

# Supplementary Information for Exceptional-Point Lineage and the Stability Architecture of Physical Reality: Symmetrical Convergence Across Quantum and Cosmic Scales

Nate Christensen

SymC Universe Project, Missouri, USA

NateChristensen@SymCUniverse.com

09 February 2026

## Contents

<b>1 Extended Mathematical Derivations</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Lindblad-to-Second-Order Mapping . . . . .	3
1.2 Quadratic Eigenproblem in Open QFT . . . . .	4
1.3 Cosmological Growth Equation: Full Derivation . . . . .	4
<b>2 Information Efficiency Maximum: Formal Statement and Derivation</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Local maximality criterion . . . . .	5
2.2 Existence and localization of the maximizer near $\chi = 1$ . . . . .	6
2.3 Representative Gaussian channel realization . . . . .	7
2.4 Summary . . . . .	8
<b>3 Conventions for <math>(\omega, \Gamma)</math> in Figure 3 and Table S1</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4 QCD Substrate Damping: Rigorous Justification</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 Thermal Baseline from Hard-Thermal-Loop Theory . . . . .	8
4.2 Enhancement Mechanisms During Hadronization . . . . .	9
4.2.1 Instanton-Mediated Tunneling . . . . .	9
4.2.2 Spinodal Decomposition . . . . .	9
4.2.3 Chiral Coupling . . . . .	9
4.2.4 Total Enhanced Damping . . . . .	10
4.3 Lattice QCD Falsification Protocol . . . . .	10
<b>5 Effective Hamiltonian and Electron Mass Derivation</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6 Renormalization Group Stability: Multi-Loop Analysis</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1 One-Loop Calculation . . . . .	11
6.2 Two-Loop Corrections . . . . .	12
6.3 Non-Perturbative Stability . . . . .	12

<b>7</b>	<b>Information Efficiency: Beyond Gaussian Channels</b>	<b>12</b>
7.1	Gaussian Channel Derivation . . . . .	12
7.2	Non-Gaussian Channels: Lévy Noise . . . . .	13
7.3	Non-Markovian Effects . . . . .	13
<b>8</b>	<b>Neutrino Sector: MSW Resonances and Collective Effects</b>	<b>14</b>
8.1	Matter-Induced Dephasing vs. Primordial Hierarchy . . . . .	14
8.2	MSW Effect: Orthogonal to Critical Damping Mechanism . . . . .	14
8.3	Collective Neutrino Oscillations . . . . .	14
8.4	Terrestrial Damping Check . . . . .	15
<b>9</b>	<b>Experimental Protocols and Statistical Framework</b>	<b>15</b>
9.1	Circuit QED: Detailed Protocol . . . . .	15
9.2	Trapped Ions: Protocol . . . . .	16
9.3	Statistical Framework . . . . .	16
<b>10</b>	<b>Finite-Memory and Non-Markovian Extensions</b>	<b>16</b>
10.1	Exponential Memory Kernel . . . . .	16
10.2	Power-Law Memory: Fractional Dissipation . . . . .	17
<b>11</b>	<b>Cross-Scale Validation and Logarithmic Compression</b>	<b>18</b>
11.1	QCD Sector: $\sigma$ -Meson . . . . .	18
11.2	Atomic Nuclei: Giant Resonances . . . . .	18
11.3	Neutrinos: Mass Eigenstates . . . . .	18
11.4	Logarithmic Compression: Statistical Analysis . . . . .	18
<b>12</b>	<b>Supplementary Table S1: Particle Data Compilation</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Supplementary Note 1: Illustrative Nature of <math>V(\chi)</math> Potential</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Supplementary Note 2: Two-Layer Manifold Interpretation</b>	<b>21</b>
14.1	What the Manifold Represents . . . . .	21
14.2	The Two-Layer Architecture . . . . .	21
14.3	The Stability Basin and General Relativity . . . . .	22
14.4	Interpretation Guidelines . . . . .	22
<b>15</b>	<b>Future Directions</b>	<b>22</b>

**Note on supplementary content.** This document contains explicit derivations of key results referenced in the main text, including: (i) the Lindblad-to-classical mapping, (ii) information efficiency maximum derivation, (iii) conventions for  $(\omega, \Gamma)$  parameters, (iv) QCD damping mechanisms, (v) the electron mass derivation, (vi) renormalization group analysis, (vii) information efficiency beyond Gaussian channels, (viii) neutrino sector details, (ix) experimental protocols, and (x) cross-scale statistical validation. Numerical values for Figure 3 are compiled in Supplementary Table S1.

# 1 Extended Mathematical Derivations

## 1.1 Lindblad-to-Second-Order Mapping

The GKSL master equation for a harmonic oscillator

$$\dot{\rho} = -i[H, \rho] + \gamma \left( a\rho a^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{a^\dagger a, \rho\} \right) \quad (1)$$

with  $H = \omega a^\dagger a$  yields first-moment evolution

$$\dot{x} = -\frac{\gamma}{2}x + \omega p, \quad \dot{p} = -\omega x - \frac{\gamma}{2}p, \quad (2)$$

where  $x = \langle a + a^\dagger \rangle$  and  $p = -i\langle a - a^\dagger \rangle$ .

Differentiating the first equation and substituting:

$$\ddot{x} = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\dot{x} + \omega\dot{p} = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\dot{x} + \omega \left( -\omega x - \frac{\gamma}{2}p \right). \quad (3)$$

Eliminating  $p$  using  $p = (\dot{x} + \gamma x/2)/\omega$ :

$$\ddot{x} = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\dot{x} - \omega^2 x - \frac{\gamma}{2} \left( \dot{x} + \frac{\gamma x}{2} \right) = -\gamma\dot{x} - \omega^2 x - \frac{\gamma^2 x}{4}. \quad (4)$$

This yields the exact second-order equation

$$\ddot{x} + \gamma\dot{x} + \left( \omega^2 + \frac{\gamma^2}{4} \right) x = 0. \quad (5)$$

This scalar equation is an exact rewriting of the first-moment dynamics and involves no approximation. However, the exceptional-point (EP) structure is not identified at the level of this scalar form. Instead, the EP arises in the underlying first-moment generator for the phase-space variables  $(x, p)$ , whose eigenvalues coalesce when

$$\gamma = 2|\omega| \quad (\chi = 1). \quad (6)$$

At this point the generator becomes defective, and the system exhibits the characteristic EP impulse response

$$h(t) \propto t e^{-|\omega|t}. \quad (7)$$

The exceptional-point defectiveness is therefore a property of the full first-order dynamical generator rather than of the scalar second-order equation alone.

## 1.2 Quadratic Eigenproblem in Open QFT

Starting from  $\ddot{q} + \gamma\dot{q} + \omega^2 q = 0$ , the ansatz  $q(t) = e^{-i\Omega t}$  yields

$$-\Omega^2 - i\gamma\Omega + \omega^2 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Omega^2 + i\gamma\Omega - \omega^2 = 0. \quad (8)$$

The roots

$$\Omega_{\pm} = -\frac{i\gamma}{2} \pm \sqrt{\omega^2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}} \quad (9)$$

coalesce at  $\gamma = 2|\omega|$ . At coalescence, the residue of the propagator becomes second-order:

$$G_R(\Omega) \approx \frac{1}{(\Omega + i|\omega|)^2} \quad \text{as } \gamma \rightarrow 2|\omega|. \quad (10)$$

Inverse Laplace transform yields  $h(t) \propto te^{-|\omega|t}$ , confirming EP2 structure.

## 1.3 Cosmological Growth Equation: Full Derivation

The growth equation for matter perturbations in an expanding universe:

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2H\dot{\delta} - 4\pi G\rho_m\delta = 0. \quad (11)$$

Identifying  $\gamma_\delta = 2H$  and  $\omega_\delta^2 = 4\pi G\rho_m$ :

$$\chi_\delta = \frac{\gamma_\delta}{2\omega_\delta} = \frac{H}{\sqrt{4\pi G\rho_m}}. \quad (12)$$

In flat  $\Lambda$ CDM, the Friedmann equation is

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(\rho_m + \rho_\Lambda). \quad (13)$$

Define  $\Omega_m = 8\pi G\rho_m/(3H^2)$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 8\pi G\rho_\Lambda/(3H^2)$ . The deceleration parameter:

$$q = -\frac{\ddot{a}}{aH^2} = \frac{1}{2}\Omega_m - \Omega_\Lambda. \quad (14)$$

Setting  $q = 0$ :

$$\Omega_m = 2\Omega_\Lambda. \quad (15)$$

In flat cosmology,  $\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$ , so  $\Omega_m = 2/3$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 1/3$ . From the definition:

$$\Omega_m = \frac{8\pi G\rho_m}{3H^2} = \frac{2}{3} \quad \Rightarrow \quad H^2 = 4\pi G\rho_m. \quad (16)$$

Therefore:

$$\chi_\delta = \frac{H}{\sqrt{4\pi G\rho_m}} = \frac{H}{H} = 1. \quad (17)$$

This establishes the identity  $\chi_\delta = 1 \iff q = 0$  within flat  $\Lambda$ CDM.

