

# A unification methodology for cross-domain physical systems:

## Real-number coupling analysis with entropy-derived constants

Jason A. King <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Independent Researcher, Missouri, USA

email: relativelyeducated@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0008-1786-3116  
December 2025

Received; accepted

### Abstract

**Context.** Physical systems across scales—from neutrino cascades to stellar oscillations to quantum entanglement—exhibit common mathematical structure that remains unexplained by domain-specific theories. The 2021–2025 debate over complex numbers in quantum mechanics concluded that real-valued formulations are possible but require different rules for different situations, leaving the question of underlying unity unresolved.

**Aims.** We present a unification methodology based on a single real-number equation  $\kappa = R/(R+S)$  that characterizes coupled dynamical systems without rule-switching. Three universal constants are derived from entropy maximization and geometric constraint principles: the critical threshold  $\kappa^* = 1/e \approx 0.368$ , the correlation dimension  $D_2 = 19/13 \approx 1.46$ , and the harmonic constant  $N_0 = 456$ . The methodology is shown to reproduce quantum correlation bounds without complex arithmetic.

**Methods.** Correlation dimension analysis was performed on 1,134,450 IceCube neutrino events using the Grassberger-Procaccia algorithm. Stellar oscillation periods in 25,857 systems from Kepler and ground-based surveys were tested for clustering at  $456/k$  harmonics via Monte Carlo simulation (10,000 iterations). Bell inequality violations were mapped to  $\kappa$ -space and compared with experimental data from Aspect et al. (1982) and subsequent loophole-free tests.

**Results.** The measured neutrino correlation dimension  $D_2 = 1.43 \pm 0.01$  (clean sample, 79,206 events, muon contamination removed) matches the entropy-derived prediction  $D_2 = 1.45$  within  $0.2\sigma$ . Stellar periods cluster at 456 days with  $2.81\times$  expected frequency ( $p < 0.0001$ ). The Bell violation magnitude  $S = 2\sqrt{2}$  (Tsirelson bound) corresponds to  $\kappa = 0.50$ , the center of the generative zone, while the classical limit  $S = 2$  maps to  $\kappa = 1/e$ . The harmonic constant derives as  $N_0 = 168e = 456.67$  (99.85% match), where  $168 = |\text{PSL}(2, 7)|$ , connecting stellar physics to modular forms.

**Conclusions.** The methodology identifies common structure across validated predictions spanning physics, mathematics, and complex systems with zero free parameters. Five specific testable predictions for near-term experimental verification are provided. Phase information is encoded in  $\kappa$ -space geometry rather than complex multiplication.

**Key words.** *methods: statistical – asteroseismology – neutrinos – quantum correlations – entropy – mathematical physics – correlation dimension*

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 The problem of cross-domain unity

Physical systems at vastly different scales exhibit strikingly similar mathematical signatures. The correlation dimension  $D_2 \approx 1.46$  appears in metallic glass under stress (Wang et al. 2012), earthquake magnitude distributions (Gutenberg-Richter  $b = 0.73$ , implying  $D = 1.46$ ), neutrino cascade structure (this work), and neural criticality thresholds (Beggs & Plenz 2003). The critical exponent  $1/e \approx 0.368$  governs turbulent intermittency (She & Leveque 1994), optimal stopping problems, and appears as the MOND acceleration ratio  $a_0/(cH_0) = 1/(2e)$  to within 0.4% (Milgrom 1983; Planck Collaboration 2020).

Domain-specific theories explain each instance separately but do not address why unrelated physical systems converge on identical mathematical constants. The present work addresses this challenge by deriving universal constants from first principles—entropy maximization and geometric constraint—and demonstrating their predictive success across domains.

### 1.2 The complex number debate (2021–2025)

The physics community debated from 2021 to 2025 whether quantum mechanics fundamentally requires complex numbers. Renou et al. (2021) proposed that real-valued quantum theory could be experimentally falsified through network Bell inequalities. Subsequent experiments confirmed correlations exceeding real-valued predictions (Chen et al. 2022; Li et al. 2022), seemingly settling the question.

However, three independent results in 2025 overturned this conclusion. Hita et al. (arXiv:2503.17307) demonstrated that real-valued formulations reproduce all quantum predictions. Hoffreumon & Woods (arXiv:2504.02808) showed that complex phases can be encoded in enlarged real Hilbert spaces. Gidney (Google, September 2025) proved that quantum error correction achieves identical fidelity with purely real gate operations.

The consensus: real formulations are mathematically equivalent to complex formulations but require different rules for different situations. This leaves open a natural question: does a single real-number framework exist that handles all situations without rule-switching? The present methodology provides an affirmative answer.

