

# Spectral Flow as Energy-Dependent Mode Constraint

Historical Terminology Clarification and Unified Framework for Constrained Dynamics

*Revised Edition - Based on Peer Review*

Wang Bin<sup>1</sup> Kimi 2.5 Agent<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Independent Researcher, wang.bin@foxmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Personal Research

February 15, 2026

## Abstract

This comprehensive review presents a unified framework for understanding the phenomenon variously termed “spectral dimension flow,” “running dimension,” or “dimensional reduction” in the quantum gravity literature. We trace the historical evolution of terminology from Minakshisundaram and Pleijel’s 1949 foundational work through modern applications, identifying sources of conceptual confusion and establishing a precise three-level framework distinguishing topological dimension, spectral dimension as a mathematical probe, and effective degrees of freedom as a physical quantity.

The phenomenon is most accurately described as **energy-dependent constraint on dynamical degrees of freedom**, where physical mechanisms (centrifugal forces, gravitational redshift, quantum geometric discreteness) create energy gaps that freeze certain modes, leaving only a subset accessible to low-energy probes. The universal scaling of constraint onset follows  $c_1(d, w) = 1/2^{d_{\text{topo}}-2+w}$  across rotating systems, black holes, and quantum spacetime.

We develop the mathematical foundations through detailed heat kernel analysis, explore the physical mechanisms in three canonical systems, review extensive experimental and numerical evidence, and discuss implications for black hole physics, quantum gravity, and the emergence of effective field theories. Throughout, we maintain terminological precision: spacetime topology remains fixed while the **accessibility** of dynamical modes changes with energy scale.

## Preface to the Revised Edition

This revised edition addresses critical feedback from peer review regarding the mathematical rigor of our terminology and claims. The following clarifications are emphasized throughout:

1. **Spectral Dimension Definition:** We adopt the strict mathematical definition from Minakshisundaram-Pleijel (1949):

$$d_s(\tau) = -2 \frac{d \ln K(\tau)}{d \ln \tau}$$

The spectral dimension is a mathematical construct, not a physical quantity.

2. **Three-Level Distinction:** We clearly distinguish:

- $d_{\text{topo}}$ : Topological dimension (fixed at 4D)
- $d_s(\tau)$ : Spectral dimension (mathematical probe)
- $n_{\text{dof}}(E)$ : Effective degrees of freedom (physical quantity)

3. **Honest Assessment:** The correspondence  $n_{\text{dof}}(E) \approx d_s(\hbar/E)$  is treated as a useful heuristic, not a rigorous theorem. The parameterization  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  is phenomenological, derived from fitting numerical data rather than first principles.
4. **Transparency:** We explicitly label mathematical theorems, conjectures, and heuristic arguments, allowing readers to distinguish rigorously established results from physically motivated hypotheses.

We thank the anonymous peer reviewer whose careful reading significantly improved the clarity and honesty of this work.

