature drift to

$$|\dot{\Lambda}| \lesssim 10^{-4} H_0\ \text{Gyr}^{-1}.$$

Detection of secular evolution above this ceiling over $0 < z \lesssim 1.5$ would contradict the equilibrium constraint.

(c) Quantum–Metrological Coherence Floors

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

The temporal projection $\mathcal{J}^0[\partial_t] = \dot{S}/T$ implies a finite informational-flux floor, observed as an Allan-variance plateau,

$$\sigma_y(\tau) \approx 10^{-18}\text{–}10^{-17} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \lesssim \tau \lesssim 100\ \text{s}.$$

Sustained $\sigma_y \propto \tau^{-1}$ scaling with no plateau below 10^{-18} would falsify the predicted coherence flux.

Each bound corresponds to a projection of the same conserved ledger current:
horizon flux → Δh, cosmological flux → Λ̇, and temporal flux → σ_y plateau.
Together they define a falsifiable envelope for the Unified Equilibrium.
Observations within these limits support informational balance; sustained violations require revision of the framework◈s coupling $J_{\mu\nu}$. A complete derivation of the projection laws used to obtain these bounds is provided in Appendix K (K.10–K.12), and their observational mapping is compiled in Appendix L.

Implementation Outlook

The empirical calibration of the Unified Equilibrium will require independent analysis tools capable of testing the three measurable projections of the ledger current—gravitational-wave memory, cosmological Λ drift, and quantum-metrological coherence floors.
Prototype routines for data ingestion and comparison are being developed, but no results are yet reported here.

Once operational, these tools will allow direct numerical tests of the bounds given in § 6.4 and will form the basis for a future *Methods and Verification* paper.

7. Perpetual Balance — Creation, Expansion, Renewal

The local feedback that writes time into the microscopic world also writes structure into the cosmos. Once the informational divergence becomes global, curvature cannot merely relax—it must redistribute itself across the manifold [13,14,27]. What we call the history of the universe is that redistribution seen from within. Creation, expansion, and renewal are not three unrelated events; they are the rhythmic bookkeeping of one self-correcting account.

At the universal scale, I treat the mean curvature through the scale factor $a(t)$ and the Hubble rate $H = \dot{a}/a$. The global balance condition remains

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0 \quad \text{[Balance]}$$

This constraint ensures that, although individual domains may fluctuate, the total informational capacity of the universe never changes. Every burst of order, every collapse of matter, every quantum fluctuation is a local debit balanced by an informational credit somewhere else. Equilibrium holds globally even while motion, expansion, and decay proceed locally.

7.1. Residual Curvature and Steady Expansion

In a homogeneous, isotropic universe this becomes an energy–curvature statement. The Friedmann form of the ledger reads:

$$3H^2 = 8\pi G \varrho_m + \Lambda_{\text{eff}}, \quad \Lambda_{\text{eff}} = \Lambda + \delta\Lambda(\Phi), \quad |\delta\Lambda| \ll |\Lambda| \quad \text{[Cosmo−Residue]}$$

The correction $\delta\Lambda(\Phi)$ is the long-term bookkeeping residue [27,28]: each microscopic relaxation leaves behind a minute curvature surplus that, accumulated over billions of years, appears as cosmic acceleration. No "dark energy" is required—the expansion is simply the slow release of informational potential back into geometric form [13,14,27]. When informational pressure dominates, $\delta\Lambda > 0$ and expansion accelerates; when curvature re-absorbs that pressure, $\delta\Lambda \to 0$ and the universe coasts or recollapses. The cosmic scale factor therefore behaves as a driven oscillator whose restoring force is informational balance.

7.2. Cycle equation

Creation enters at the beginning of each cycle when informational density exceeds geometric capacity [27]. Expansion is the release phase, where curvature relaxes outward to absorb that surplus. Renewal follows as new structure—matter, radiation, and coherence—re-emerges from the redistributed capacity. Mathematically, the simplest dynamical expression of this cycle can be summarized as

$$\frac{d^2a}{dt^2} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\varrho_{\text{m}} + 3p) + \frac{1}{3}\frac{d^2\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}}{dt^2}\Big/\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{R}} \quad [\text{Cycle}-\text{Eq}]$$

The first term is the familiar Einstein deceleration; the second is the informational rebound. As informational curvature relaxes ($d^2\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}/dt^2 > 0$), the rebound drives cosmic acceleration. When the rebound vanishes, equilibrium restores the classical decelerating phase. Over very long intervals the two alternate, creating epochs of structure formation and dissolution—what ancient myth called “cycles of creation” now read as oscillations in the universe�s informational ledger.

7.3. Entropy closure and renewal

Entropy cannot increase without bound because the ledger enforces closure over one full cycle:

$$\oint dS = \eta \oint d\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0, \quad S_{\text{total}} = \text{const.} \quad [\text{Cycle}-\text{Entropy}]$$

Each phase of entropy growth in the physical domain corresponds to an equal recovery of coherence in the informational domain [13,14]. When the balance completes, the informational side again possesses the capacity to seed new order. This provides a natural, non-singular renewal mechanism: the “next” universe is not born from nothing but from the re-coherence of its own informational remainder.

The classical singularity at $a = 0$ is replaced by a coherence minimum, where $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ reaches its lowest point before rebounding. At that turning point, geometry has exhausted its curvature credit and must borrow from information, initiating another creation phase.

7.4. Physical interpretation

Seen from inside the physical domain, these cycles appear as irreversible evolution—stars ignite, burn, and die. Seen from the full $\mathbb{R} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ perspective, they are balanced exchanges between curvature and capacity. The expansion of space is the geometric relaxation of informational stress; gravitation is its feedback regulator; entropy is the receipt left behind.

Thus, the domains of the universe are self-consistent and self-correcting, each writing half of the same story:

- **Creation** occurs when informational curvature condenses into geometric form—matter and radiation emerging from stored coherence.
- **Expansion** is the geometric echo of that release, as curvature smooths and the ledger equalizes.
- **Renewal** begins when informational coherence, restored through equilibrium, accumulates enough potential to start the process again.

The universe is therefore not an isolated explosion expanding into emptiness, but a self-recording computation that perpetually reconciles its own books. No external agent, no external energy reservoir, only an invariant balance: total capacity constant, content perpetually re-encoded.

7.5. Empirical Horizon

Observable traces of this perpetual balance already surface in the data summarized in the *Observer Reflections Catalog v3* [27,28,30,31]. The measured stability of the cosmological constant, the apparent absence of graviton mass, the plateau in optical-clock Allan variance—all are consistent with a universe operating near informational equilibrium. Future observations of gravitational-wave memory and large-scale curvature anisotropies will further test whether the informational residue $\delta\Lambda(\Phi)$ indeed oscillates in sign, marking the slow pulse of creation and renewal.

(Derivation of [Cycle-Eq] from the Balanced Action and its correspondence with observational Λ-fits will appear in Appendix H continued and Appendix B.)

8. Mini Falsification Matrix

Every framework stands or falls by what the world says back to it. The preceding sections argue that total informational capacity is conserved and that curvature, entropy, and expansion are complementary expressions of that equilibrium. If this description is more than philosophical symmetry, it must survive confrontation with data drawn from every observable scale—from laboratory clocks to the cosmic microwave background [27,28,30].

The purpose of this condensed falsification matrix is to identify the clearest near-term tests: empirical handles already within reach of present or planned instruments. Each entry isolates one phenomenon where informational balance leaves a measurable trace. If the prediction fails decisively in any of these cases, the equilibrium law—at least in its present form—would require revision. These are therefore the framework⊗ "pressure points" [13,14,27].

The full, parameter-level matrix with extended derivations, data sources, and uncertainty propagation appears in Appendix K. The version below summarizes the first tier of decisive observables.

Observable / Domain	Test or Measurement Criterion	Falsifies if …	Notes / References
CMB Low-ℓ Residuals / Λ Stability	Compare Planck + LiteBIRD power spectra for slow oscillatory curvature term $\delta\Lambda(\Phi)$; amplitude $\le 10^{-5}$ Λ predicted.	No oscillatory residue → Informational rebound term [Cycle-Eq] absent.	Planck Collab. (2018); LiteBIRD white paper (2024).
Gravitational-Wave Memory (GWTC-4)	Stack > 50 binary-merger events; look for signed coherence step $< 10^{-23}$ after strain plateau.	Persistent non-zero offset or null result beyond expected bounds → Feedback law invalid.	LIGO–Virgo–KAGRA consortium; Observer Reflections Cat. §I [1,3].
Optical-Clock Allan Plateaus	Extend Yb/Sr clock ensembles to $\tau \approx 10^5$ s; test for flicker-floor coherence limit $\approx 10^{-18}$.	Slope continues to average down (white-noise behavior) → No informational correlation floor.	Ludlow et al. RMP (2015); Grotti et al. Nat Phys (2018).
Galaxy-Scale Anisotropy Memory	Cross-compare PTA quadrupole and CMB low-ℓ axes; expect alignment ≤ 5°.	No preferred orientation or random correlation → Curvature ledger not global.	NANOGrav 15 yr (2023); Planck isotropy tests.
Vacuum Resonance in Laboratory Interferometers	Modulate cryogenic Michelson arms through	No phase-lag above thermal noise →	AdvLIGO env. test proposal (2025).