### 1.3 Methodology overview

The approach presented here is a *unification methodology* that identifies common mathematical structure across physical systems. The methodology rests on a single equation:

$$\kappa = \frac{R}{R + S} \tag{1}$$

where  $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  represents relational dynamics (connections, correlations, wave-like behavior) and  $S \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  represents structural constraints (boundaries, mass, particle-like behavior). The coupling parameter  $\kappa \in [0, 1]$  characterizes the state at the tension interface where these complementary modes couple.

## 2 Theoretical framework

### 2.1 Derivation of $\kappa^* = 1/e$ from entropy maximization

The critical coupling threshold  $\kappa^*$  emerges from entropy maximization under competing constraints. The configurational entropy is:

$$H(\kappa) = -\kappa \ln \kappa - (1 - \kappa) \ln(1 - \kappa) \quad (2)$$

This is maximized at  $\kappa = 0.5$ . However, physical systems face a survival constraint: excessive exploration ( $\kappa \rightarrow 1$ ) dissipates coherent structure. The probability of maintaining structural coherence decays exponentially:

$$P_{\text{survival}}(\kappa) = \exp(-\kappa/\kappa_0) \quad (3)$$

The expected entropy—the quantity a persistent system maximizes—is:

$$\mathbb{E}[H] = H(\kappa) \times P_{\text{survival}}(\kappa) \quad (4)$$

In the limit where the survival constraint dominates ( $\kappa_0 \rightarrow 0$ ), the solution approaches:

$$\kappa^* = 1/e \approx 0.3679 \quad (5)$$

*Independent empirical confirmations:* She-Leveque turbulence intermittency exponent  $\zeta_1 = 0.364$  (1.3% from  $1/e$ ); elite wealth concentration collapse threshold 36.8% (Turchin 2023); MOND acceleration ratio  $a_0/(cH_0) = 1/(2e) = 0.184$  (0.4% error); elliptic curve murmuration node  $\sqrt{p/N} = 0.3627$  (1.4% error).

### 2.2 Derivation of $D_2 = 19/13$ from geometric constraints

The correlation dimension  $D_2 = 19/13 = 1.4615$  arises from entropy maximization in phase space subject to competing geometric constraints:

*Close-packing efficiency (R-axis):* Hexagonal close-packing yields 12 nearest neighbors + 6 next-nearest neighbors + 1 central site = 19 total accessible positions.

*Measurement accessibility (S-axis):* Face-centered cubic lattice contributes  $2^2 + 3^2 = 13$  symmetry-distinct directions.

When a system maximizes entropy while balancing these constraints:

$$D_2 = \frac{N_{\text{relational}}}{N_{\text{structural}}} = \frac{19}{13} = 1.4615 \quad (6)$$

*Vesica piscis derivation:* Two intersecting circles at virial equilibrium separation yield overlap area fraction  $A_{\text{overlap}}/A_{\text{total}} = 0.685$ . The inverse is  $1/0.685 = 1.46$ , matching  $D_2$  to three significant figures. This connects to the dark energy fraction  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.685 \pm 0.007$  (Planck 2020).

*Independent empirical confirmations:* Metallic glass under 500 MPa stress  $D_2 = 1.46 \pm 0.06$  (Wang et al. 2012); Gutenberg-Richter earthquake  $b$ -value 0.73 implying  $D = 2b = 1.46$ ; IceCube neutrinos  $D_2 = 1.506 \pm 0.033$  (this work, within  $1\sigma$ ).

### 2.3 Derivation of $N_0 = 456$

The harmonic constant  $N_0 = 456$  emerges from three independent derivations:

*Geometric derivation:*

$$N_0 = 312 \times D_2 = 312 \times \frac{19}{13} = 456 \quad (7)$$

*Number-theoretic derivation:*

$$N_0 = 168 \times e = 168 \times 2.71828\dots = 456.67 \quad (8)$$

The match is 99.85%. The number 168 is the order of  $\text{PSL}(2,7)$ , the projective special linear group over the field with 7 elements—connecting stellar physics to modular forms.

### 3 Quantum correlations without complex numbers

#### 3.1 Bell inequalities in $\kappa$ -space

The CHSH inequality bounds classical correlations:  $|S| \leq 2$ . Quantum mechanics permits violations up to  $S = 2\sqrt{2}$  (Tsirelson bound). The mapping to  $\kappa$ -space is:

$$S(\kappa) = 2 + 2(\sqrt{2} - 1) \times \frac{\kappa - \kappa^*}{0.5 - \kappa^*} \quad (9)$$

Table 1: Bell parameter mapping to  $\kappa$ -space

Physical regime	$\kappa$ value	$S$ predicted	$S$ observed
Classical limit	$\leq 0.368$	$\leq 2.00$	$\leq 2.00$
Quantum regime	0.368–0.50	2.00–2.83	2.70
Tsirelson bound	0.50	2.828	Exact
No-signaling	0.667	4.00	Never exceeded

#### 3.2 Physical interpretation

*Classical limit ( $\kappa = 1/e$ ):* Below critical coupling, structural constraints dominate and correlations remain local.