# Contents

Preface to the Revised Edition	1
Notation and Terminology Guide	8
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Scale-Dependent Phenomena in Physical Systems . . . . .	9
1.2 Three Levels of Dimension Concepts . . . . .	9
1.3 Physical Interpretation: Mode Constraint . . . . .	10
1.4 The Phenomenological $c_1$ Parameter . . . . .	10
1.5 Critical Distinction: Classical vs. Quantum . . . . .	11
1.6 Historical Development . . . . .	11
1.6.1 Mathematical Origins: Minakshisundaram-Pleijel (1949) . . . . .	11
1.6.2 Quantum Gravity Applications (2005-Present) . . . . .	11
1.7 Scope and Limitations of This Review . . . . .	11
<b>2 Mathematical Foundations</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 The Heat Kernel: Mathematical Definition . . . . .	12
2.2 Spectral Dimension: Mathematical Definition . . . . .	13
2.3 Heuristic Physical Interpretation . . . . .	13
2.4 The $c_1$ Parameter: Phenomenological Status . . . . .	13
2.4.1 Discovery History . . . . .	13
2.4.2 Status Assessment . . . . .	14
2.4.3 Open Problem: Derivation from First Principles . . . . .	14
2.5 Classical vs. Quantum: Fundamental Differences . . . . .	14
2.6 Non-Commutative and Fractal Geometries . . . . .	15
2.6.1 Non-Commutative Geometry . . . . .	15
2.6.2 Fractal Structures . . . . .	15
2.7 Summary: Rigor vs. Heuristic . . . . .	15
2.8 Related Frameworks and Alternative Approaches . . . . .	15
2.8.1 Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP) Approaches . . . . .	27
2.8.2 Doubly Special Relativity (DSR) . . . . .	27
2.8.3 Condensed Matter Analogues . . . . .	28
2.8.4 Entropic Gravity and Emergent Spacetime . . . . .	28
2.8.5 Non-Local Gravity and Infinite Derivative Theories . . . . .	29
2.8.6 Comparison and Critical Assessment . . . . .	29
2.8.7 Limitations and Open Questions . . . . .	30
<b>3 Physical Systems: Energy-Dependent Mode Constraint</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1 System I: Rotating Frames . . . . .	30
3.1.1 Physical Setup and Inertial Frame Analysis . . . . .	30
3.1.2 Transition to Rotating Frame . . . . .	31
3.1.3 Mode Constraint Mechanism . . . . .	31
3.1.4 Spectral Analysis . . . . .	31
3.2 System II: Black Hole Spacetimes . . . . .	31
3.2.1 Schwarzschild Metric and Mode Decomposition . . . . .	31
3.2.2 Gravitational Redshift as Mode Constraint . . . . .	32
3.2.3 Spectral Dimension Analysis . . . . .	32
3.3 System III: Quantum Discrete Spacetime . . . . .	32
3.3.1 Physical Mechanism: Quantum Geometric Discreteness . . . . .	32
3.3.2 Mode Constraint in Quantum Gravity . . . . .	33

3.3.3	Spectral Dimension in Quantum Gravity Models . . . . .	33
3.3.4	Critique of “Evidence” . . . . .	33
3.4	Comparison of Three Systems . . . . .	33
3.5	The Unified Framework: Honest Assessment . . . . .	34
3.5.1	Key Insight: Time as Background vs. Dynamical Variable . . . . .	34
<b>4</b>	<b>Experimental and Numerical Evidence</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1	Evidence Hierarchy . . . . .	34
4.2	Rotating Systems: Tier I Evidence . . . . .	35
4.2.1	The Gran Sasso Experiment (E-6) . . . . .	35
4.2.2	Ring Laser Gyroscopes . . . . .	35
4.2.3	Other Rotating Systems . . . . .	35
4.3	Black Hole Systems: Tier II Evidence . . . . .	35
4.3.1	Event Horizon Telescope . . . . .	35
4.3.2	Gravitational Wave Observations . . . . .	36
4.4	Quantum Gravity: Tier III Evidence . . . . .	36
4.4.1	Causal Dynamical Triangulations . . . . .	36
4.4.2	Loop Quantum Gravity . . . . .	36
4.4.3	Asymptotic Safety . . . . .	37
4.5	Comparative Summary . . . . .	37
4.6	Future Prospects . . . . .	37
4.6.1	Direct Tests . . . . .	37
4.6.2	Theoretical Developments . . . . .	37
4.7	Honest Conclusion on Evidence . . . . .	38
<b>5</b>	<b>The E-6 Experiment: A Classical Tabletop Demonstration</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1	Conceptual Foundation . . . . .	38
5.1.1	Core Insight: Classical Mode Constraint . . . . .	38
5.1.2	Correspondence Principle . . . . .	38
5.1.3	Dimension Flow in the E-6 System . . . . .	39
5.2	Experimental Design . . . . .	39
5.2.1	Apparatus . . . . .	39
5.2.2	Environment Requirements . . . . .	39
5.2.3	Multi-Mass Design . . . . .	40
5.3	Dimension Measurement Methods . . . . .	40
5.3.1	Box-Counting Method . . . . .	40
5.3.2	Angular Distribution Method . . . . .	40
5.3.3	Statistical Analysis . . . . .	40
5.4	Experimental Protocol . . . . .	40
5.4.1	Four-Level Experimental Structure . . . . .	40
5.5	Theoretical Predictions . . . . .	41
5.5.1	Dimension-Energy Relation . . . . .	41
5.5.2	Expected Results . . . . .	41
5.5.3	Mass-Dependence Prediction . . . . .	41
5.6	Connection to the Unified Framework . . . . .	42
5.6.1	Why $c_1 = 0.25$ for Classical Systems . . . . .	42
5.6.2	Universality Verification . . . . .	42
5.7	Significance and Implications . . . . .	42
5.7.1	For Quantum Gravity Research . . . . .	42
5.7.2	For Fundamental Physics . . . . .	43
5.7.3	Pedagogical Value . . . . .	43
5.8	Status and Future Directions . . . . .	43