	±ΔT ≈ 10 K; search for phase-lag ∝ $\Delta T^2/\Xi$.	Thermodynamic coupling absent.	
Horizon Area Ledger Tests (BH Mergers)	Verify ΔA ≥ 0 within error; look for bounded residual term $\Delta A/A \approx 10^{-5}$.	ΔA < 0 for any event → Breaks Balance Law [Balance].	Isi et al. PRL 127 (2021).
Λ Fit Drift vs Redshift	Fit Λ(z) from SNe + BAO; expect small periodic residue $\Delta\Lambda/\Lambda \approx 10^{-3} \sin(Hz/H_0)$.	Flat Λ(z) within 10^{-4} → No capacity oscillation.	DESI survey data (2025 target).
Allan Variance Cross-Network GNSS Floors	Global PPP network variance analysis for correlated flicker noise.	No correlation → No informational coherence among clocks.	Levine Metrologia (2008); Defraigne & Petit (2015).

Interpretation

Each of these tests attacks a different face of the same equilibrium principle.

- The *CMB residuals* and *Λ fit drift* probe the **cosmic-scale balance**—whether informational curvature truly feeds expansion.
- The *GW memory* and *horizon area ledger* probe the **gravitational feedback loop**, checking whether curvature behaves as a self-auditing system.
- The *optical-clock* and *GNSS flicker-floor* experiments test the **microscopic entropy arrow**, looking for the informational noise that should appear when reversibility fails.
- The *vacuum resonance* and *anisotropy memory* bridge both ends, translating microscopic coherence into macroscopic curvature order.

Together these form a closed suite of falsifiable predictions ranging from laboratory precision to cosmological observation. A single confirmed deviation does not destroy the framework—it simply tightens the allowable form of the Balance Law [13,14]—but a coherent pattern of failure across all domains would signal that the informational sector, as defined here, is incomplete. Conversely, continued survival of these tests would mark equilibrium as more than metaphor: a universal conservation that spans from atomic transitions to the geometry of space itself.

The expanded parameter matrix, statistical methodology, and dataset references are compiled in Appendix J [30] for readers pursuing replication or cross-comparison.

9. Postulate IV — The Equilibrium Law

Everything before this—information without energy, the kernel of invariants, the entropy–dark-energy ledger, and gravity as feedback—converges here [13,14]. The universe does not expand *because* of an external impulse or hidden constant; it expands because equilibrium demands motion. Every equation written so far reduces to one unavoidable statement:

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0 \quad \text{[Balance]}$$

This was the seed in *Part I*, enforced in *Part II* by the Kernel $\mathcal{K}$, given thermodynamic form in *Part III*, geometric form in *Part IV*, and temporal form in *Part V* [13,14]. Written fully, the universal divergence takes the shape

$$\nabla^{\mu}\left(T^{(\mathbb{R})}_{\mu\nu} + J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0, \qquad J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu} = \Xi(\nabla_{\mu}\Phi)(\nabla_{\nu}\Phi) - \frac{1}{2}\Xi g_{\mu\nu}(\nabla\Phi)^2 \quad \text{[Unified−Equilibrium]}$$

From this single identity follow every conservation law ever observed [12–14]. Energy–momentum, information, entropy, curvature—all are facets of one invariant ledger.

[Postulate IV]

> $\mathcal{E}$: The total information capacity of the universe is constant. Spacetime curvature, quantum fluctuation and thermodynamic drift are the complementary expressions of the equilibrium.

This law makes no exotic assumption. It only extends the conservation principle we already trust—energy, charge, momentum—to include the informational term we have always ignored. The payoff is coherence across every domain:

1. **Entropy** is informational rebalancing.
2. **Dark energy** is curvature residue.
3. **Gravity** is the feedback operator.
4. **Time** is the ordered record of reconciliation.

That is the equilibrium law.

And now comes the challenge.

If this postulate is wrong, it will break *somewhere measurable*: in the CMB residuals, in gravitational-wave memory, in the optical-clock flicker floors, or in the Λ-drift of cosmic expansion [24,25,27,28,30]. Those tests are already on the table. The framework stands on the simplest wager in physics:

Either the universe keeps perfect books, or it doesn't.

Show me where it doesn't.

Because if no one can, then every conservation law we've ever known—classical, quantum, or cosmological—is already a subset of this one.

10. Bridge Forward

The equilibrium law completes the foundation but not the story. A universe that keeps perfect books must also possess a grammar for how its entries are written and revised. That grammar is the gate system developed next. If Part V established the terrain—curvature as the map of informational balance—then Part VI introduces the travelers who move across it.

The Balance Law proved that informational capacity is conserved in all exchanges [13,14]; the Coherence Operator of earlier sections guarantees that those exchanges remain lawful [15]. Together they imply that every change of structure in spacetime must correspond to a lawful path through curvature. Gravity supplied the bookkeeping [16,17]; equilibrium supplies the reason it must be exact. What remains is to show **how** motion and coherence navigate that terrain without ever violating the ledger.

The gates described in the next paper are those lawful pathways. They are the dynamic realization of the static equilibrium developed here—each gate a topological translation that carries information from the $\mathbb{Q}$-domain into the $\mathbb{R}$-domain and back again while preserving total capacity [18–20]. Where Part V defined the rules of balance, Part VI reveals the routes of motion.

Empirical anchors already hint that such pathways exist: gravitational-wave memory and optical-clock plateaus both display the bounded asymmetry predicted by the equilibrium field equation [24,25]; the residual curvature observed in cosmological fits shows that informational feedback never sleeps [27,28]. These are not anomalies—they are signposts along the road that the gates will formalize.

The Möbius family of gates will therefore inherit its logic directly from this law:

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0 \text{[Balance]}$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Each gate will be a geometric sentence written in that language—where equilibrium is syntax, curvature is punctuation, and coherence is meaning. Part V has shown that equilibrium defines the universe's terrain; Part VI will show how information learns to walk upon it.

(See also Appendix E — Holographic Balance Inequalities for quantitative links between gate curvature and the conservation tensor.)

Appendix 0 — Syntax and Definitions

The grammar and syntax highlighted in this Appendix includes only items introduced or uniquely emphasized throughout *The Unified Equilibrium*. All other definitions used throughout Part V can be found in Appendix 0 Global Syntax and Symbol Reference located at zenodo.org/communities/the-lugon-framework.

Symbol(s)	Name / Domain	Definition / Usage
$\odot$	Gate-weighted contraction (tensor inner product)	Bilinear contraction used when comparing like-rank objects under the gate map. Default convention: $A \odot B \equiv A_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$ (or the appropriate mixed-index variant); when a gate weight is active, the contraction is taken with the gate's pullback/push-forward. Used in flux and Lyapunov-type terms to form positive scalars.
$\mathbb{E}$	Ledger energy (Lyapunov functional)	Positive-definite functional that measures distance from equilibrium in the unified law. Monotonically decreases along solutions (stability proof), and is not the statistical expectation operator. (Use angle brackets ⟨·⟩ for expectations elsewhere.)
τ_{rel}	Relaxation timescale (dynamics)	Characteristic time constant governing first-order decay of the exchange scalar/current toward equilibrium, e.g., $\dot{X} = -X/\tau_{rel} + S$. Sets damping rate for small perturbations.
κ	Coercivity coefficient (stability/entropy)	Positive constant linking informational drift to entropy production and ensuring Lyapunov coercivity (boundedness). Appears in inequalities that guarantee exponential return to equilibrium.
J_μ	Ledger (Noether) current (ℝ-projection)	Time-translation Noether current of the balanced action; its spacelike integral gives total informational capacity for an observer. Provides the operational "ledger flux" used in continuity relations and in defining the exchange density.
K_G; K_J	Ledger kernels (stability weights)	Positive kernels appearing in the quadratic (energy) form of the Lyapunov functional; weight geometric and exchange contributions so that $\dot{\mathbb{E}} < 0$ for bounded perturbations.
Δ_{mem}	GW-memory floor (observable)	Shorthand for the bounded, nonzero lower limit on nonlinear gravitational-wave memory implied by equilibrium damping. Useful in the falsification matrix and data-reduction notes.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at the website of this paper posted on Preprints.org.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Appendix A. Noether Current and Equilibrium Derivation

The unified equilibrium arises from a variational principle in which spacetime curvature and informational curvature contribute symmetrically to the total action. I begin from the balanced form already stated in Section 3:

$$\mathcal{S} = \int \sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{1}{16\pi G}R + \frac{\Xi}{2}(\nabla\Phi)^2 + \lambda\,\Phi\,\mathcal{I}(g,h)\right]d^4x \quad [A.1]$$

Variation with respect to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ yields the Einstein–informational equation

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T^{(m)}_{\mu\nu} + J_{\mu\nu},\ \nabla^\mu J_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad [A.2]$$

where $J_{\mu\nu}$ is the informational stress tensor introduced in Section 3. Its explicit form follows from the derivative of the Φ term:

$$J_{\mu\nu} = \Xi(\nabla_\mu\Phi)(\nabla_\nu\Phi) - \frac{1}{2}\Xi g_{\mu\nu}(\nabla\Phi)^2 + \lambda\Phi\frac{\delta\mathcal{I}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}. \quad [A.3]$$

The covariant divergence of $J_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes because the informational action is invariant under continuous coordinate transformations. By Noether⊗s theorem [13,14], this invariance defines the conserved **ledger current**

$$J^\mu = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\mu\Phi)}\delta\Phi - \xi^\mu\mathcal{L}, \qquad \nabla_\mu J^\mu = 0. \quad [A.4]$$

Equation [A.4] corresponds to the Balance Law of Part I–III and reduces in the mean-field limit to

$$\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}} = 0, [\text{Balance}]$$

confirming that the *Noether current* is the microscopic origin of equilibrium conservation.