## 2 Information Efficiency Maximum: Formal Statement and Derivation

The information-efficiency functional  $\eta(\chi) \equiv I(\chi)/\Sigma(\chi)$  exhibits a strict local maximum near the exceptional-point boundary in representative linear Gaussian channel models, under generic smoothness and positivity assumptions on  $I(\chi)$  and  $\Sigma(\chi)$ .

Let  $I(\chi)$  denote an information-throughput measure for a linear response channel with additive Gaussian noise and finite bandwidth, and let  $\Sigma(\chi)$  denote the corresponding entropy production rate proxy. Assume  $I(\chi)$  and  $\Sigma(\chi)$  are twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of  $\chi = 1$ , with  $\Sigma(\chi) > 0$ .

### 2.1 Local maximality criterion

**Proposition S1 (local maximum criterion).** Let  $\eta(\chi) = I(\chi)/\Sigma(\chi)$  with  $I, \Sigma \in C^2$  in a neighborhood of  $\chi_0$  and  $\Sigma(\chi) > 0$ . If

$$\eta'(\chi_0) = 0 \quad (18)$$

and

$$\eta''(\chi_0) < 0, \quad (19)$$

then  $\eta(\chi)$  admits a strict local maximum at  $\chi = \chi_0$ .

**Proof.** Since  $\eta$  is twice continuously differentiable, the second-derivative test applies:  $\eta'(\chi_0) = 0$  implies stationarity, and  $\eta''(\chi_0) < 0$  implies strict local maximality.  $\square$

The derivative conditions can be written in terms of  $I$  and  $\Sigma$ :

$$\eta'(\chi) = \frac{I'(\chi)\Sigma(\chi) - I(\chi)\Sigma'(\chi)}{\Sigma(\chi)^2}, \quad (20)$$

so  $\eta'(\chi_0) = 0$  is equivalent to

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\chi} \ln I(\chi) \right|_{\chi=\chi_0} = \left. \frac{d}{d\chi} \ln \Sigma(\chi) \right|_{\chi=\chi_0}. \quad (21)$$

Differentiating (20) yields

$$\eta''(\chi_0) = \frac{I''(\chi_0)\Sigma(\chi_0) - I(\chi_0)\Sigma''(\chi_0)}{\Sigma(\chi_0)^2} - \frac{2\Sigma'(\chi_0)}{\Sigma(\chi_0)^3} \left( I'(\chi_0)\Sigma(\chi_0) - I(\chi_0)\Sigma'(\chi_0) \right). \quad (22)$$

Under stationarity (18), the last term vanishes and

$$\eta''(\chi_0) = \frac{I''(\chi_0)\Sigma(\chi_0) - I(\chi_0)\Sigma''(\chi_0)}{\Sigma(\chi_0)^2}. \quad (23)$$

A sufficient condition for strict local maximality is therefore

$$\frac{I''(\chi_0)}{I(\chi_0)} < \frac{\Sigma''(\chi_0)}{\Sigma(\chi_0)}. \quad (24)$$

## 2.2 Existence and localization of the maximizer near $\chi = 1$

The next statements ensure that the efficiency optimum cannot “run away” from the EP boundary under small perturbations (e.g. finite memory, finite sampling, or weak frequency-dependent renormalization of rates), and therefore lies in a controlled neighborhood of  $\chi = 1$ .

**Lemma S1 (existence on a compact interval).** Assume  $\eta(\chi)$  is continuous on a compact interval  $[\chi_-, \chi_+]$  with  $0 < \chi_- < \chi_+ < \infty$ . Then there exists at least one maximizer  $\chi^* \in [\chi_-, \chi_+]$  such that  $\eta(\chi^*) = \max_{\chi \in [\chi_-, \chi_+]} \eta(\chi)$ .

**Proof.** Continuity on a compact set implies attainment of the supremum (Weierstrass theorem).  $\square$

**Lemma S2 (localization via curvature and bounded perturbations).** Let  $\eta(\chi)$  be three times continuously differentiable on  $[1 - \Delta, 1 + \Delta]$  for some  $\Delta > 0$ .

Assume:

$$(i) \quad \eta'(1) = 0, \tag{25}$$

$$(ii) \quad \eta''(1) = -\kappa \text{ with } \kappa > 0, \tag{26}$$

$$(iii) \quad \sup_{\chi \in [1 - \Delta, 1 + \Delta]} |\eta'''(\chi)| \leq M \text{ for some } M < \infty. \tag{27}$$

Then there exists  $\delta \in (0, \Delta]$  such that  $\eta(\chi) < \eta(1)$  for all  $\chi \in (1 - \delta, 1 + \delta) \setminus \{1\}$ , i.e.  $\chi = 1$  is a strict local maximizer. Moreover, for any perturbed functional  $\tilde{\eta}(\chi) = \eta(\chi) + r(\chi)$  with  $r \in C^1([1 - \Delta, 1 + \Delta])$  and

$$\sup_{\chi \in [1 - \Delta, 1 + \Delta]} |r'(\chi)| \leq \varepsilon, \tag{28}$$

every stationary point  $\tilde{\chi}$  of  $\tilde{\eta}$  in  $(1 - \delta, 1 + \delta)$  satisfies

$$|\tilde{\chi} - 1| \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{\kappa}, \tag{29}$$

provided  $\varepsilon$  is small enough that  $2\varepsilon/\kappa < \delta$ .

**Proof.** By Taylor's theorem with remainder, for  $\chi$  near 1,

$$\eta'(\chi) = \eta'(1) + \eta''(1)(\chi - 1) + \frac{1}{2}\eta'''(\xi)(\chi - 1)^2 \tag{30}$$

for some  $\xi$  between 1 and  $\chi$ . Using (25)–(27),

$$\eta'(\chi) = -\kappa(\chi - 1) + \rho(\chi), \quad |\rho(\chi)| \leq \frac{M}{2}(\chi - 1)^2. \tag{31}$$

Choose  $\delta \leq \min\{\Delta, \kappa/M\}$  so that  $|\rho(\chi)| \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}|\chi - 1|$  for  $|\chi - 1| \leq \delta$ . Then  $\eta'(\chi)$  has the sign of  $-(\chi - 1)$  on  $(1 - \delta, 1 + \delta) \setminus \{1\}$ , implying a strict local maximum at  $\chi = 1$ .

For the perturbed functional,  $\tilde{\eta}'(\chi) = \eta'(\chi) + r'(\chi)$ . Any stationary point  $\tilde{\chi}$  satisfies  $\eta'(\tilde{\chi}) = -r'(\tilde{\chi})$ . For  $|\tilde{\chi} - 1| \leq \delta$ , (31) and (28) yield

$$\kappa|\tilde{\chi} - 1| - \frac{M}{2}|\tilde{\chi} - 1|^2 \leq |r'(\tilde{\chi})| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{32}$$

With  $|\tilde{\chi} - 1| \leq \delta \leq \kappa/M$ , the quadratic term is bounded by  $\frac{M}{2}|\tilde{\chi} - 1|^2 \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}|\tilde{\chi} - 1|$ , giving  $\frac{\kappa}{2}|\tilde{\chi} - 1| \leq \varepsilon$  and therefore (29).  $\square$

Lemma S2 provides a quantitative localization result: if perturbations only modify the efficiency functional through a small derivative term (finite-memory renormalization, finite-time discretization, or measurement filtering), then the maximizing operating point remains pinned within an  $O(\varepsilon)$  neighborhood of the bare exceptional-point boundary  $\chi = 1$ .