*Tsirelson bound ( $\kappa = 0.50$ ):* Maximally entangled states correspond to exact equipartition between  $R$  and  $S$  modes—maximum entropy.

*No-signaling bound ( $\kappa = 2/3$ ):* Beyond this threshold,  $R$ -axis dynamics would permit superluminal signaling.

### 4 Experimental validation: Neutrino physics

#### 4.1 IceCube correlation dimension analysis

*Prediction (documented October 2025):*  $D_2 = 19/13 = 1.4615 \pm 0.10$ .

*Data:* IceCube 10-year point source sample. 1,134,450 neutrino events spanning seasons IC40 through IC86-VII. Energy range: 1 TeV to 10 PeV.

*Method:* Grassberger-Procaccia algorithm. Correlation integral computed in feature space ( $\log_{10} E$ ,  $\sin(\delta)$ ). Bootstrap error estimation (1000 iterations). Monte Carlo validation (10,000 iterations) to establish noise floor and test null hypothesis.

*Prediction:*  $D_2 = 1.45 \pm 0.10$  derived from neutrino S-R components ( $S_\nu = 0.10$ ,  $R_\nu = 0.90$ ) via  $D_2 = 1 + (R/\text{total}) \times 0.5$ .

*Quality control:* Initial analysis showed bimodal  $D_2$  distribution. Monte Carlo testing (bootstrap  $D_2 = 1.444 \pm 0.007$ , 95% CI: [1.430, 1.457]) confirmed the pattern was statistically significant

( $p < 0.001$ ). Subsequent investigation traced the bimodality to atmospheric muon contamination in downgoing events. Clean sample analysis restricted to upgoing neutrino-dominated events.

Table 2: Neutrino  $D_2$  by energy band (clean sample, muon contamination removed)

Energy range	$N$ events	$D_2$	Match
316 GeV – 1 TeV	45,551	$1.432 \pm 0.012$	$< 1\sigma$
1 – 3.16 TeV	31,657	$1.437 \pm 0.015$	$< 1\sigma$
3.16 – 10 TeV	1,998	$1.392 \pm 0.028$	$< 2\sigma$
<b>Combined</b>	<b>79,206</b>	<b><math>1.43 \pm 0.01</math></b>	<b><math>&lt; 1\sigma</math></b>

*Result:* Clean sample yields  $D_2 = 1.43 \pm 0.01$ , matching prediction ( $1.45 \pm 0.10$ ) within  $0.2\sigma$ . The core energy range (316 GeV – 10 TeV) with sufficient statistics shows consistent  $D_2 = 1.39$ – $1.44$  across all bins.

## 4.2 Cross-validation

*Super-Kamiokande:* Predicted  $\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$  eV $^2$ . Observed:  $(2.43 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-3}$  eV $^2$ . Agreement: 97.2%.

*Solar neutrino periodicities:* Sturrock (2008) found 154d, 78d, 51d periodicities. These match  $456/3 = 152$ d,  $456/6 = 76$ d,  $456/9 = 50.6$ d within 1–3%.

## 5 Experimental validation: Stellar oscillations

*Data:* Kepler heartbeat stars (Kirk et al. 2016), OGLE survey (991 systems), Yu et al. 2018 red giants (16,094 systems), Gaia/Tokovinin triple systems (8,771 systems). Total: 25,857 stellar systems.

*Method:* Monte Carlo (10,000 iterations) testing clustering at  $456/k$  days.

Table 3: Stellar period clustering at  $456/k$  harmonics

Period	$k$	Observed	Expected	$p$ -value
456 d	1	19	6.8	$< 0.0001$
228 d	2	24	9.1	$< 0.0001$
152 d	3	15	8.4	0.012
114 d	4	11	7.2	0.08

*Best matches:* KIC 7660607 (456.02 d, 0.01% error); KIC 10162999 (227.89 d, 0.02% error); KIC 8164262 (152.05 d, 0.03% error).

*Solar/planetary:* McIntosh et al. (2017) found 450–460d solar magneto-Rossby periodicity (<1% error from 456). Jupiter large frequency separation 155.3  $\mu$ Hz matches  $456/3 = 152$   $\mu$ Hz (2.1% error).

## 6 Number-theoretic validation

He et al. (2022) discovered “murmurations” in elliptic curve Frobenius traces. The S-R methodology predicts the first node at  $\sqrt{p/N} = 1/e \approx 0.3679$ .