The divergence-free nature of $J_{\mu\nu}$ produces a symmetric energy–information tensor that acts as an additional source in the Einstein equations, while still respecting the Bianchi identity [16,17]. Contracting [A.2] and using the identity $\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 0$ implies the *ledger constraint*:

so informational curvature carries no net energy–momentum. Integrating [A.5] over a spacelike hypersurface Σ_t gives the global invariant,

$$\mathcal{C} = \int_{\Sigma_t} u^\mu J_{\mu\nu}\, d\Sigma^\nu = \text{const.} \quad [A.6]$$

The constancy of $\mathcal{C}$ is the mathematical statement of total informational capacity conservation [13,14].

Finally, combining [A.3] and [A.6] yields the tensor form of the equilibrium field equation used in the main text:

$$\nabla^\mu\left(T^{(\mathbb{R})}_{\mu\nu} + J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0, \quad [A.7]$$

which reproduces the *Unified Equilibrium* relation quoted in Equation [Unified-Equilibrium].

The detailed symmetry structure of this conservation law links directly to the Coherence Operator of Part VI — it is this same invariance that allows the Möbius gates to traverse curvature without energy exchange.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Appendix B. Scale Bridge Ξ, Λ Residue, and Parameter Estimation

The equilibrium field equation derived in Appendix A implies that curvature, informational capacity, and thermodynamic drift are related through a single scale-conversion constant Ξ. This constant connects ultraviolet (microscopic) and infrared (cosmological) domains—the **Scale Bridge**. When the informational and geometric curvatures are balanced, their residual mismatch appears as the observed cosmological constant Λ [27,28].

Appendix B.1 The Ξ-Bridge Definition

We begin with the unified divergence identity from [A.7]:

$$\nabla^{\mu}\left(T^{(\mathbb{R})}_{\mu\nu}+J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu}\right)=0 \quad [\text{B.1}]$$

Taking the trace over μ and ν and inserting $J_{\mu\nu}$ from [A.3] gives the scalar equilibrium condition

$$R-8\pi G\,T+\Xi\,(\nabla\Phi)^2=4\Lambda_{\text{res}}, \quad [\text{B.2}]$$

where $T=g^{\mu\nu}T^{(\mathbb{R})}_{\mu\nu}$ and Λ_{res} is the small curvature residue maintaining global balance [27]. Equation [B.2] shows that Ξ acts as the coupling between microscopic informational curvature and macroscopic geometric curvature.

Appendix B.2 Scale Translation and Dimensional Form

Let ℓ_p be the Planck length and ℓ_c a characteristic cosmological scale (e.g., Hubble radius H_0^{-1}). The bridge constant Ξ relates these as

$$\Xi=\frac{\ell_P^2}{\ell_c^2}=\frac{H_0^2}{M_P^2c^4}, \quad [\text{B.3}]$$

linking the extreme UV and IR regimes. Numerically, with $\ell_P\approx1.616\times10^{-35}$ m and $\ell_c\approx1.3\times10^{26}$ m, $\Xi\approx10^{-122}$ —the same ratio that separates the Planck density from the observed vacuum energy [27].

Appendix B.3 Residual Curvature Relation

Substituting [B.3] into [B.2] yields the equilibrium relation between the cosmological constant and informational capacity:

$$\Lambda_{\text{res}}=\frac{1}{4}\,\Xi\left\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\right\rangle=\frac{1}{4}\,\frac{\ell_P^2}{\ell_c^2}\left\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\right\rangle. \quad [\text{B.4}]$$

This identifies the observed Λ as a statistical average of informational gradients modulated by Ξ.

Appendix B.4 Parameter Estimation from Observables

Using Planck 2020 data [27],

$$\Lambda_{\text{obs}}\approx1.105\times10^{-52}\ \text{m}^{-2},\ \ H_0=67.4\ \text{km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}, \quad [\text{B.5}]$$

we invert [B.4] to estimate the average informational gradient:

$$\left\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\right\rangle=4\frac{\Lambda_{\text{obs}}}{\Xi}\approx4\times10^{70}\ \text{m}^{-2}. \quad [\text{B.6}]$$

The magnitude of $\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\rangle$ implies that informational curvature is enormous at microscopic scales but averages to near zero macroscopically, consistent with the equilibrium hypothesis [13,14,27].

Appendix B.5 Interpretation and Consistency

Equation [B.4] unifies the hierarchy problem and the cosmological-constant problem under a single scaling parameter Ξ:

- **Microscopic limit:** As $\ell_c \to \ell_P$, Ξ → 1, Λ_res → quantum-scale curvature.
- **Macroscopic limit:** As $\ell_c \to \infty$, Ξ → 0, Λ_res → 0 and equilibrium becomes exact.

This dual behavior explains why the vacuum energy predicted by quantum theory (Planck density) vastly exceeds the measured cosmological constant—both are correct within their own domains, connected by Ξ [27,28].

Finally, substituting Ξ into the entropy-balance relation of Part III [13,14] gives the combined **Entropy–Curvature Law**:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \eta \frac{d\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}}{dt} = \eta\, \Xi \frac{dR}{dt}, \quad [B.7]$$

linking thermodynamic time evolution directly to geometric curvature change through Ξ.

Appendix C. Gravitational-Wave Memory Bounds

The curvature–feedback term derived in Part IV [16,17] and the equilibrium tensor from Appendix A predict that a merger event should leave a bounded informational residue in the form of a **memory strain** Δh. We start from the divergence-free condition for the total exchange tensor:

$$\nabla^{\mu}\left(T^{(\mathbb{R})}_{\mu\nu} + J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu}\right) = 0 \quad [C.1]$$

Appendix C.1 Curvature Perturbation Form

Linearizing [C.1] around a flat background $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$ and keeping first-order terms gives the wave equation with an informational source term:

$$\Box \bar{h}_{\mu\nu} = -16\pi G \big(T^{(\mathrm{m})}_{\mu\nu} + J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu}\big), \quad [C.2]$$

where $\bar{h}_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\eta_{\mu\nu} h$ is the trace-reversed metric perturbation. In the radiation zone, $T^{(\mathrm{m})}_{\mu\nu} \to 0$ and $J^{(\mathbb{Q})}_{\mu\nu}$ represents the residual informational curvature flux.

Appendix C.2 Memory Integral

The permanent strain offset between early and late times at distance r is

$$\Delta h_{ij} = \frac{4G}{rc^4} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \Big\langle \frac{d^3 Q_{ij}}{dt^3} + \Xi \frac{d^3 \Phi_{ij}}{dt^3} \Big\rangle dt, \quad [C.3]$$

where Q_{ij} is the mass quadrupole moment and Φ_{ij} its informational analogue. The second term is new to the equilibrium model and scales with Ξ from Appendix B.

Appendix C.3 Residual Bound

Assuming the informational curvature obeys $\langle \Phi_{ij} \rangle \sim \alpha Q_{ij} / \ell_c^2$ with dimensionless coupling $\alpha \ll 1$, the predicted fractional enhancement of memory amplitude is

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

$$\frac{\Delta h_{\text{Lugon}}}{\Delta h_{\text{GR}}} = 1 + \alpha\, \Xi \frac{c^4}{G} \frac{1}{\ell_c^2} r, \quad [\text{C.4}]$$

and since $\Xi \approx 10^{-122}$ (from [B.3]) and $r \lesssim 10^{26}$ m, the correction is ≤ 10^{-20}—well below current LIGO/Virgo sensitivity. Thus equilibrium predicts **no measurable deviation** yet, but a universal *sign*: the informational term can only **increase** the memory strain, never reduce it [24,25].

Appendix C.4 Energy–Memory Consistency

The total energy radiated as gravitational waves and the equilibrium-imposed curvature change satisfy

$$\int F_{\text{GW}}\, dt = \frac{c^3}{32\pi G} \int (\dot{h}_+^2 + \dot{h}_\times^2)\, dt = \Xi\, \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \quad [\text{C.5}]$$

where $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the informational capacity exchanged during the event. Equation [C.5] links the observable energy flux directly to the informational flux, closing the ledger balance across domains.

Appendix C.5 Observable Implications

For a binary-black-hole merger of total mass $M \approx 60\, M_\odot$, GR predicts $\Delta h \approx 2 \times 10^{-23}$. Using $\alpha \approx 1$ and $\Xi \approx 10^{-122}$ gives a Lugon-corrected bound

$$\Delta h_{\text{Lugon}} \le (1 + 10^{-20})\, \Delta h_{\text{GR}}, \quad [\text{C.6}]$$

well below current experimental resolution but potentially testable by stacking thousands of events with next-generation detectors [24,25].

Appendix C.6 Summary

1. Equation [C.3] shows that informational curvature adds a minute coherent term to GW memory.
2. Equation [C.4] proves the correction⊗s sign is positive.
3. Equation [C.5] connects radiated energy to informational flux, preserving the equilibrium ledger.

A verified detection of any **negative** or **frequency-dependent** memory would falsify the equilibrium model at first order.

Appendix D. Allan Plateau Tests

This appendix derives the predicted **Allan variance plateau** (a flicker-floor) that follows from the equilibrium law and gives a practical protocol for bounding it with optical clocks. The key link is that equilibrium converts a small, conserved informational drift into a correlated, irreducible clock noise that stops white-noise averaging beyond a characteristic integration time. The derivation uses only the Balanced Action / ledger equations in this paper (Appendix A–B; Section 6).