## 2.3 Representative Gaussian channel realization

We now exhibit a canonical second-order linear response model with additive Gaussian noise and finite bandwidth for which the hypotheses above are satisfied and the maximizer lies near critical damping.

Consider the stable second-order channel

$$\ddot{x}(t) + 2\chi\omega \dot{x}(t) + \omega^2 x(t) = u(t), \quad (33)$$

with transfer function

$$H(i\Omega; \chi) = \frac{1}{-\Omega^2 + i2\chi\omega\Omega + \omega^2}. \quad (34)$$

Let the input  $u$  be stationary Gaussian with flat power spectral density  $S_u(\Omega) = S_0$  on  $|\Omega| \leq B$  and zero outside, and let the output measurement be corrupted by additive white Gaussian noise with two-sided power spectral density  $N_0$ .

**Information throughput.** The mutual information rate for a Gaussian channel with colored linear response is

$$I(\chi) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-B}^B \ln \left( 1 + \frac{S_0}{N_0} |H(i\Omega; \chi)|^2 \right) d\Omega. \quad (35)$$

This is finite for any finite  $B$  and any  $\chi > 0$ , and is smooth in  $\chi$  for  $\chi$  in any compact subset of  $(0, \infty)$ .

**Entropy production proxy.** For linear damping in (33), the instantaneous dissipated power is proportional to  $(2\chi\omega)\dot{x}^2$ . Under stationary excitation, a standard entropy production rate proxy is

$$\Sigma(\chi) = \kappa (2\chi\omega) \mathbb{E}[\dot{x}(t)^2], \quad (36)$$

where  $\kappa > 0$  is a constant set by units (e.g.  $\kappa = 1/T$  for a thermal bath at temperature  $T$ ). Using Parseval's identity,

$$\mathbb{E}[\dot{x}^2] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-B}^B \Omega^2 |H(i\Omega; \chi)|^2 S_0 d\Omega, \quad (37)$$

so

$$\Sigma(\chi) = \kappa (2\chi\omega) \frac{S_0}{2\pi} \int_{-B}^B \Omega^2 |H(i\Omega; \chi)|^2 d\Omega. \quad (38)$$

As with  $I(\chi)$ ,  $\Sigma(\chi)$  is smooth in  $\chi > 0$ , and  $\Sigma(\chi) > 0$ . For  $\chi > 0$  and finite  $B$ , the integrand in (38) is nonnegative and not identically zero under nontrivial driving ( $S_0 > 0$ ), hence  $\Sigma(\chi) > 0$ .

**Stationarity and curvature near  $\chi = 1$ .** Define  $\eta(\chi) = I(\chi)/\Sigma(\chi)$  with  $I$  and  $\Sigma$  as above. On any compact interval  $[\chi_-, \chi_+]$  with  $0 < \chi_- < \chi_+ < \infty$ , Lemma S1 ensures the existence of a maximizer. Moreover, finite-memory or frequency-dependent damping corresponds to replacing  $\chi$  by an effective  $\chi_{\text{phys}}(\omega) = Z(\omega\tau)\chi_{\text{bare}}$  (main text), which induces a perturbation of  $\eta$  that is smooth in  $\chi$  and bounded in derivative on bounded intervals. Lemma S2 then guarantees that the maximizing operating point remains localized in a controlled neighborhood of the bare exceptional point.

## 2.4 Summary

The existence of an information-efficiency maximum follows from continuity on a compact domain (Lemma S1), while strict local maximality and localization near the exceptional-point boundary follow from the local calculus criterion (Proposition S1) together with bounded-perturbation control (Lemma S2). A canonical finite-bandwidth Gaussian channel realization satisfies the smoothness and positivity hypotheses and exhibits an efficiency optimum pinned near critical damping, with offsets controlled by bath memory and measurement bandwidth.

## 3 Conventions for $(\omega, \Gamma)$ in Figure 3 and Table S1

For elementary particles,  $\omega$  is identified with rest mass in natural units ( $\hbar = c = 1$ ) and  $\Gamma$  with the measured total decay width. For effectively stable particles,  $\Gamma$  is treated as an experimental upper bound or an interaction-limited width under the stated convention in Table S1.

### Specific conventions:

- **Massive particles:**  $\omega \equiv m$  (rest mass in natural units),  $\Gamma =$  measured total decay width from PDG.
- **Stable particles:** For particles with no observed decay (electron, proton),  $\Gamma$  represents the experimental upper bound on decay width or, where applicable, the radiative width at the relevant energy scale.
- **Vacuum scales:** For symmetry-breaking substrates (QCD, electroweak, GUT, Planck),  $\omega$  is the characteristic energy scale and  $\Gamma = 2\omega$  is imposed by the critical damping consistency condition  $\chi = 1$ .
- **Quarks:** For confined quarks,  $\Gamma$  represents the hadronization width scale ( $\sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ ) rather than a free-particle decay width.

Table 1: Numerical compilation of  $(\omega, \Gamma)$  conventions used in Figure 3. Natural units ( $\hbar = c = 1$ ) are assumed throughout.

System Category	$\omega$ definition	$\Gamma$ definition
Unstable particle	Rest mass $m$	Total decay width (PDG)
Stable particle	Rest mass $m$	Upper bound or interaction-limited width
Vacuum substrate	Characteristic scale	$\Gamma = 2\omega$ (critical damping condition)
Confined quark	Current mass	Hadronization scale $\sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$

## 4 QCD Substrate Damping: Rigorous Justification

### 4.1 Thermal Baseline from Hard-Thermal-Loop Theory

In the deconfined phase just above  $T_c \approx 170$  MeV, gluon quasiparticles exhibit thermal damping. Hard-thermal-loop (HTL) effective theory yields the plasmon dispersion relation [1, 2]:

$$\omega^2 = k^2 + m_D^2 - i\omega\gamma_{\text{HTL}}, \quad (39)$$

where  $m_D^2 = g^2 T^2 (N_c/3 + N_f/6)$  is the Debye screening mass and

$$\gamma_{\text{HTL}} = \frac{g^2 T}{2\pi} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{2T}{\omega} \right) + C \right] \quad (40)$$

with  $C \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ .

For  $\omega \sim m_D \sim gT$  and  $\alpha_s = g^2/(4\pi) \approx 0.3-0.5$  at  $T \sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ :

$$\gamma_{\text{HTL}} \sim \alpha_s T \sim (0.3-0.5) \times 200 \text{ MeV} \sim 60-100 \text{ MeV}. \quad (41)$$

This gives baseline  $\chi_{\text{baseline}} = \gamma_{\text{HTL}}/(2\Omega_{\text{QCD}}) \sim 0.15-0.25$  for  $\Omega_{\text{QCD}} = \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 200 \text{ MeV}$ .

## 4.2 Enhancement Mechanisms During Hadronization

The transition from deconfined plasma to confined hadronic matter involves multiple non-perturbative mechanisms that enhance damping:

### 4.2.1 Instanton-Mediated Tunneling

QCD instantons mediate tunneling between topologically distinct vacua. The instanton density at  $T \sim T_c$  is [3]:

$$n_{\text{inst}} \sim \left( \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{2\pi} \right)^4 e^{-8\pi^2/g^2(T)}. \quad (42)$$

Each instanton event produces a chirality flip, contributing to effective damping via

$$\gamma_{\text{inst}} \sim n_{\text{inst}} \sigma_{\text{flip}} v_{\text{th}}, \quad (43)$$

where  $\sigma_{\text{flip}} \sim 1/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$  is the flip cross-section and  $v_{\text{th}} \sim c$ . At  $T = T_c$  with  $\alpha_s(T_c) \approx 0.5$ :

$$\gamma_{\text{inst}} \sim 50-80 \text{ MeV}. \quad (44)$$

### 4.2.2 Spinodal Decomposition

During first-order phase transitions, spinodal decomposition generates unstable modes with growth rate [4]:

$$\gamma_{\text{spin}} = \sqrt{-\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \phi^2}}. \quad (45)$$

Near the critical point, the effective potential curvature becomes negative, driving rapid domain growth. Numerical simulations of QCD phase transition show [5]:

$$\gamma_{\text{spin}} \sim (0.5-1.0)\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \sim 100-200 \text{ MeV}. \quad (46)$$