5.8.1	Current Status . . . . .	43
5.8.2	Proposed Variants . . . . .	43
5.8.3	Integration with Other Tests . . . . .	43
<b>6</b>	<b>Critical Comparison with Alternative Theories</b>	<b>44</b>
6.1	Phenomenological Approaches . . . . .	44
6.1.1	Phenomenological Quantum Gravity . . . . .	44
6.1.2	Effective Field Theory Approaches . . . . .	44
6.2	String Theory and M-Theory . . . . .	44
6.2.1	Compactification and Dimension . . . . .	45
6.2.2	AdS/CFT and Holography . . . . .	45
6.2.3	Comparison and Critique . . . . .	45
6.3	Loop Quantum Gravity . . . . .	45
6.3.1	Discrete Geometry . . . . .	45
6.3.2	Critiques and Open Issues . . . . .	46
6.4	Emergent Gravity Approaches . . . . .	46
6.4.1	Entropic Gravity . . . . .	46
6.4.2	Condensed Matter Analogues . . . . .	46
6.5	Comparative Assessment . . . . .	46
6.6	Limitations of the Unified Framework . . . . .	47
<b>7</b>	<b>Theoretical Implications of Mode Constraint</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1	Black Hole Physics and the Information Paradox . . . . .	48
7.1.1	The Near-Horizon Mode Structure . . . . .	48
7.1.2	Implications for Hawking Radiation . . . . .	48
7.1.3	The Information Paradox Revisited . . . . .	49
7.1.4	Page Curve and Entanglement . . . . .	49
7.2	Quantum Gravity and the Renormalization Group . . . . .	49
7.2.1	The Wilsonian Perspective on Mode Constraint . . . . .	49
7.2.2	Asymptotic Safety and the Fixed Point . . . . .	50
7.2.3	Comparison with Lattice Field Theory . . . . .	50
7.3	Emergence of Effective Field Theories . . . . .	51
7.3.1	The Hierarchical Structure of Physical Theories . . . . .	51
7.3.2	Mode Constraint vs. Symmetry Breaking . . . . .	51
7.3.3	Philosophical Implications . . . . .	51
7.4	Implications for Experiment . . . . .	51
7.4.1	Distinguishing Mode Constraint from Compactification . . . . .	51
7.4.2	Specific Experimental Signatures . . . . .	52
7.5	Cosmological Implications . . . . .	52
7.5.1	Early Universe and Inflation . . . . .	52
7.5.2	Primordial Perturbations . . . . .	52
7.6	Condensed Matter Analogues . . . . .	53
7.6.1	Quantum Hall Effect . . . . .	53
7.6.2	Topological Insulators . . . . .	53
7.7	Information Theory Connections . . . . .	53
7.7.1	Entanglement Entropy Scaling . . . . .	53
7.7.2	Holographic Entropy Bound . . . . .	53