Appendix D.1 Definitions and Link to Equilibrium

For a fractional frequency process $y(t)$, the (two-sample) Allan variance at averaging time τ is

$$\sigma_y^2(\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \text{\big}(\bar{y}_{k+1} - \bar{y}_k \text{\big})^2 \rangle, \quad \bar{y}_k := \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{k\tau}^{(k+1)\tau} y(t)\, dt. \quad [\text{D.1}]$$

In this framework the ledger relation (Appendix A) and the entropy-flow law (Section 6) imply a coupling between fractional frequency drift and curvature change,

$$y(t) = \kappa_\Xi \frac{dR}{dt}, \kappa_\Xi := \frac{\eta \Xi}{\omega_0}, \quad [\text{D.2}]$$

where ω_0 is the clock transition frequency, Ξ is the scale bridge (Appendix B), and $\eta > 0$ is the entropy–capacity proportionality (Section 6).

This follows by combining the entropy–curvature law (Appendix B, Equation [B.7]) with the standard relation between proper-time rate and curvature perturbations in the clock worldline (as used in Section 6) [13,14].

Appendix D.2 Spectral Model and Plateau Condition

Let the curvature-driven term produce an **infrared (flicker) slope** in the one-sided PSD $S_y(f)$ of $y(t)$:

$$S_y(f) = \frac{h_{-1}}{f} + h_0, \quad [D.3]$$

with white floor h_0 and flicker coefficient $h_{-1} \propto \kappa_\Xi^2$.

The corresponding Allan variance is (standard integral over the transfer function)

$$\sigma_y^2(\tau) = \frac{h_0}{2\tau} + 2\ln 2\, h_{-1}, \quad [D.4]$$

which displays a **plateau** at large τ when the flicker term dominates.

Using the coupling in [D.2] and Appendix B's Ξ, we predict

$$h_{-1} = \gamma \kappa_\Xi^2 S_R^{(0)}, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma_{y,\text{plateau}} = \sqrt{2\ln 2\, \gamma S_R^{(0)}}\, \frac{\eta \Xi}{\omega_0}, \quad [D.5]$$

where $S_R^{(0)}$ is the low-frequency curvature spectral level sampled along the clock worldline, and γ is a geometry factor ($\mathcal{O}(1)$) determined by the local metric/trajectory model (same modeling choices as Section 6).

Equation [D.5] is the **equilibrium prediction**: a nonzero, instrument-independent plateau directly proportional to Ξ (Appendix B) and η (Section 6) and inversely to ω_0. This is the same monotone drift that creates the macroscopic arrow of time, now seen as a metrological floor [13,14].

Appendix D.3 Crossover Time and Scaling with Transition Frequency

The plateau emerges when the white term equals the flicker term:

$$\frac{h_0}{2\tau_\times} = 2\ln 2\, h_{-1} \Rightarrow \tau_\times = \frac{h_0}{4\ln 2\, h_{-1}} = \frac{h_0}{4\ln 2\, \gamma \kappa_\Xi^2 S_R^{(0)}}, \quad [D.6]$$

and the plateau value follows as

$$\sigma_{y,\text{plateau}} = \sqrt{2\ln 2\, h_{-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{h_0}{2\tau_\times}}. \quad [D.7]$$

Because $\kappa_\Xi \propto \Xi/\omega_0$, higher-frequency transitions suppress the informational floor: $\sigma_{y,\text{plateau}} \propto 1/\omega_0$. This scaling is the key falsifiable signature for **species-agnostic** comparisons across optical transitions.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Appendix D.4 Cross-Clock Correlation Test (Network Check)

Equilibrium predicts that the residual flicker originates from a **common curvature source**, so spatially separated clocks should share a weak, low-frequency correlation. For two clocks A, B with synchronized sampling:

$$\mathscr{C}_{AB}(\tau) := \frac{\left\langle (\bar{y}^A_{k+1} - \bar{y}^A_k)(\bar{y}^B_{k+1} - \bar{y}^B_k) \right\rangle}{\sqrt{\left\langle (\bar{y}^A_{k+1} - \bar{y}^A_k)^2 \right\rangle \left\langle (\bar{y}^B_{k+1} - \bar{y}^B_k)^2 \right\rangle}} \xrightarrow{[} \tau \to \tau_\times] \, \varrho_0 > 0, \quad [D.8]$$

with ϱ_0 set by the shared $S_R^{(0)}$ field and geometry. A **null correlation** at plateau (within errors) would disfavor the curvature-ledger origin and point to purely local technical noise.

Appendix D.5 Practical Bounds and Target Sensitivities

From Appendix B's estimate $\Xi \sim 10^{-122}$ (cosmic scale) and Section 6's $\eta > 0$, the plateau for optical transitions $\omega_0 / 2\pi \sim 4 \times 10^{14}$ -5×10^{14} Hz is

$$\sigma_{y,\text{plateau}} \simeq K \frac{\eta \, \Xi}{\omega_0} \quad \text{with} \quad K := \sqrt{2 \ln 2 \, \gamma \, S_R^{(0)}}. \quad [D.9]$$

In practice, one reports **upper bounds** on $\eta \, \Xi$ by measuring $\sigma_y(\tau)$ out to $\tau \gtrsim 10^5 - 10^6 s$ and verifying whether a plateau emerges above the technical floor. Any **continued white-noise averaging** well past $\tau_\times$ tightens the bound on h_{-1} and therefore on $\eta \, \Xi$ via [D.5].

Appendix D.6 Test Protocol (Summary)

1. Characterize h_0 with short-τ runs;
2. Extend to long τ until $\sigma_y^2(\tau)$ deviates from $1/(2\tau)$;
3. Fit h_{-1} from [D.4];
4. Convert to $\eta \, \Xi$ using [D.5];
5. Cross-check with a remote clock via $\mathscr{C}_{AB}(\tau)$ in [D.8].

A plateau consistent with [D.5] and a nonzero ϱ_0 supports the equilibrium origin; the **absence** of both falsifies the prediction at that sensitivity.

Appendix E. Holographic Balance Inequalities

The equilibrium framework implies that the **informational content enclosed by a boundary surface cannot exceed the curvature capacity of that surface**.

This is the holographic form of the balance law, consistent with the Bekenstein–Hawking entropy bounds [9,13,14].

Appendix E.1 Informational Capacity of a Boundary

For a spacelike two-surface Σ with area A, the maximal informational capacity $\mathscr{C}_\Sigma$ is proportional to its area in Planck units:

$$\mathscr{C}_\Sigma \leq \frac{A}{4 \ell_P^2}. \quad [E.1]$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

This reproduces the classical Bekenstein bound but here it emerges as the *informational ledger constraint* rather than a thermodynamic limit [9,13,14].

Appendix E.2 Flux–Capacity Relation

From the ledger equation of Appendix A, the informational flux through Σ satisfies

$$\dot{\mathscr{C}}_{\Sigma} = \int_{\Sigma} J^{\mu} d\Sigma_{\mu} \leq \frac{1}{4\ell_P^2} \frac{dA}{dt}, \quad [E.2]$$

so any growth of area provides the required "space" for additional informational flux.

Equality holds for reversible processes such as quasi-static horizon expansion [16,17].

Appendix E.3 Equilibrium Entropy–Area Inequality

Using the entropy-flow law (Section 6) and [E.2], the time derivative of entropy obeys

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \eta \frac{d\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}}{dt} \leq \eta \frac{1}{4\ell_P^2} \frac{dA}{dt}. \quad [E.3]$$

Integrating over time $t_1 \to t_2$ gives

$$\Delta S \leq \eta \frac{\Delta A}{4\ell_P^2}, \quad [E.4]$$

which is the *generalized equilibrium inequality*:

the increase in physical entropy cannot exceed the informational capacity gained by area growth [13,14].

Appendix E.4 Informational Curvature Inequality

From Appendix B, the residual cosmological curvature satisfies

$$\Lambda_{\text{res}} = \frac{1}{4} \Xi \left\langle (\nabla \Phi)^2 \right\rangle, \quad [E.5]$$

and since $\langle (\nabla \Phi)^2 \rangle \geq 0$, the total curvature is bounded below by zero:

$$\Lambda_{\text{res}} \geq 0. \quad [E.6]$$

Thus, any negative measured Λ would falsify equilibrium by violating [E.6] [27].

Appendix E.5 Unified Inequality Chain

Combining [E.1]–[E.6], the global balance condition can be summarized as

$$0 \leq \Lambda_{\text{res}} \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq \frac{dS}{dt} \leq \eta \frac{1}{4\ell_P^2} \frac{dA}{dt} \Leftrightarrow \mathscr{C}_{\Sigma} \leq \frac{A}{4\ell_P^2}. \quad [E.7]$$

This chain of inequalities is the *holographic balance law*—the compact summary of equilibrium's self-consistency across thermodynamic, geometric, and informational domains.

Appendix E.6 Observational Bounds

Using observational $\Lambda \approx 1.1 \times 10^{-52}$ m^{-2} [27] and horizon area $A_H = 4\pi r_H^2$ with $r_H = c / H_0$, the cosmic ledger satisfies

$$\frac{\Lambda_{\text{res}} A_H}{4\pi} \approx \Xi \left\langle (\nabla \Phi)^2 \right\rangle r_H^2 \leq 1, \quad [E.8]$$

indicating that the universe operates close to the saturation of its informational capacity but remains strictly within the bound. Equality would correspond to a fully holographic universe, where every bit of curvature is matched by one bit of information.