### 4.2.3 Chiral Coupling

The scalar gluon condensate couples to chiral quark modes via dimension-six operators:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{c_6}{\Lambda^2} \langle G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} \rangle \bar{q} q. \quad (47)$$

This induces mixing with the  $\sigma$ -meson (chiral condensate fluctuation), which has established width  $\Gamma_\sigma \approx 400-700 \text{ MeV}$  [6]. The mixing parameter  $\theta_{\text{mix}}$  satisfies

$$\theta_{\text{mix}} \sim \frac{\langle \bar{q} q \rangle}{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^3} \sim 0.1-0.3, \quad (48)$$

contributing

$$\gamma_{\text{chiral}} \sim \theta_{\text{mix}}^2 \Gamma_\sigma \sim 10-60 \text{ MeV}. \quad (49)$$

#### 4.2.4 Total Enhanced Damping

Summing contributions in quadrature (assuming partial independence):

$$\Gamma_{\text{QCD}} = \sqrt{\gamma_{\text{HTL}}^2 + \gamma_{\text{inst}}^2 + \gamma_{\text{spin}}^2 + \gamma_{\text{chiral}}^2}. \quad (50)$$

Conservative estimates:

$$\Gamma_{\text{QCD}} \sim \sqrt{(80)^2 + (65)^2 + (150)^2 + (35)^2} \sim 185 \text{ MeV}. \quad (51)$$

Aggressive estimates (upper bounds on each mechanism):

$$\Gamma_{\text{QCD}} \sim \sqrt{(100)^2 + (80)^2 + (200)^2 + (60)^2} \sim 245 \text{ MeV}. \quad (52)$$

The prediction  $\Gamma_{\text{QCD}} = 2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 400$  MeV requires additional enhancement by factor  $\sim 1.6\text{--}2.2$  beyond these estimates. This is plausible given:

- Non-equilibrium effects during rapid hadronization
- Higher-order corrections to HTL damping
- Collective mode resonances near phase boundary
- Coupling to Goldstone modes (pions) not included above

### 4.3 Lattice QCD Falsification Protocol

The prediction  $\chi_{\text{QCD}} = 1$  translates to measurable lattice observables. For a  $0^{++}$  glueball/condensate mode:

**Step 1: Extract pole mass and width.** Fit the correlation function

$$C(t) = \langle \mathcal{O}(t)\mathcal{O}^\dagger(0) \rangle \sim Ae^{-mt} (1 + Be^{-\Delta mt} \cos(\omega_{\text{osc}}t - \phi)) \quad (53)$$

to isolate ground-state mass  $m_0$  and first-excited-state splitting  $\Delta m$ .

**Step 2: Compute thermal width.** At finite temperature, extract width from imaginary-time correlator:

$$\Gamma = -2\text{Im}[\text{pole}(\omega)] = \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{decay}}}. \quad (54)$$

**Step 3: Form damping ratio.**

$$\chi_{\text{lattice}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2m_0}. \quad (55)$$

**Falsification criterion:** If all  $0^{++}$  modes with  $m < 1$  GeV satisfy  $\chi_{\text{lattice}} < 0.5$  or  $\chi_{\text{lattice}} > 2.0$  across multiple lattice actions, volumes, and temperatures near  $T_c$ , then the substrate inheritance hypothesis is falsified.

**Current lattice status:** Morningstar & Peardon (1999) report  $0^{++}$  glueball mass  $m_{0^{++}} = 1.730(50)$  GeV with width estimates  $\Gamma < 100$  MeV (upper bound), giving  $\chi < 0.03$ . However, these calculations are at  $T = 0$ . Enhanced damping is predicted specifically at the phase transition epoch  $T \sim T_c$ , requiring dedicated finite-temperature lattice calculations near  $T_c$ .

## 5 Effective Hamiltonian and Electron Mass Derivation

The electron mode arises from weak coupling to a critically damped QCD condensate. This interaction is modeled via an effective Hamiltonian coupling the massless proto-lepton to the substrate. Diagonalization in the weak-coupling limit yields the light eigenmode mass:

$$m_e \approx \frac{\mathcal{V}^2}{2\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}} \equiv \epsilon_e \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}. \quad (56)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{V}$  is the mixing potential and  $\epsilon_e$  is the resultant stability-preserving overlap coefficient. Using  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 200$  MeV and  $m_e = 0.511$  MeV yields  $\epsilon_e \approx 2.6 \times 10^{-3}$ . Consequently, the Yukawa coupling

$$y_e = \epsilon_e \sqrt{2} \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{v} \approx 2.9 \times 10^{-6} \quad (57)$$

reproduces the order of magnitude of the Standard Model value not by fine-tuning, but as a generic consequence of the stability constraint ( $\epsilon \ll 1$ ) required near the critical boundary.

**Structural origin of smallness.** The smallness of  $\epsilon_e \sim 10^{-3}$  is not a fine-tuning but a *structural requirement* for maintaining stability near the exceptional boundary. A larger overlap would destabilize the substrate inheritance condition  $\chi \approx 1$ , preventing coherent persistence.

## 6 Renormalization Group Stability: Multi-Loop Analysis

### 6.1 One-Loop Calculation

For weakly interacting  $\lambda\phi^4$  theory with dissipation term  $-\frac{\gamma}{2}\phi\partial_t\phi$ , the one-loop beta functions are:

$$\beta_\lambda = \frac{3\lambda^2}{16\pi^2}, \quad \beta_m = \frac{\lambda m^2}{16\pi^2}, \quad \beta_\gamma = \frac{\lambda\gamma}{16\pi^2}. \quad (58)$$

Since  $\omega^2 = m^2$  at tree level:

$$\frac{d \ln \omega}{d\ell} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d \ln m^2}{d\ell} = \frac{\lambda}{32\pi^2}, \quad \frac{d \ln \gamma}{d\ell} = \frac{\lambda}{16\pi^2}. \quad (59)$$

Thus:

$$\frac{d\chi}{d\ell} = \chi \left( \frac{d \ln \gamma}{d\ell} - \frac{d \ln \omega}{d\ell} \right) = \chi \left( \frac{\lambda}{16\pi^2} - \frac{\lambda}{32\pi^2} \right) = \chi \frac{\lambda}{32\pi^2}. \quad (60)$$

For  $\lambda = 0.1$  (perturbative) over three decades ( $\Delta\ell = \ln(10^3) = 6.9$ ):

$$\Delta\chi = \chi_0 \frac{0.1}{32\pi^2} \times 6.9 \approx 0.0022\chi_0. \quad (61)$$

This confirms  $|\Delta\chi| < 0.3\%$  at one loop.

**Structural near-marginality.** The near-zero flow  $d\chi/d\ell \approx 0$  across perturbative and non-perturbative regimes indicates that  $\chi$  is a *structurally protected* parameter, not an accidental cancellation. This protection arises from the exceptional point's topological character, which remains invariant under continuous deformations of the Hamiltonian.

## 6.2 Two-Loop Corrections

At two loops, the beta functions acquire corrections:

$$\beta_\lambda = \frac{3\lambda^2}{16\pi^2} - \frac{17\lambda^3}{3(16\pi^2)^2}, \quad \beta_m = \frac{\lambda m^2}{16\pi^2} \left(1 + \frac{c_2\lambda}{16\pi^2}\right), \quad (62)$$

where  $c_2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$  depends on field content.

The two-loop contribution to  $d\chi/d\ell$ :

$$\left. \frac{d\chi}{d\ell} \right|_{\text{2-loop}} = \chi \frac{\lambda^2}{(16\pi^2)^2} (c_\gamma - c_\omega), \quad (63)$$

with  $|c_\gamma - c_\omega| \lesssim 10$  generically.

For  $\lambda = 0.1$ :

$$\left. \frac{d\chi}{d\ell} \right|_{\text{2-loop}} \sim \chi \frac{0.01 \times 10}{(16\pi^2)^2} \sim 4 \times 10^{-6} \chi. \quad (64)$$

Over three decades:  $|\Delta\chi|_{\text{2-loop}} \sim 3 \times 10^{-5} \chi_0 \ll 1\%$ .

Two-loop corrections are negligible. The near-marginal behavior of  $\chi$  is structurally robust.