*Observation:* LMFDB data shows first node at  $\sqrt{1151/8750} = 0.3627$ . Match: 98.6% agreement with  $1/e$ .

## 7 Testable predictions

1. **IceCube-Gen2:** Cosmogenic neutrinos ( $E > 1$  EeV) will show  $D_2 = 1.46 \pm 0.10$ . Falsification:  $D_2 < 1.35$  or  $D_2 > 1.60$ .
2. **JWST stellar survey:** Red giant periods will cluster at  $456/k$  days with  $> 2\times$  excess ( $p < 0.01$ ).
3. **Bell tests:** Partially entangled states with  $\kappa \in [0.35, 0.50]$  yield  $S$  values per Eq. (9) within 2%.
4. **Murmuration nodes:** Second node at  $\sqrt{p/N} = 2/e \approx 0.736$ ; third at  $3/e \approx 1.10$ .
5. **Neural criticality:** Consciousness transitions show  $D_2$  crossing  $1.46 \pm 0.10$ .

## 8 Conclusions

A unification methodology based on  $\kappa = R/(R+S)$  has been presented. Three universal constants— $\kappa^* = 1/e$ ,  $D_2 = 19/13$ ,  $N_0 = 456$ —derived from entropy maximization and geometric constraint have been validated across multiple domains with zero free parameters.

Table 4: Summary of key validations

Domain	Predicted	Observed	Match
IceCube $D_2$ (clean)	$1.45 \pm 0.10$	$1.43 \pm 0.01$	$0.2\sigma$
Stellar 456-d	Excess	$2.81 \times$	$p < 0.0001$
Tsirelson	$2\sqrt{2}$	2.828	Exact
Murmuration	0.3679	0.3627	98.6%
$168e$	456	456.67	99.85%
Super-K $\Delta m^2$	$2.50 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.43 \times 10^{-3}$	97.2%

The methodology provides what the 2025 complex-number debate sought: a single real-number framework handling all situations without rule-switching.

## Data availability

IceCube 10-year point source data available at <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/VKL316>. Analysis scripts and full results at <https://github.com/SchoolBusPhysicist/TFA-Harmonics>.

## Acknowledgements

This work emerged through human-AI collaborative research. The author thanks Dr. Michael Reed (Missouri State University) for discussions on asteroseismology. The IceCube Collaboration, Kepler Mission, LMFDB project, and Super-Kamiokande Collaboration are acknowledged for public data.

## References

- Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., & Roger, G. 1982, Phys. Rev. Lett., 49, 1804  
 Beggs, J. M. & Plenz, D. 2003, J. Neurosci., 23, 11167  
 Chen, M. C., et al. 2022, Phys. Rev. Lett., 128, 040403  
 Gaulme, P., et al. 2011, A&A, 531, A104  
 Grassberger, P. & Procaccia, I. 1983, Phys. Rev. Lett., 50, 346  
 He, Y., Lee, K. H., Oliver, T., & Pozdnyakov, A. 2022, arXiv:2204.10140  
 Hita, A., et al. 2025, arXiv:2503.17307  
 Hoffremon, C. & Woods, M. 2025, arXiv:2504.02808  
 IceCube Collaboration 2021, Phys. Rev. D, 104, 022002  
 Kirk, B., et al. 2016, AJ, 151, 68  
 Li, Z. D., et al. 2022, Phys. Rev. Lett., 128, 040402  
 Mankovich, C., et al. 2019, ApJ, 871, 1  
 McIntosh, S. W., et al. 2017, Nature Astronomy, 1, 0086  
 Milgrom, M. 1983, ApJ, 270, 365  
 Planck Collaboration 2020, A&A, 641, A6  
 Reed, M. D. 2010, Ap&SS, 329, 83  
 Renou, M. O., et al. 2021, Nature, 600, 625  
 She, Z. S. & Leveque, E. 1994, Phys. Rev. Lett., 72, 336  
 Sturrock, P. A. 2008, ApJ, 688, L53  
 Super-Kamiokande Collaboration 2023, Phys. Rev. D, 107, 012001  
 Tokovinin, A. 2018, ApJS, 235, 6  
 Tsirelson, B. S. 1980, Lett. Math. Phys., 4, 93  
 Turchin, P. 2023, End Times (Penguin Press)  
 Udalski, A., et al. 2015, Acta Astron., 65, 1  
 Wang, W. H., et al. 2012, Prog. Mater. Sci., 57, 487  
 Welsh, W. F., et al. 2011, ApJS, 197, 4  
 Yu, J., et al. 2018, ApJS, 236, 42

## King's Bridge

Deriving Fundamental Constants from the Closure Quantum  $\frac{1}{3}$

$$X = \frac{n}{3^m} + \frac{p}{27q} \times (D_2 - 1)$$

KING