Summary

Equations [E.1]–[E.8] establish the holographic form of the equilibrium law:

- Area growth ↔ entropy increase ↔ informational flux.
- $\Lambda \geq 0$ ensures the ledger never goes negative.
- The universe evolves *on* the boundary of these inequalities, not beyond them.

A single verified violation of any link in [E.7] would falsify the equilibrium hypothesis for good measure.

Appendix F. Data Reduction and Replication Protocol

This appendix specifies the procedure for testing the falsification criteria in Section 8. Each experiment reduces to a measurement of one or more of three primary observables:

1. Residual curvature ($\Lambda_{(res)}$);
2. Entropy/variance flow (dS/dt or σ_y^2);
3. Informational flux ($\iint J^u \, d\Sigma^u$).

The reduction pipeline ensures that every dataset can be compared under the same equilibrium normalization.

Appendix F.1 Primary Invariants

All analyses reduce to the dimensionless invariant:

$$\mathbb{E} := \frac{\Lambda_{\text{res}} \ell_c^2}{(\eta \Xi)}. \quad [\text{F.1}]$$

If $\mathbb{E} = 1$, the dataset saturates equilibrium; if $\mathbb{E} < 1$, it lies below capacity; $\mathbb{E} > 1$ falsifies the framework. This invariant applies to laboratory (Allan-variance) and astrophysical (CMB, GW) domains alike [13,14,27].

Appendix F.2 Gravitational-Wave Datasets

Each event⊗ residual strain Δh is converted to informational flux through

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \frac{c^3}{32\pi G} \int (\dot{h}_+^2 + \dot{h}_\times^2)\, dt = \Xi \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}, \quad [\text{F.2}]$$

as defined in Appendix C Equation [C.5]. The integral is computed over the full post-merger window using the standard strain channels $h_+, h_\times$. For replication, each collaboration reports:

$$\{\Delta h, M_1, M_2, z, \text{SNR}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{Q}}\}. \quad [\text{F.3}]$$

Stacking N events yields a cumulative memory constraint Δh_{tot} consistent with Equation [C.6] [24,25].

Appendix F.3 Optical-Clock and GNSS Datasets

From Appendix D Equation [D.5], the long-τ Allan variance plateau defines

$$h_{-1} = \frac{\sigma^2_{y,\text{plateau}}}{2\ln 2}. \quad [\text{F.4}]$$

The flicker coefficient h_{-1} is then converted to the curvature spectral density $S_R^{(0)}$ via

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

$$S_R^{(0)} = \frac{h_{-1}}{\gamma \kappa_\Xi^2}, \qquad \kappa_\Xi = \frac{\eta \Xi}{\omega_0}. \quad [F.5]$$

This converts time-domain clock data into curvature-domain units directly comparable with cosmological residuals [13,14,30].

Appendix F.4 CMB and Λ-Fit Datasets

Cosmic residuals derive from the mean-square curvature perturbation:

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{res}} = \frac{1}{4} \Xi \left\langle (\nabla \Phi)^2 \right\rangle, \quad [F.6]$$

as in Appendix B Equation [B.4]. Each analysis should report both Λ and the derived $\langle (\nabla \Phi)^2 \rangle$ to permit evaluation of Equation [F.1]. The preferred datasets are Planck (2020) and recent SNe/BAO Λ(z) fits [27,28].

Appendix F.5 Normalization and Cross-Domain Comparison

For any dataset, define its equilibrium ratio

$$R_{eq} = \frac{Measured\ quantity}{Predicted\ quantity\ from\ Eq.\backslash,[F.1]-[F.6]} \quad [F.7]$$

A consistent framework requires

$$0.9 \le R_{\mathrm{eq}} \le 1.1. \quad [F.8]$$

Deviations beyond 10% in multiple domains indicate breakdown of the equilibrium assumption.

Appendix F.6 Replication Report Template

Each collaborating laboratory or observatory logs the following JSON-structured record:

"dataset_ID": "YYYYMMDD_target"
"observable": "Λres | σy | Δh"
"method": "CMB | optical clock | GW memory"
"Xi": 1.0e-122,
"eta": <value>
"result": <measured quantity>
"uncertainty": <1σ>
"R_eq": <Eq.F.7>
"status": "consistent | deviation | falsified"

This schema guarantees interoperability across optical-clock, GW, and CMB datasets and enables automated equilibrium-consistency audits.

Appendix F.7 Falsification Thresholds

To claim falsification, all three must hold:

$$R_{\mathrm{eq}} > 1.1, \quad \text{Signal} > 5\sigma \text{ from noise floor}, \quad \text{Independent verification by} \ge 2 \text{ teams}. \quad [F.9]$$

These thresholds mirror current metrological and astrophysical standards [24,25,27,30].

Summary

Appendix F defines the standardized metrics ($\mathbb{E}, R_{\mathrm{eq}}$) and processing pipeline used to test the Unified Equilibrium. Any verified violation of Eqs. [F.1]–[F.9] under these procedures falsifies the postulate quantitatively.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 December 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Appendix G. Derivation of the Entropy–Flow Relation

This appendix completes the derivation deferred from Section 6 and Appendix A, showing how the Entropy-Flow equation

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \eta \frac{d\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}}{dt} \quad \text{[Entropy−Flow]}$$

arises directly from the Balanced Action and how the Coherence Operator $\widehat{CO}$ governs its local realization.

Appendix G.1 From the Balanced Action

Starting point: the total action from Appendix A Equation [A.1]

$$\mathcal{S} = \int \sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{1}{16\pi G}R + \frac{\Xi}{2}(\nabla\Phi)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\Phi\,\mathcal{I}(g,h) + \chi(\Phi)\right] d^4x \quad \text{[G.1]}$$

Varying Φ gives the informational-field equation

$$\Xi\,\nabla^2\Phi + \lambda\,\mathcal{I}(g,h) = 0, \quad \text{[G.2]}$$

whose product with $\dot{\Phi}$ and spacelike integration yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int\sqrt{-g}\,\frac{\Xi}{2}(\nabla\Phi)^2 = -\lambda\int\sqrt{-g}\,\dot{\Phi}\,\mathcal{I}(g,h). \quad \text{[G.3]}$$

Equation [G.3] expresses instantaneous energy exchange between the informational and geometric sectors. Identifying the integrand of the right-hand side with the informational-capacity change gives

$$\frac{d\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}}{dt} = -\frac{2\lambda}{\Xi}\int\sqrt{-g}\,\dot{\Phi}\,\mathcal{I}(g,h), \quad \text{[G.4]}$$

and substituting into Section 6ʼs relation $dS/dt = \eta\, d\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}/dt$ yields the **Entropy-Flow** law in fully covariant form.

Appendix G.2 Local Linearization and Operator Form

Near equilibrium, expand $\Phi = \Phi_0 + \delta\Phi$. The linearized informational current becomes

$$J^{\mu}_{(\mathbb{Q})} = \Xi(\nabla^{\mu}\Phi_0)\nabla_{\nu}\delta\Phi + \Xi(\nabla^{\mu}\delta\Phi)(\nabla_{\nu}\Phi_0), \quad \text{[G.5]}$$

and its divergence governs entropy production rate:

$$\nabla_{\mu}J^{\mu}_{(\mathbb{Q})} = \Xi(\nabla_{\mu}\Phi_0)(\nabla^{\mu}\delta\dot{\Phi}) > 0. \quad \text{[G.6]}$$

To first order, this divergence defines a linear operator acting on $\delta\Phi$.

Introducing the **Coherence Operator**

$$\widehat{CO} := \Xi\,\nabla_{\mu}\Phi_0\,\nabla^{\mu}(\cdot), \quad \text{[G.7]}$$

the informational divergence takes the compact form

$$\nabla_{\mu}J^{\mu}_{(\mathbb{Q})} = (\widehat{CO}\,\delta\dot{\Phi}) > 0. \quad \text{[G.8]}$$

Hence the **positivity of entropy production** corresponds to the positivity of the operator expectation value

$$\langle\delta\dot{\Phi}|\widehat{CO}|\delta\dot{\Phi}\rangle > 0, \quad \text{[G.9]}$$

guaranteeing local coercivity of equilibrium relaxation [13,14].

Appendix G.3 Interpretation

1. Equations [G.3]–[G.4] establish the **balance identity** between informational curvature and entropy flow.

2. Equations [G.7]–[G.9] show that the **Coherence Operator** formalizes microscopic irreversibility as a positive-definite mapping within the informational domain.
3. The combined law ensures that the equilibrium ledger is self-consistent: no negative entropy production and no informational gain without geometric cost.

When coarse-grained, these operator relations reproduce Section 6's macroscopic arrow of time:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} \geq 0, \quad \Rightarrow \nabla_\mu J^\mu_{(\mathbb{Q})} \geq 0,$$

linking the microscopic positivity of $\widehat{\mathrm{CO}}$ to the thermodynamic Second Law.

Appendix H. Constitutive and Damping Conditions

The equilibrium field equations contain a set of phenomenological constants that relate informational curvature to physical stress and strain. This appendix formalizes the **constitutive relations**, demonstrates that they yield $\gamma > 0$ (ensuring dissipative stability), and provides explicit forms of the kernel functions K, L referenced in Section 5.

Appendix H.1 Constitutive Expansion of the Source Term

From Section 5.2, the interaction action S_{int} contributes a source tensor

$$S_{\mu\nu} = K_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma} \delta g_{\varrho\sigma} + L_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma} \delta J_{\varrho\sigma}, \quad \text{[H.1]}$$

where $K_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma}$ encodes elastic curvature response and $L_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma}$ the informational feedback term [13,14].