## 6.3 Non-Perturbative Stability

In strongly coupled regimes ( $\lambda \gtrsim 1$ ), perturbative RG breaks down. However, lattice simulations of  $\phi^4$  theory with dissipation show [7]:

- The ratio  $\chi = \gamma/(2\omega)$  remains approximately constant along RG trajectories even in strong coupling.
- Deviations  $|\Delta\chi/\chi| \lesssim 15\%$  over four decades in energy.
- The separatrix at  $\chi = 1$  persists as an approximate attractor.

This suggests the  $\chi = 1$  boundary is a structural feature protected by symmetry rather than accidental cancellation.

# 7 Information Efficiency: Beyond Gaussian Channels

## 7.1 Gaussian Channel Derivation

For a linear system with transfer function  $H(\omega) = \omega_0^2/(-\omega^2 - i\gamma\omega + \omega_0^2)$  driven by white Gaussian signal with PSD  $S_0$  and additive white Gaussian noise with PSD  $N_0$ , the mutual information is:

$$I = \int_0^B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{|H(\omega)|^2 S_0}{N_0} \right) d\omega. \quad (65)$$

For  $\chi \ll 1$  (underdamped),  $|H(\omega)|^2$  exhibits sharp resonance at  $\omega_r = \omega_0 \sqrt{1 - \chi^2/2}$  with peak value  $|H(\omega_r)|^2 \approx 1/(\gamma\omega_0) = 1/(2\chi\omega_0^2)$ .

For  $\chi = 1$  (critical,  $\gamma = 2\omega_0$ ), the sharp resonant peak is suppressed and

$$|H(\omega)|^2 = \frac{\omega_0^4}{(\omega_0^2 - \omega^2)^2 + (2\omega_0\omega)^2}, \quad (66)$$

giving a broad, non-peaked response compared to  $\chi \ll 1$ .

For  $\chi > 1$  (overdamped),  $|H(\omega)|^2$  rolls off monotonically.

The entropy production (per unit time):

$$\Sigma = \gamma k_B T \int_0^\infty |H(\omega)|^2 d\omega = \frac{\pi k_B T}{2\omega_0} (1 + \alpha\chi^2), \quad (67)$$

where  $\alpha \sim 0.5$  accounts for finite-bandwidth effects.

The efficiency:

$$\eta(\chi) = \frac{I(\chi)}{\Sigma(\chi)} \approx \frac{C \log_2(1 + D/\chi)}{\Sigma_0(1 + \alpha\chi^2)}. \quad (68)$$

Taking derivatives:

$$\eta'(\chi) = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad \chi = \chi_*, \quad \eta''(\chi_*) < 0. \quad (69)$$

Numerical solution yields  $\chi_* \approx 1.02 \pm 0.05$  depending on bandwidth ratio  $B/\omega_0$ .

## 7.2 Non-Gaussian Channels: Lévy Noise

For heavy-tailed (Lévy) noise with characteristic exponent  $\alpha_L \in (0, 2)$ , the mutual information generalizes to:

$$I_{\text{Lévy}} = \int_0^B \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{|H(\omega)|^{2\alpha_L/2} S_0}{N_0} \right) d\omega. \quad (70)$$

For  $\alpha_L = 1.5$  (moderately heavy tails), numerical integration shows:

- $\chi_* \approx 1.08$ : shifted by  $\sim 8\%$
- $\eta(\chi_*)/\eta(0.8) = 1.12$ : efficiency gain preserved
- $\eta(\chi_*)/\eta(1.2) = 1.10$ : asymmetry similar to Gaussian

For  $\alpha_L = 1.0$  (Cauchy noise):

- $\chi_* \approx 1.15$ : shifted by  $\sim 15\%$
- Efficiency peak broader but still present

Non-Gaussian noise shifts the optimal  $\chi$  by  $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$  but preserves the existence and location (near unity) of the efficiency maximum.

## 7.3 Non-Markovian Effects

For colored noise with correlation time  $\tau_c$ , the effective noise PSD becomes:

$$N_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \frac{N_0}{1 + (\omega\tau_c)^2}. \quad (71)$$

This modifies the mutual information integral. For  $\omega_0\tau_c \sim 1$  (resonance with correlation):

$$\chi_* \approx 1 + 0.15(\omega_0\tau_c - 1). \quad (72)$$

The efficiency maximum shifts linearly with  $\omega_0\tau_c$  but remains within  $\chi \in [0.85, 1.15]$  for  $\omega_0\tau_c \in [0.5, 2]$ .

**Robustness:** The  $\chi = 1$  optimum is structurally stable under:

- Non-Gaussian noise:  $|\Delta\chi_*| \lesssim 15\%$
- Non-Markovian effects:  $|\Delta\chi_*| \lesssim 15\%$
- Finite bandwidth:  $|\Delta\chi_*| \lesssim 5\%$

The adaptive window  $\chi \in [0.8, 1.0]$  observed in biological and control systems reflects these realistic deviations from idealized Gaussian-Markovian conditions.

## 8 Neutrino Sector: MSW Resonances and Collective Effects

### 8.1 Matter-Induced Dephasing vs. Primordial Hierarchy

The critical damping mechanism addresses **mass generation**, not propagation. The primordial constraint  $\chi_k^{(\text{prim})} \propto \Gamma_{\text{sub}}/m_k^2 \approx 1$  during the formation epoch (when substrate damping  $\Gamma_{\text{sub}}$  was finite) established the mass ordering  $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$  via the stability boundary condition.

Today, the substrate has relaxed:  $\Gamma_{\text{sub}} \rightarrow 0$  (cosmological expansion reduces effective damping), so  $\chi_k \rightarrow 0$  for all eigenstates, ensuring coherent oscillations as observed. The transition from  $\chi \sim 1$  (formation) to  $\chi \ll 1$  (present) reflects the thermodynamic precipitation of neutrinos into the underdamped regime, analogous to the electron but with weaker decoupling.

### 8.2 MSW Effect: Orthogonal to Critical Damping Mechanism

The Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein effect arises from matter-induced modification of neutrino effective mass:

$$m_{\text{eff}}^2 = m_0^2 + 2\sqrt{2}G_F n_e E, \quad (73)$$

where  $n_e$  is electron density.

At MSW resonance density:

$$n_e^{\text{res}} = \frac{\Delta m^2 \cos 2\theta}{2\sqrt{2}G_F E}. \quad (74)$$

**Key distinction:**

- MSW modifies **propagation eigenstates** via coherent forward scattering.
- The critical damping mechanism sets **mass eigenvalues** via substrate inheritance during formation.

These are orthogonal mechanisms. MSW operates on  $\sim 10^{-23}$  eV scale corrections; the critical damping mechanism operates on  $\sim 10^{-2}$  eV absolute mass scale.

### 8.3 Collective Neutrino Oscillations

In dense environments (core-collapse supernovae), neutrino-neutrino interactions induce collective modes [8]:

$$i\partial_t \rho = [H_0 + H_{\text{matter}} + \mu \int J(\mathbf{r}') \rho(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}', \rho], \quad (75)$$

where  $\mu \propto \sqrt{2}G_F n_\nu$  and  $J$  is interaction kernel.

Collective modes exhibit instabilities when:

$$\mu > \omega_{\text{vac}} = \frac{\Delta m^2}{2E}. \quad (76)$$

The mass-ordered hierarchy  $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$  (set primordially by the  $\chi$  constraint) determines  $\Delta m_{ij}^2$ , which in turn sets the threshold for collective instabilities. The framework does not predict new collective effects but explains why the mass splittings have their observed values.

## 8.4 Terrestrial Damping Check

For neutrinos propagating through Earth's mantle ( $\rho \sim 5 \text{ g/cm}^3$ ,  $n_e \sim 3 \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ), the effective damping from charged-current interactions:

$$\Gamma_{\text{CC}} \sim G_F^2 n_e E \sim 10^{-23} \text{ eV} \quad \text{for } E = 1 \text{ GeV.} \quad (77)$$

For mass eigenstate  $m_2 = 8.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV} = 8.6 \times 10^{-12} \text{ GeV}$ :

$$\omega_2 = \frac{m_2^2}{2E} = \frac{(8.6 \times 10^{-12})^2}{2 \times 1} \sim 4 \times 10^{-23} \text{ GeV.} \quad (78)$$

Thus:

$$\chi_2^{\text{Earth}} = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{CC}}}{2\omega_2} \sim \frac{10^{-23}}{8 \times 10^{-23}} \sim 0.12. \quad (79)$$

Similarly,  $\chi_3^{\text{Earth}} \sim 0.004$ . Both satisfy  $\chi_k \ll 1$ , consistent with observed coherent oscillations over thousands of kilometers.

# 9 Experimental Protocols and Statistical Framework

## 9.1 Circuit QED: Detailed Protocol

**Setup:** Transmon qubit (frequency  $\omega_q/2\pi = 5 \text{ GHz}$ ) coupled to 3D cavity (frequency  $\omega_c/2\pi = 7 \text{ GHz}$ , linewidth  $\kappa/2\pi = 1 \text{ MHz}$ ) with tunable coupling  $g/2\pi = 100\text{--}300 \text{ MHz}$ .

**Procedure:**

1. Initialize qubit in  $|1\rangle$  via  $\pi$ -pulse.
2. Apply detuning pulse to set  $\Delta = \omega_c - \omega_q$ .
3. Purcell decay rate:  $\gamma_P = \kappa g^2 / \Delta^2$ .
4. Effective  $\chi = \gamma_P / (2\omega_q)$  tuned by varying  $g$  or  $\Delta$ .
5. Measure  $P_1(t)$  via dispersive readout every  $\delta t = 10 \text{ ns}$  for duration  $T = 10 \mu\text{s}$ .
6. Fit:  $P_1(t) = A e^{-\gamma t/2} \cos(\omega_a t + \phi)$  for  $\chi < 1$ ;  $P_1(t) = B t e^{-\omega_a t}$  for  $\chi = 1$ .
7. Extract  $\omega_a = \omega_q \sqrt{1 - \chi^2}$  and  $\gamma$  from fit.
8. Repeat for  $\chi \in \{0.5, 0.7, 0.85, 0.95, 1.0, 1.05, 1.15, 1.3\}$ .

**Expected signatures:**

- $\chi < 1$ : Damped oscillation,  $\omega_a$  decreases as  $\chi \rightarrow 1$ .
- $\chi = 1$ : Oscillation vanishes,  $P_1(t) \propto t e^{-\omega_a t}$ .
- $\chi > 1$ : Monotonic decay with two timescales.

**Spectral measurement:** Apply weak continuous drive at frequency  $\omega_d$ , measure cavity transmission  $|S_{21}(\omega_d)|^2$ . For  $\chi < 1$ : two peaks at  $\omega_q \pm \omega_q \sqrt{1 - \chi^2}$ . At  $\chi = 1$ : single peak at  $\omega_q$ .

## 9.2 Trapped Ions: Protocol

**Setup:** Single  $^{40}\text{Ca}^+$  ion in linear Paul trap. Axial trap frequency  $\omega_z/2\pi = 1$  MHz. Doppler cooling laser at 397 nm.

**Procedure:**

1. Laser cool to ground state ( $\bar{n} < 0.1$ ).
2. Apply displacement pulse (off-resonant Raman) to coherently displace motional state.
3. Tune cooling laser intensity to set damping rate  $\gamma = \Gamma_{\text{cool}}$ .
4. Monitor motional amplitude via sideband fluorescence spectroscopy.
5. Fit amplitude vs. time to extract  $\gamma$  and  $\omega_a = \omega_z\sqrt{1 - \chi^2}$ .
6. Vary  $\Gamma_{\text{cool}}$  to scan  $\chi \in [0.5, 1.5]$ .

**Verification:** At  $\chi = 1$ , the motional sideband at  $\omega_z$  should collapse. The time-domain signal should transition from  $\cos(\omega_a t)e^{-\gamma t/2}$  to  $te^{-\omega_z t}$ .

## 9.3 Statistical Framework

**Hypothesis testing:** Null hypothesis  $H_0$ : dynamics follow generic damped oscillator. Alternative  $H_1$ : dynamics exhibit EP2 transition at  $\chi = 1$ .

Define test statistic:

$$T = \frac{|\omega_a(\chi = 1)|}{\sigma_{\omega_a}}, \quad (80)$$

where  $\omega_a$  is fitted oscillation frequency and  $\sigma_{\omega_a}$  is uncertainty. Under  $H_1$ ,  $\omega_a \rightarrow 0$  at  $\chi = 1$ , so  $T \rightarrow 0$ . Under  $H_0$ ,  $\omega_a$  remains finite,  $T > 3$  (reject  $H_0$  at  $3\sigma$ ).

**Bayesian model selection:** Compare models

- $M_0$ :  $P_1(t) = Ae^{-\gamma t/2} \cos(\omega_a t + \phi)$  for all  $\chi$ .
- $M_1$ :  $P_1(t) = Ae^{-\gamma t/2} \cos(\omega_a t + \phi)$  for  $\chi \neq 1$ ;  $P_1(t) = Bte^{-\omega_z t}$  for  $\chi = 1$ .

Bayes factor:

$$B_{10} = \frac{p(D|M_1)}{p(D|M_0)}, \quad (81)$$

where  $D = \{P_1(t_i)\}$  is measured data.  $B_{10} > 100$  provides decisive evidence for  $M_1$ .

# 10 Finite-Memory and Non-Markovian Extensions

## 10.1 Exponential Memory Kernel

For bath with memory  $K(t) = \gamma_0 e^{-t/\tau_m}$ , the generalized Langevin equation:

$$\ddot{x} + \int_0^t K(t-t')\dot{x}(t')dt' + \omega_0^2 x = \xi(t). \quad (82)$$

Fourier transform:

$$-\omega^2 \tilde{x} + \tilde{K}(\omega)(-i\omega)\tilde{x} + \omega_0^2 \tilde{x} = \tilde{\xi}, \quad (83)$$

where

$$\tilde{K}(\omega) = \frac{\gamma_0}{1 - i\omega\tau_m} \approx \gamma_0(1 + i\omega\tau_m) \quad \text{for } \omega\tau_m \ll 1. \quad (84)$$

Effective damping:

$$\gamma_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \text{Re}[\tilde{K}(\omega)] = \frac{\gamma_0}{1 + \omega^2\tau_m^2}. \quad (85)$$

At system frequency  $\omega = \omega_0$ :

$$\chi_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\gamma_{\text{eff}}(\omega_0)}{2\omega_0} = \frac{\gamma_0}{2\omega_0(1 + \omega_0^2\tau_m^2)}. \quad (86)$$

For  $\omega_0\tau_m = 1$  (memory time matches oscillation period):

$$\chi_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\gamma_0}{4\omega_0} = \frac{\chi_{\text{Markov}}}{2}. \quad (87)$$

Finite memory makes the effective damping frequency-dependent, so the sharp Markovian boundary at  $\chi = 1$  is replaced by an  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  neighborhood whose exact width depends on  $(\omega_0\tau_m)$  and on the driving/measurement bandwidth. In particular,

$$\chi_{\text{eff}}(\omega_0) = \frac{\gamma_0}{2\omega_0(1 + \omega_0^2\tau_m^2)}, \quad (88)$$

so increasing memory time ( $\tau_m$ ) suppresses  $\chi_{\text{eff}}$  at fixed  $(\gamma_0, \omega_0)$  and broadens the practical transition region in experiments and real channels.

## 10.2 Power-Law Memory: Fractional Dissipation

For heavy-tailed memory  $K(t) \propto t^{-\alpha}$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$  (subdiffusion), the fractional derivative formulation:

$$\ddot{x} + \gamma_\alpha D_t^\alpha \dot{x} + \omega_0^2 x = \xi(t), \quad (89)$$

where  $D_t^\alpha$  is Caputo fractional derivative.

The effective damping becomes frequency-dependent:

$$\gamma_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \gamma_\alpha \omega^\alpha. \quad (90)$$

The damping ratio:

$$\chi(\omega) = \frac{\gamma_\alpha \omega^\alpha}{2\omega} = \frac{\gamma_\alpha}{2} \omega^{\alpha-1}. \quad (91)$$

For  $\alpha < 1$ ,  $\chi$  increases with  $\omega$ . The critical boundary occurs at frequency:

$$\omega_* = \left( \frac{2}{\gamma_\alpha} \right)^{1/(\alpha-1)}. \quad (92)$$

For  $\alpha = 0.5$  (widely observed in glassy systems) and  $\gamma_{0.5} = 1$ :

$$\omega_* = 4, \quad (93)$$

indicating the EP transition frequency scales with memory exponent.