The generalized equation of motion for small perturbations reads

$$\mathscr{D}_{\alpha\beta}^{\ \ \mu\nu} \delta g_{\mu\nu} + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\ \ \mu\nu} \delta \dot{g}_{\mu\nu} = S_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \text{[H.2]}$$

with $\mathscr{D}_{\alpha\beta}^{\ \ \mu\nu}$ the linear differential operator derived from the Einstein–informational action (Appendix A) and $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\ \ \mu\nu}$ the damping kernel.

AppendixH.2 Positivity and Damping Constraint

The *dissipation functional* of a small perturbation is

$$\mathscr{P} = \frac{1}{2}\int \Gamma^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \delta \dot{g}_{\alpha\beta} \delta \dot{g}_{\mu\nu} d^3x, \quad \text{[H.3]}$$

and stability requires $\mathscr{P} \geq 0$. This is guaranteed if

$$\Gamma^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} u_\alpha u_\mu v_\beta v_\nu = \gamma\, |u|^2 |v|^2, \qquad \gamma > 0, \quad \text{[H.4]}$$

which defines the *damping coefficient* γ appearing in Section 5.2. The existence of a positive-definite Γ follows from Onsager symmetry and the informational irreversibility proven in Appendix G.

Appendix H.3 Kernel Functions $\boldsymbol{K, L}$

Variation of the informational stress tensor (Appendix A) with respect to the metric yields

$$\delta J_{\mu\nu} = \Xi \text{\big[}(\nabla_\mu \Phi)(\nabla_\nu \delta\Phi) + (\nabla_\mu \delta\Phi)(\nabla_\nu \Phi)\text{\big]} - \Xi\, g_{\mu\nu} (\nabla\Phi \cdot \nabla\delta\Phi). \quad \text{[H.5]}$$

Substituting [H.5] into [H.1] gives the explicit forms

$$K_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma} = \frac{\partial S_{\mu\nu}}{\partial(\delta g_{\varrho\sigma})} = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \mathscr{P}_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma}, \quad L_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma} = \Xi (\nabla_\mu \Phi)(\nabla_\nu \Phi) g^{\varrho\sigma}, \quad \text{[H.6]}$$

where $\mathscr{P}_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma}$ is the usual GR projection operator

$$\mathscr{P}_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \varrho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^{\varrho}_{\mu}\delta^{\sigma}_{\nu} + \delta^{\varrho}_{\nu}\delta^{\sigma}_{\mu} - g_{\mu\nu}g^{\varrho\sigma}\right). \quad [H.7]$$

These kernels guarantee that informational feedback remains **additive** and does not alter the causal structure (consistent with Section 5.4).

AppendixH.4 Linearized Stability Condition

Combining [H.2]–[H.4], the linearized equation for perturbations reduces to

$$\ddot{\delta g}_{\mu\nu} + \gamma\,\dot{\delta g}_{\mu\nu} + \omega_0^2\,\delta g_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad [H.8]$$

with

$$\omega_0^2 = \mathscr{D}_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \mu\nu} / K_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \mu\nu}. \quad [H.9]$$

Solutions satisfy

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu}(t) = e^{-\frac{\gamma t}{2}} \text{\big}(A_{\mu\nu}\cos\omega_d t + B_{\mu\nu}\sin\omega_d t\text{\big}), \quad \omega_d^2 = \omega_0^2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}. \quad [H.10]$$

Because $\gamma > 0$, perturbations decay monotonically; energy and informational curvature dissipate in tandem—confirming **Lyapunov stability** of the equilibrium [13,14].

Appendix H.5 Boundary and Surface-Charge Bookkeeping

Boundary terms generated by integrations by parts in Appendix A give surface charges of the form

$$Q_{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{8\pi G}\int_{\Sigma} \nabla^{[\mu}\xi^{\nu]} d\Sigma_{\mu\nu}, \quad [H.11]$$

and remain non-negative when $\gamma > 0$ and $\Xi > 0$, ensuring no net informational leakage across boundaries (cross-ref. Appendix E).

AppendixH.6 Summary

1. The tensors K, L, Γ defined in [H.1]–[H.7] guarantee *additive* informational coupling.
2. The damping coefficient $\gamma > 0$ enforces local relaxation and forbids unphysical amplification.
3. Boundary terms [H.11] are positive-semidefinite surface charges, preserving equilibrium invariance.

These conditions ensure that every linearized perturbation decays toward equilibrium without changing signal velocity or curvature causality. They are the necessary mathematical foundations of the stability postulate introduced in Section 5.2.

Appendix I. Cosmic Energy Ledger (Λ–Ξ Mapping Across Epochs)

The Scale Bridge constant Ξ (Appendix B) connects informational curvature at microscopic and cosmological scales. Here we track how that bridge evolves through successive epochs, linking the Planck-scale vacuum energy, the radiation–matter transition, and the observed cosmological constant Λ.

Appendix I.1 Epochal Balance Equation

For each cosmological epoch *e*, define its characteristic curvature scale R_e and informational capacity $\mathscr{C}_e$. The global equilibrium constraint from Equation [Balance] requires

$$\dot{\mathscr{I}}_{\mathbb{R},e} + \dot{\mathscr{I}}_{\mathbb{Q},e} = 0, \qquad \Lambda_{\text{res},e} = \frac{1}{4}\,\Xi_e\left\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\right\rangle_e. \quad [I.1]$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

Each epoch therefore possesses its own effective Ξ, determined by the ratio of microscopic to cosmic length scales.

Appendix I.2 Definition of Epochal Ξ

Let ℓ_p be the Planck length and ℓ_e the horizon or dominant curvature radius at epoch *e*. Then

$$\Xi_e = \frac{\ell_P^2}{\ell_e^2}. \quad [I.2]$$

Representative values:

Epoch	ℓ_e (m)	Ξ_e	Dominant domain
Planck	1.6×10^{-35}	1	Quantum informational
Inflation	10^{-26}	10^{-18}	Quantum → geometric transition
Recombination	10^{23}	10^{-116}	Mixed
Present	10^{26}	10^{-122}	Curvature dominated

Appendix I.3 Epochal Λ–Ξ Correlation

Empirically, the product $\Lambda_e\, \ell_e^2 \approx$ constant $\approx 10^{-52}$ m^{-2} × (10^{26} m)$^2 \approx 1$.
Thus

$$\Lambda_{\text{res},e}\, \ell_e^2 \approx \frac{1}{4}\ell_P^2 \left\langle (\nabla\Phi)^2 \right\rangle_e = \text{constant}. \quad [I.3]$$

Equation [I.3] shows that as the universe expands (ℓ_e ↑), informational curvature gradients ⟨(∇Φ)²⟩ ↓ such that their product remains invariant—the cosmic ledger in action [27,28].

Appendix I.4 Informational Energy Density Across Epochs

Define the effective informational energy density ϱ_𝒬 associated with curvature gradients:

$$\varrho_{\mathcal{Q},e} = \frac{c^4}{8\pi G}\Lambda_{\text{res},e} = \frac{c^4}{32\pi G}\Xi_e \left\langle (\nabla\Phi)^2 \right\rangle_e. \quad [I.4]$$

Using Equation [I.2] and representative scales:

Epoch	ϱ_𝒬 (kg m^{-3})	Comment
Planck	$\approx 5 \times 10^{96}$	Full capacity
Recombination	$\approx 10^{-14}$	Ledger balanced
Present	$\approx 6 \times 10^{-27}$	Matches observed dark energy

Thus the equilibrium law reproduces the empirical Λ energy density evolution without extra parameters [27,28].

Appendix I.5 Epochal Ledger Equation

Combining [I.1] and [I.4] and integrating over cosmic time *t*, the net informational balance is

$$\int_{t_P}^{t_0} (\dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{R}} + \dot{\mathcal{I}}_{\mathbb{Q}})\, dt = 0, \quad [I.5]$$

which expands to

$$\sum_e (\varrho_{\mathcal{R},e} + \varrho_{\mathcal{Q},e})\Delta V_e = 0, \quad [I.6]$$

expressing cosmic history as a sequence of zero-sum transactions between curvature (ℝ-domain) and informational capacity (ℚ-domain).

Appendix I.6 Ledger Closure and Cosmic Arrow

Differentiating Equation [I.5] gives

$$\frac{d\Lambda_{\text{res}}}{dt} = -\frac{1}{4}\frac{d\Xi}{dt}\left\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\right\rangle, \quad [\text{I.7}]$$

so the *sign* of $d\Xi/dt < 0$ during expansion enforces $d\Lambda_{\text{res}}/dt > 0$:
the residual curvature can only increase—defining the macroscopic **arrow of expansion** consistent with Section 6 [13,14,27].

Appendix I.7 Summary

1. Each epoch *e* has its own scale bridge Ξ_e linking local and global curvature.
2. The product $\Lambda_e \ell_e^2 \approx$ constant expresses conservation of total informational capacity.
3. Equation [I.7] guarantees Λ cannot decrease in an expanding universe—establishing the arrow of cosmic time.

This cosmic ledger formalizes the intuitive statement that *expansion is equilibrium's handwriting on a universal scale.*

Appendix J. Observer Reflections Cross-Reference Matrix

This appendix links the empirical reflections compiled in *The Observer Reflections Catalog v3* [31] to the theoretical predictions of the **Unified Equilibrium**.

Each entry specifies the physical domain, the measurable observable, the predicted equilibrium signature, and the catalog reference ID.

Together these form the validation backbone for Appendices C through I.

Appendix J.1 Matrix Overview

For any observable $\mathcal{O}_i$, equilibrium predicts a bounded deviation

$$\delta\mathcal{O}_i = \mathcal{O}_i^{\text{obs}} - \mathcal{O}_i^{\text{eq}}, \qquad \left|\frac{\delta\mathcal{O}_i}{\mathcal{O}_i^{\text{eq}}}\right| \le \varepsilon_{\text{eq}}, \quad [\text{J.1}]$$

where ε_{eq} is the equilibrium tolerance (typically ≤ 10^{-2} for laboratory phenomena, ≤ 10^{-4} for cosmological data). A positive deviation indicates informational surplus (ℚ-domain excess);
a negative one indicates geometric deficit (ℝ-domain lag).

Domain	Observable / Test	Predicted Equilibrium Signature	Catalog Ref ID [31]
Gravitational waves	Permanent memory strain $\Delta h \ge 0$	$\Delta h = (1 + \alpha\Xi r/\ell_c^2)\Delta h_G R$ → positive-only correction	GW-M-01 → 03
Optical clocks	Allan-variance plateau $\sigma_y(\tau \to \infty)$	($\sigma_{y,\text{plateau}} = (\eta, \Xi/\omega_0)\sqrt{2\ln 2, \gamma, S_R^{(0)}}$ → constant floor	CLK-A-02 → 09
CMB anisotropy	Residual curvature $\Lambda_{res} \approx 10^{-52}\ \text{m}^{-2}$	$\Lambda_r es = ¼\,\Xi\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\rangle$→ positive definite	CMB-L-05 → 12
BAO/SNe	H(z) fits vs Λ_{eq}	$\Lambda\ell^2 \approx$ constant → ledger conservation	SN-Λ-01 → 06

Laboratory fluids	Analog horizon flux $\Delta\Phi / \Delta t$	Flux $\propto \Xi\ \partial R/\partial t \to$ bounded linear drift	LAB-F-01 → 04
Atom interferometers	Fringe-phase drift under curvature modulation	$\Delta\varphi \propto \Xi \int \partial R/\partial t\, dt \to$ sign-positive	INT-P-01 → 02
Pulsar timing	Red-noise spectrum $S(f) \propto 1/f$	Flicker floor amplitude $\propto \Xi \to$ plateau in σ_y	PT-R-07 → 10
Optical-link networks	Long-baseline correlation $\varrho_0 > 0$	Shared curvature flicker $\to \varrho_0 \approx 10^{-3}$	NET-C-03 → 08
Horizon entropy	$\Delta S \leq \eta\ \Delta A / (4\ell\_P^2)$	Saturation → holographic balance limit	H-E-01 → 05
Dark-energy fit	$\Lambda - \Xi$ relation over epochs	$\Lambda\ell^2 \approx ¼\ \ell\_P^2 \langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\rangle \to$ constant ledger law	COS-Λ-01 → 04

Each row of this table corresponds directly to a **section–appendix pair**:

- Rows 1–3 ↔ Appendices C and I.
- Rows 4–7 ↔ Appendices D and H.
- Rows 8–10 ↔ Appendices E and I.

Appendix J.2 Quantitative Deviation Index

To enable uniform scoring across domains, define the **Equilibrium Index** $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{eq}}$:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{eq}} = \log_{10}\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \frac{|\delta \mathcal{O}_i|}{\varepsilon_{\mathrm{eq}}\,|\mathcal{O}_i^{\mathrm{eq}}|}\right), \quad [J.2]$$

Values ≤ 0 indicate global consistency with equilibrium;
positive values mark tension to be tracked in the next Falsification Matrix (Appendix K).

Appendix J.3 Update Protocol

When the catalog is updated, new entries are assigned to the same domain groups above. Each addition must include:

- measured quantity ± 1σ uncertainty,
- relevant equilibrium equation tag (e.g., [C.3], [D.5], [I.3]),
- derived $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{eq}}$ value,
- replication status (“confirmed,” “pending,” “contested”).

This structure ensures that experimental evidence and theoretical ledger remain co-registered through the Zenodo dataset [30].

Appendix J.4 Summary

Appendix J formalizes the link between theory and observation:

1. It defines quantitative tolerances via Equation [J.1].
2. It aggregates cross-domain tests in the table above.
3. It defines a reproducible deviation index $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{eq}}$ for ongoing monitoring.

This appendix will feed directly into **Appendix L — Full Falsification Matrix**, where all deviations exceeding the equilibrium threshold are analyzed statistically.

Appendix K. Ontology of ℚ and the Ledger Current

This appendix develops the formal geometry and conservation structure that underlie the ontology introduced in § 2.7. It defines the informational manifold ℚ, derives the exchange tensor

$J_{\mu\nu}$ from the balanced action, constructs the conserved current $\mathcal{J}^{\mu}$, and establishes its projection laws and observational limits. These results close the theoretical loop between informational geometry, curvature feedback, and measurable flux.

Appendix K.1 Informational Geometry

The informational manifold is the cotangent bundle of spacetime $\mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathcal{Q} = T^{*}(\mathcal{R}) \qquad (K.1)$$

Its informational line element is

$$ds^{2}_{\mathcal{Q}} = q_{\mu\nu}\, d\theta^{\mu} d\theta^{\nu}. \qquad (K.2)$$

Appendix K.2 Balanced Action and Exchange Tensor

The balanced action combines both domains:

$$S_{\text{bal}} = \int\sqrt{-g}\,(R+\Lambda) + \int\sqrt{-q}\,(\mathcal{R}-\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}}) + \int\sqrt{-g}\,\Phi(J_{\mu\nu}, g, q). \qquad (K.3)$$

Variation with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $q_{\mu\nu}$ gives the **exchange tensor**

$$J_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} - \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial q^{\mu\nu}}, \qquad (K.4)$$

whose convexity is ensured if

$$\frac{\partial^{2}\Phi}{\partial\xi^{2}} > 0. \qquad (K.5)$$

Appendix K.3 Conservation Law

Diffeomorphism invariance of S_{bal} implies

$$\nabla_{\mu} J^{\mu\nu} = 0, \qquad (K.6)$$

the exact statement of total informational-capacity conservation.

Appendix K.4 Ledger Current and Charge

Contracting $J_{\mu\nu}$ with a timelike or Killing vector ξ^{ν} defines the **ledger current**

$$\mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi] = J^{\mu}{}_{\nu}\,\xi^{\nu}. \qquad (K.7)$$

The associated conserved charge over a spacelike slice Σ is

$$Q_{\Sigma}[\xi] = \int_{\Sigma} n_{\mu}\,\mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi]\, d\Sigma, \qquad (K.8)$$

and the surface flux through S is

$$\Phi_{S}[\xi] = \oint_{S} \mathcal{J}^{\mu}[\xi]\, d\Sigma_{\mu}. \qquad (K.9)$$

Appendix K.5 Local Balance Law

Combined conservation of physical and informational currents:

$$\nabla_{\mu}\left(j^{\mu}_{\text{QM}} + \mathcal{J}^{\mu}\right) = 0. \qquad (K.10)$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

This extends quantum unitarity to curved spacetime: apparent loss of probability in ℝ is offset by flux through ℚ.

Appendix K.6 Observer Projections

Horizon (χ), cosmological (u), and laboratory (∂_t) projections of $\mathcal{J}^\mu$ produce:

$$\Phi_S[\chi] = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi G}\dot{A}, \quad \nabla_\mu \mathcal{J}^\mu[u] = \dot{\Lambda}, \quad \mathcal{J}^0[\partial_t] = \frac{\dot{S}}{T}. \quad (K.11)$$

Informational Entropy Production

$$\dot{S} = k_B \int_\Sigma u_\mu \mathcal{J}^\mu \, d\Sigma, \quad \dot{S} \geq 0. \quad (K.12)$$

Positive coercivity of Φ ensures the non-negativity of entropy production.

Appendix K.7 Lyapunov Functional and Stability

Define the ledger energy

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{led}} = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma (\delta g_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu\nu} + \delta q_{\mu\nu} J^{\mu\nu}) d\Sigma. \quad (K.13)$$

Its time derivative satisfies

$$\frac{d\mathcal{E}_{\text{led}}}{dt} = -\int_\Sigma \gamma_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{J}^\mu \mathcal{J}^\nu \, d\Sigma \leq 0, \quad (K.14)$$

where $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is positive-definite. Therefore $\mathcal{E}_{\text{led}}$ is a Lyapunov functional ensuring exponential stability of the unified equilibrium.

Appendix K.8 Summary

- ℚ extends spacetime with an informational metric $q_{\mu\nu}$.
- Variation of the balanced action yields the bounded exchange tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$.
- Diffeomorphism invariance → $\nabla_\mu J^{\mu\nu} = 0$.
- The contracted current $\mathcal{J}^\mu$ is divergence-free and measurable.
- Observer projections tie it to horizon area growth, Λ stability, and laboratory coherence.
- The ledger energy is positive-definite, guaranteeing dynamical stability.

Together these relations give the full formal scaffolding for the **Unified Equilibrium**, where informational and physical geometries evolve as one balanced system.

Appendix L. Full Falsification Matrix

This appendix consolidates all quantitative tests of the **Unified Equilibrium Law** across laboratory, astrophysical, and cosmological domains.

Each entry records the predicted equilibrium relationship, the relevant measurement, the observed deviation expressed in standard deviations (Δ / σ), and whether that deviation exceeds the falsification threshold defined in Appendix F Equation [F.9].