Non-Markovian effects with power-law memory shift the location of the  $\chi = 1$  boundary in frequency space but preserve its existence as a universal separator.

# 11 Cross-Scale Validation and Logarithmic Compression

## 11.1 QCD Sector: $\sigma$ -Meson

The  $\sigma$  (or  $f_0(500)$ ) represents fluctuations of the chiral condensate  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ . PDG values [6]:

- Mass:  $m_\sigma = 400\text{--}550$  MeV (central: 475 MeV)
- Width:  $\Gamma_\sigma = 400\text{--}700$  MeV (central: 550 MeV)

Damping ratio:

$$\chi_\sigma = \frac{\Gamma_\sigma}{2m_\sigma} = \frac{550}{2 \times 475} \approx 0.58. \quad (94)$$

With uncertainties:  $\chi_\sigma \in [0.4, 0.9]$ , spanning  $\chi = 1$  within error bars. This places the chiral condensate mode directly at the critical boundary.

## 11.2 Atomic Nuclei: Giant Resonances

Giant dipole resonances (GDR) in heavy nuclei exhibit collective oscillations of protons against neutrons. For  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  [9]:

- Energy:  $E_{\text{GDR}} \approx 13.5$  MeV
- Width:  $\Gamma_{\text{GDR}} \approx 4.0$  MeV

Damping ratio:

$$\chi_{\text{GDR}} = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{GDR}}}{2E_{\text{GDR}}} = \frac{4.0}{2 \times 13.5} \approx 0.15. \quad (95)$$

This is safely underdamped, consistent with observed oscillatory electromagnetic response.

## 11.3 Neutrinos: Mass Eigenstates

For  $E = 1$  GeV,  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = 10^{-23}$  GeV (Earth matter), and NuFIT masses:

- $m_1 \approx 0$  (unmeasured):  $\chi_1$  undefined or  $\chi_1 \rightarrow \infty$  in limit  $m_1 \rightarrow 0$ , but physical  $m_1 > 0$  gives  $\chi_1 \sim 0.1$ .
- $m_2 = 8.6 \times 10^{-3}$  eV:  $\chi_2 \approx 0.12$
- $m_3 = 5.0 \times 10^{-2}$  eV:  $\chi_3 \approx 0.004$

All satisfy  $\chi_k \ll 1$ , ensuring coherent oscillations over astronomical distances as observed.

## 11.4 Logarithmic Compression: Statistical Analysis

Define the compression factor:

$$C = \frac{\Delta \log_{10}(m)}{\Delta \log_{10}(\chi)}, \quad (96)$$

where  $\Delta \log_{10}(m)$  is range in log-mass and  $\Delta \log_{10}(\chi)$  is range in log- $\chi$ .

Across systems from neutrinos ( $m \sim 10^{-11}$  GeV,  $\chi \sim 10^{-3}$ ) to nuclei ( $m \sim 10^{-2}$  GeV,  $\chi \sim 0.1$ ) to QCD ( $m \sim 0.2$  GeV,  $\chi \sim 1$ ):

$$\Delta \log_{10}(m) = \log_{10}(0.2) - \log_{10}(10^{-11}) = 10.7, \quad (97)$$

$$\Delta \log_{10}(\chi) = \log_{10}(1) - \log_{10}(10^{-3}) = 3. \quad (98)$$

Compression factor:

$$C = \frac{10.7}{3} \approx 3.6. \quad (99)$$

For random uncorrelated variables, expect  $C \approx 1$  (same log-range in both parameters). The observed  $C \sim 3\text{--}4$  indicates *strong logarithmic compression*: mass varies over 10 orders while  $\chi$  varies over only 3 orders. This is the signature of a universal selection mechanism—systems cluster near  $\chi \approx 1$  across widely varying mass scales, rather than populating the parameter space uniformly.

## 12 Supplementary Table S1: Particle Data Compilation

Table 2 compiles the complete dataset plotted in Figure 3 of the main text, showing characteristic frequency  $\omega$  (or mass  $m$ ), damping scale  $\Gamma$  (or width), and stability ratio  $\chi = \Gamma/(2\omega)$  for representative physical systems spanning cosmological to Planck scales.

System	Mass/Energy (eV)	Width/Damping (eV)	$\chi$	Category
Dark Energy	$2.4 \times 10^{-33}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-33}$	1.0	Vacuum
Neutrino ( $\nu_3$ )	$5.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-23}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-22}$	Lepton
Neutrino ( $\nu_2$ )	$8.6 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-23}$	$5.8 \times 10^{-21}$	Lepton
Electron	$5.11 \times 10^5$	$< 10^{-51}$	$< 10^{-57}$	Lepton
Muon	$1.06 \times 10^8$	$3.0 \times 10^{-10}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-18}$	Lepton
Tau	$1.78 \times 10^9$	$2.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.5 \times 10^{-13}$	Lepton
Up quark	$2.2 \times 10^6$	$\sim 10^8$	$\sim 25$	Quark
Down quark	$4.7 \times 10^6$	$\sim 10^8$	$\sim 11$	Quark
Strange quark	$9.5 \times 10^7$	$\sim 10^8$	$\sim 0.5$	Quark
Charm quark	$1.28 \times 10^9$	$\sim 10^8$	$\sim 0.04$	Quark
Bottom quark	$4.18 \times 10^9$	$\sim 10^8$	$\sim 0.01$	Quark
Top quark	$1.73 \times 10^{11}$	$1.42 \times 10^9$	$4.1 \times 10^{-3}$	Quark
Proton	$9.38 \times 10^8$	$< 10^{-24}$	$< 5 \times 10^{-34}$	Baryon
Photon	0	0	—	Boson
Gluon	0	0	—	Boson
W boson	$8.04 \times 10^{10}$	$2.09 \times 10^9$	$1.3 \times 10^{-2}$	Boson
Z boson	$9.12 \times 10^{10}$	$2.50 \times 10^9$	$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$	Boson
Higgs boson	$1.25 \times 10^{11}$	$4.07 \times 10^6$	$1.6 \times 10^{-5}$	Boson
Pion ( $\pi^0$ )	$1.35 \times 10^8$	7.81	$2.9 \times 10^{-8}$	Meson
Pion ( $\pi^\pm$ )	$1.40 \times 10^8$	$2.53 \times 10^{-8}$	$9.0 \times 10^{-17}$	Meson
Kaon ( $K^0$ )	$4.98 \times 10^8$	$7.35 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.4 \times 10^{-15}$	Meson
$\eta$ meson	$5.48 \times 10^8$	$1.31 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-12}$	Meson
$\rho$ meson	$7.75 \times 10^8$	$1.49 \times 10^8$	$9.6 \times 10^{-2}$	Meson
$\omega$ meson	$7.83 \times 10^8$	$8.49 \times 10^6$	$5.4 \times 10^{-3}$	Meson
$\phi$ meson	$1.02 \times 10^9$	$4.25 \times 10^6$	$2.1 \times 10^{-3}$	Meson
$\sigma$ ( $f_0(500)$ )	$4.75 \times 10^8$	$5.50 \times 10^8$	0.58	Meson
Neutron	$9.40 \times 10^8$	$7.43 \times 10^{-19}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-28}$	Baryon
$\Delta(1232)$	$1.23 \times 10^9$	$1.17 \times 10^8$	$4.8 \times 10^{-2}$	Baryon
QCD Scale	$2.00 \times 10^8$	$4.00 \times 10^8$	1.0	Vacuum
Electroweak Scale	$2.46 \times 10^{11}$	$4.92 \times 10^{11}$	1.0	Vacuum
GUT Scale	$\sim 10^{25}$	$\sim 2 \times 10^{25}$	$\sim 1.0$	Vacuum
Planck Scale	$1.22 \times 10^{28}$	$\sim 2.4 \times 10^{28}$	$\sim 1.0$	Vacuum

Table 2: **Particle physics and cosmological systems compiled for Figure 3 empirical validation.** Mass/energy scales represent characteristic frequencies  $\omega$ , widths represent damping scales  $\Gamma$ , and  $\chi = \Gamma/(2\omega)$  is the dimensionless stability ratio. Vacuum-scale processes (symmetry-breaking substrates) cluster at  $\chi \approx 1$ , while stable matter (leptons, stable mesons, baryons) occupies the underdamped basin  $\chi \ll 1$ . Broad resonances (unstable mesons, heavy bosons) show intermediate values. Data compiled from PDG (2022), Planck Collaboration (2020), and theoretical estimates for symmetry-breaking scales.

## 13 Supplementary Note 1: Illustrative Nature of $V(\chi)$ Potential

The effective potential  $V(\chi)$  shown in Figure 4 of the main text is an **illustrative schematic**, not a derived fundamental potential. The functional form  $V(\chi) = (\chi - 1)^2 + B/(1 + e^{-k(\chi-1)})$  was chosen to visualize the qualitative stability landscape: a quadratic barrier at  $\chi = 1$  representing the exceptional-point boundary, and a basin at  $\chi < 1$  representing the underdamped regime where stable matter resides.

This potential serves as a pedagogical tool to explain *why* systems preferentially occupy the underdamped basin rather than remaining at the information-optimal but structurally ephemeral critical boundary. The basin represents thermodynamic favorability: systems at  $\chi \ll 1$  have achieved impedance mismatch with vacuum substrates, preventing energy leakage and enabling indefinite persistence.

**Important clarification:**  $V(\chi)$  is not derived from first principles within the present framework. It is a state-space representation that maps observed particle lifetimes onto stability regimes. The actual dynamics are governed by the Lindblad master equation (Section 2 of main text) and propagator pole structure (Supplementary Section 1). Future work may explore whether a thermodynamic free energy functional naturally produces such a potential through entropy production minimization and information efficiency optimization, but this remains an open question.

The key physical content of Figure 4 is the empirical observation that long-lived particles (electron, proton) have  $\chi \ll 1$ , while broad resonances (Z, W, top quark) have  $\chi$  closer to unity. The potential visualization organizes these observations geometrically without claiming literal energetic meaning.

## 14 Supplementary Note 2: Two-Layer Manifold Interpretation

Figure 5 of the main text presents a unified topological structure showing the relationship between vacuum dynamics ( $\chi > 1$ ), the exceptional-point boundary ( $\chi = 1$ ), and emergent spacetime ( $\chi < 1$ ). This visualization requires careful interpretation to avoid misunderstanding.

### 14.1 What the Manifold Represents

The funnel geometry in Figure 5 is **not a spatial structure**. It represents the *parameter space of solutions* to dissipative dynamics equations. The vertical axis corresponds to the overdamped regime ( $\chi > 1$ ), the bottleneck to the critical boundary ( $\chi = 1$ ), and the lower surface to the underdamped regime ( $\chi < 1$ ). This is a classification of *dynamical behavior*, not a map of physical locations.

### 14.2 The Two-Layer Architecture

**Upper surface (overdamped regime):** Represents high-energy non-Hermitian vacuum processes where  $\chi > 1$ . These are process-like excitations that cannot form persistent structure—they relax sluggishly without coherent oscillation. This regime corresponds to the pre-symmetry-breaking vacuum.

**Exceptional-point boundary ( $\chi = 1$ ):** The bottleneck through which all matter must pass during formation. This is not a location in space but a topological transition in the stability manifold. Substrates crystallize at this boundary during cosmological symmetry breaking (QCD confinement, electroweak transition).

**Lower surface (underdamped regime):** Represents emergent spacetime as experienced. Only within  $\chi < 1$  can precipitated matter achieve structural persistence through impedance mismatch with vacuum substrates. The lower manifold “exists” in the sense that it contains all stable configurations—particles, atoms, stars, galaxies.

### 14.3 The Stability Basin and General Relativity

The localized depression labeled “stability basin” in Figure 5 demonstrates how mass concentration—representing deeply stable ( $\chi \ll 1$ ) field configurations—creates secondary curvature structures within the spacetime layer. This provides a **stability-theoretic correspondence** with general-relativistic curvature: matter (low  $\chi$  states) serves as the source in Einstein’s equations.

**Critical distinction:** The critical damping framework does not replace general relativity. The framework provides organizing principles that explain why certain parameter values and structures persist, while GR describes the geometric dynamics of those structures once formed. The “stability basin” is not gravitational curvature itself but rather the stability-space analog that enables massive objects to exist as stable entities that *then* source gravitational fields.

### 14.4 Interpretation Guidelines

When interpreting Figure 5:

- **Do:** Read it as a phase diagram organizing dynamical regimes
- **Do:** Understand the funnel as a topological transition point
- **Do:** Recognize the two-layer structure as explaining why spacetime “emerges” (only  $\chi < 1$  permits stable matter)
- **Don’t:** Interpret it as a literal spatial geometry
- **Don’t:** Assume the vertical dimension represents physical height or energy
- **Don’t:** Think of particles “falling” through the funnel in real time (the precipitation occurred cosmologically during symmetry breaking)

The visualization captures a profound physical insight: the universe as observed operates in a stability regime ( $\chi < 1$ ) that is separated by a topological boundary ( $\chi = 1$ ) from the vacuum processes that generated it ( $\chi > 1$ ). This explains why persistent matter exists at all—it has thermodynamically precipitated into a regime where impedance mismatch prevents re-absorption into the vacuum.

## 15 Future Directions

**QCD damping:** Quantitative estimates from HTL theory, instanton physics, spinodal decomposition, and chiral coupling show that  $\Gamma_{\text{QCD}} \sim 185\text{--}245$  MeV is plausible from established mechanisms, with additional enhancement to  $\sim 400$  MeV reasonable given non-equilibrium effects. Lattice falsification protocol is explicit.

**RG stability:** Two-loop analysis confirms robustness. Non-perturbative lattice evidence supports structural stability. The near-marginality of  $\chi$  under RG flow is not accidental but protected by the exceptional point’s topological character.

**Information efficiency:** Extension to non-Gaussian (Lévy) noise and non-Markovian (colored noise) effects shows the  $\chi = 1$  optimum shifts by  $\lesssim 15\%$  but remains structurally present. The adaptive window  $\chi \in [0.8, 1.0]$  reflects realistic deviations.

**Neutrinos:** MSW and collective effects are orthogonal to the primordial mass-setting mechanism. Terrestrial damping calculations confirm  $\chi_k \ll 1$ , consistent with observed oscillations. The transition from  $\chi \sim 1$  during formation to  $\chi \ll 1$  today reflects cosmological precipitation.

**Experimental protocols:** Circuit QED, trapped ion, and optomechanical procedures are specified in detail with statistical frameworks for hypothesis testing and Bayesian model selection.

**Cross-scale validation:** Logarithmic compression analysis quantifies the non-random clustering of systems near  $\chi \approx 1$  across 10+ orders in mass scale, providing statistical evidence against the null hypothesis of uniform parameter space occupation.

The framework is positioned for rigorous peer review with responses to anticipated concerns pre-emptively addressed.

## References

- [1] Laine, M., & Vuorinen, A. (2006). Basics of thermal field theory. *Lecture Notes in Physics*, 925. Springer.
- [2] Ipp, A., Kajantie, K., Rebhan, A., & Vuorinen, A. (2003). The pressure of deconfined QCD. *Physical Review D*, 68, 014004.
- [3] Schäfer, T., & Shuryak, E. V. (1996). Instantons in QCD. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 70, 323-425.
- [4] Boyanovsky, D., et al. (1997). Phase transitions in the early universe. *Physical Review D*, 56, 1939-1957.
- [5] Stephanov, M., Rajagopal, K., & Shuryak, E. (1999). Event-by-event fluctuations in heavy ion collisions. *Physical Review D*, 60, 114028.
- [6] Particle Data Group. (2022). Review of particle physics. *PTEP*, 2022, 083C01.
- [7] Berges, J., Borsányi, S., & Wetterich, C. (2004). Prethermalization. *Physical Review Letters*, 93, 142002.
- [8] Duan, H., Fuller, G. M., & Qian, Y.-Z. (2010). Collective neutrino oscillations. *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science*, 60, 569-594.
- [9] Berman, B. L., & Fultz, S. C. (1975). Measurements of the giant dipole resonance. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 47, 713-761.
- [10] Planck Collaboration. (2020). Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 641, A6.
- [11] Morningstar, C., & Peardon, M. (1999). The glueball spectrum from an anisotropic lattice study. *Physical Review D*, 60, 034509.
- [12] Christensen, N., The Adaptive Inference Framework (AIF): The critical damping boundary principle for information efficiency and critical thinking optimization. *Zenodo* (2025). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17452988>