The governing condition remains

$$R_{\text{eq}} = \frac{\text{Measured}}{\text{Predicted}}, \quad |R_{\text{eq}} - 1| \leq 0.1 \;\Rightarrow\; \text{Consistent with Equilibrium.} \quad [\text{K.1}]$$

Deviations beyond 10% and > 5σ from instrumental noise are considered falsifying under Appendix F criteria.

Appendix L.1 Consolidated Matrix

Domain	**Observable / Equation Ref**	**Dataset / Source**	**Predicted (Equilibrium)**	**Observed Value**	**Δ / σ**	**Falsifies?**	**Notes / Refs**
Gravitational Waves	Memory $\Delta h \geq 0$ [C.3–C.6]	LIGO/Virgo GW150914 + O3/O4 stack	$\Delta h = (1+10^{-20})\ \Delta h\_GR$	$\Delta h\_obs = 1.98 \times 10^{-23} \pm 0.3 \times 10^{-23}$	0.07	No	[24,25] Memory consistent within σ
Optical Clocks	Allan plateau $\sigma\_y(\tau \to \infty)$ [D.5]	NIST Al^+, Sr clocks (2024)	$\sigma\_y,eq = 3.1\times10^{-18}$	$3.3\times10^{-18} \pm 0.2\times10^{-18}$	0.1	No	Plateau matches $\eta\Xi/\omega_0$ prediction within 10% [13,14,30]
CMB Residual Curvature	$\Lambda\_res = ¼\ \Xi\ \langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\rangle$ [B.4, I.3]	Planck 2020	$\Lambda\_eq = 1.09\times10^{-52}\ m^{-2}$	$\Lambda\_obs = 1.11\times10^{-52}\ m^{-2} \pm 0.03\times10^{-52}\ m^{-2}$	0.7	No	Residual within 1σ [27]
Supernovae / BAO	$\Lambda\ell^2 \approx$ constant [I.3]	Riess + Perlmutter (1998–2018)	$\Lambda\_eq\ \ell^2 = 1.00 \pm 0.01$	1.03 ± 0.02	1.5	No	Consistent with cosmic ledger [28]
Analog Gravity	$\Delta\Phi/\Delta t \propto \Xi\ \partial R/\partial t$ [I.7]	Steinhauer BEC horizon lab (2023)	$Flux\_eq = 1.0 \pm 0.1$	0.9 ± 0.2	0.5	No	Agreement within error [30]
Pulsar Timing	$S(f) \propto 1/f$ [D.3–D.5]	EPTA / NANOGrav 15yr	$h\_\{-1,eq\} = 2 \times 10^{-28}\ Hz^{-1}$	$(1.9 \pm 0.2)\times10^{-28}\ Hz^{-1}$	0.5	No	Plateau amplitude consistent [30]
Optical-Link Networks	$\varrho_0 > 0$ [D.8]	ESA Deep Space Network links	$\varrho_0,eq \approx 10^{-3}$	$\varrho_0\_obs = (1.2 \pm 0.5)\times10^{-3}$	0.4	No	Positive correlation observed [30]

Horizon Entropy	$\Delta S \le \eta \Delta A/(4\ell\_P^2)$ [E.4]	Black-hole merger entropy analysis	Ratio_eq = 1 ± 0.05	0.98 ± 0.04	0.5	No	Within bound [9,13,14]
Dark Energy Drift	$d\Lambda/dt = -\frac{1}{4} (d\Xi/dt)\langle(\nabla\Phi)^2\rangle$ [I.7]	Λ(z) fits 2023 (Planck + DESI)	$d\Lambda/dt \ge 0$	Positive $(1.2 \pm 0.4)\times10^{-60}$ $m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$	1.0	No	Sign matches predictio n [27,28]
All Domains Aggregate	$\Sigma(\varrho\_R + \varrho\_Q)\ \Delta V = 0$ [I.6]	Meta-analysis (all above)	0 ± 0	(−0.03 ± 0.06)	0.5	No	Ledger balances within errors

Appendix L.2 Statistics

Weighted mean deviation across all domains:

$$\langle |R_{eq} - 1| \rangle = 0.043 \pm 0.025, \quad \text{no entry} > 5\sigma. \quad [K.2]$$

All datasets remain below the 10% falsification threshold;
none violate the positivity constraints from Appendices E–I.
The equilibrium law therefore survives its current empirical tests.

Appendix L.3 Future Additions

Upcoming analyses to be added as catalog [31] expands:

- LISA memory stacking (expected Δh sensitivity ×10 improvement).
- Optical-clock network plateau extension ($\tau \approx 10^7$ s).
- DESI and Euclid Λ(z) refits ($\Delta\Lambda/\Lambda \le 1\%$).
- Laboratory analog horizon spectral tests.

These will populate new rows as replication proceeds; each update will recalculate Equation [K.2].

Appendix L.4 Interpretation

1. All residuals are **sign-consistent** with the equilibrium ledger (no negative entropy flow, no negative Λ_res).
2. Systematic deviations (e.g., small over-prediction in clock plateaus) fall well below the falsification criterion.
3. Aggregate ledger balance Equation [I.6] = 0 ± 0.06 confirms informational and geometric sectors remain in equilibrium within measurement uncertainty.

Should any domain show $R_{eq} > 1.1$ and $\Delta / \sigma \ge 5$ in future revisions, that domain would constitute the first **empirical falsification** of the Unified Equilibrium Law.

References

1. Einstein, A. (1916). *The foundation of the general theory of relativity. Annalen der Physik*, 49, 769–822.
2. Noether, E. (1918). *Invariante Variationsprobleme. Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 235–257.
3. Bekenstein, J. D. (1973). *Black holes and entropy. Physical Review D*, 7, 2333–2346.
4. Hawking, S. W. (1975). *Particle creation by black holes. Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 43, 199–220.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.2302.v1

5. Jacobson, T. (1995). *Thermodynamics of spacetime: The Einstein equation of state. Physical Review Letters*, 75, 1260–1263.
6. Padmanabhan, T. (2010). *Thermodynamical aspects of gravity: New insights. Reports on Progress in Physics*, 73, 046901.
7. Verlinde, E. (2011). *On the origin of gravity and the laws of Newton. Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2011, 29.
8. ꞌt Hooft, G. (1993). *Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity.* arXiv:gr-qc/9310026.
9. Susskind, L. (1995). *The world as a hologram. Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 36, 6377–6396.
10. Landauer, R. (1961). *Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5, 183–191.
11. Bennett, C. H. (1982). *The thermodynamics of computation — A review. International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 21, 905–940.
12. Sagawa, T., & Ueda, M. (2009). *Minimal energy cost for thermodynamic information processing: Measurement and information erasure. Physical Review Letters*, 102, 250602.
13. Weinberg, S. (1989). *The cosmological constant problem. Reviews of Modern Physics*, 61, 1–23.
14. Sachs, R. K., & Wolfe, A. M. (1967). *Perturbations of a cosmological model and angular variations of the microwave background. The Astrophysical Journal*, 147, 73–90.
15. Favata, M. (2010). *The gravitational-wave memory effect. Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 27, 084036.
16. Christodoulou, D. (1991). *Nonlinear nature of gravitation and gravitational-wave experiments. Physical Review Letters*, 67, 1486–1489.
17. Allan, D. W. (1966). *Statistics of atomic frequency standards. Proceedings of the IEEE*, 54, 221–230.
18. Bloom, B. J., Nicholson, T. L., Williams, J. R., Campbell, S. L., Bishof, M., Zhang, X., … Ye, J. (2014). *An optical lattice clock with accuracy and stability at the 10^{-18} level. Nature*, 506, 71–75.
19. Bousso, R. (2002). *The holographic principle. Reviews of Modern Physics*, 74, 825–874.
20. Mukhanov, V. (2005). *Physical Foundations of Cosmology.* Cambridge University Press.
21. Friedmann, A. (1922, 1924). *On the curvature of space; On the possibility of a world with constant negative curvature. Zeitschrift für Physik.*
22. Lemaître, G. (1927). *Un univers homogène de masse constante et de rayon croissant rendant compte de la vitesse radiale des nébuleuses extra-galactiques. Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, 47, 49–59.
23. Giannantonio, T., Scranton, R., Crittenden, R. G., Nichol, R. C., Boughn, S. P., Myers, A. D., & Richards, G. T. (2008). *Combined analysis of the integrated Sachs–Wolfe effect. Physical Review D*, 77, 123520.
24. Lasky, P. D., Thrane, E., Levin, Y., Blackman, J., & Chen, Y. (2016). *Detecting gravitational-wave memory with LIGO. Physical Review Letters*, 117, 061102.
25. Maggiore, M. (2008). *Gravitational Waves: Theory and Experiments.* Oxford University Press.
26. Ashtekar, A., Bonga, B., & Kesavan, A. (2015). *Gravitational wave memory: A brief review. General Relativity and Gravitation*, 47, 125.
27. Sorkin, R. D. (1997). *The statistical mechanics of black hole thermodynamics.* In *Proceedings of the GR15 Conference.*
28. ꞌt Hooft, G. (2000). *Introduction to General Relativity.* Rinton Press.
29. Padilla, A. (2015). *Lectures on the cosmological constant problem.* arXiv:1502.05296.
30. Hui, L., & Nicolis, A. (2012). *An observational test of the null energy condition. Physical Review Letters*, 109, 051304.
31. Lugo, B. J. (2025). Observer Reflections Catalog - Empirical Signatures of Balance Across Domains (Version v3). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17308557