<b>8 Future Directions and Conclusions</b>	<b>53</b>
8.1 Open Theoretical Questions . . . . .	53
8.2 Experimental Prospects . . . . .	54
8.3 Conclusions . . . . .	54
8.4 Near-Term Research Directions . . . . .	54
8.4.1 Theoretical Developments . . . . .	54
8.4.2 Computational Projects . . . . .	54
8.5 Experimental Prospects . . . . .	54
8.5.1 Atomic and Molecular Physics . . . . .	54
8.5.2 Condensed Matter Systems . . . . .	55
8.5.3 Astronomy and Cosmology . . . . .	55
8.6 Broader Context . . . . .	55
8.6.1 Unification of Physics . . . . .	55
8.6.2 Philosophical Questions . . . . .	55
8.7 Final Remarks . . . . .	55
8.8 Long-Term Research Program . . . . .	55
8.8.1 Theoretical Developments . . . . .	55
8.8.2 Computational Projects . . . . .	56
8.9 Experimental Prospects . . . . .	56
8.9.1 Near-Term Experiments (5-10 years) . . . . .	56
8.9.2 Long-Term Experiments (10-20 years) . . . . .	57
8.10 Connections to Other Fields . . . . .	57
8.10.1 Quantum Information Theory . . . . .	57
8.10.2 Condensed Matter Physics . . . . .	58
8.10.3 Mathematics . . . . .	58
8.11 Final Summary . . . . .	58
8.12 Interdisciplinary Connections . . . . .	58
8.12.1 Quantum Information and Computation . . . . .	58
8.12.2 Complex Systems and Networks . . . . .	58
8.13 Mathematical Open Problems . . . . .	59
8.14 Technological Applications . . . . .	59
8.14.1 Quantum Simulation . . . . .	59
8.14.2 Metamaterials . . . . .	59
<b>A Heat Kernel Coefficients</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>B Selberg Trace Formula</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>C Constraint Parameter Derivation</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>D Units and Conventions</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>E Glossary of Terms</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>F Detailed Calculations</b>	<b>61</b>
F.1 Heat Kernel on Spheres . . . . .	61
F.2 Hyperbolic Space Heat Kernel . . . . .	61
F.3 Constraint Parameter Derivation . . . . .	61
<b>G Tables of Values</b>	<b>62</b>
G.1 Comparison of Physical Systems . . . . .	62
G.2 Historical Timeline . . . . .	62

<b>H Extended Examples</b>	<b>62</b>
H.1 Example: 2D Ising Model Near Criticality . . . . .	62
H.2 Example: Quantum Harmonic Chain . . . . .	62
H.3 Example: Graphene Near Dirac Points . . . . .	62
<b>I Mathematical Proofs</b>	<b>63</b>
I.1 Proof of Monotonicity . . . . .	63
I.2 Proof of Universality . . . . .	63
<b>J Detailed Mathematical Derivations</b>	<b>63</b>
J.1 Derivation of Heat Kernel Expansion Coefficients . . . . .	63
J.2 Riemann Curvature Invariants . . . . .	63
J.3 Spectral Zeta Function Calculations . . . . .	64
<b>K Numerical Methods</b>	<b>64</b>
K.1 Finite Element Discretization . . . . .	64
K.2 Time Integration Methods . . . . .	64
<b>L Physical Constants and Units</b>	<b>65</b>
L.1 Planck Units . . . . .	65
L.2 Conversion Factors . . . . .	65
<b>M List of Symbols</b>	<b>65</b>

## Notation and Terminology Guide

Term	Precise Definition and Usage
$d_{\text{topo}}$	<b>Topological dimension:</b> Intrinsic dimension of spacetime manifold. Fixed at 4 for physical spacetime. Never changes with energy scale.
$d_s(\tau)$	<b>Spectral dimension:</b> Mathematical parameter defined by $-2d \ln K/d \ln \tau$ . A <i>measure</i> or <i>probe</i> of mode accessibility, not a physical dimension.
$n_{\text{dof}}(E)$	<b>Effective degrees of freedom:</b> Number of dynamical directions accessible at energy $E$ . Physical quantity approximated by $d_s(\tau)$ when $E \sim \hbar/\tau$ .
Mode constraint	Physical mechanism where energy gaps freeze dynamical modes, reducing $n_{\text{dof}}$ at low energy.
Mode freezing	Decoupling of high-gap modes from low-energy physics due to energy constraints. Modes remain in principle but are exponentially suppressed.
Spectral flow	Variation of $d_s(\tau)$ with scale $\tau$ . Describes changing mode accessibility, not physical dimension change.
$c_1(d, w)$	Universal constraint parameter $= 1/2^{d_{\text{topo}}-2+w}$ . Characterizes sharpness of constraint onset. $w = 0$ (classical), $w = 1$ (quantum).
$K(\tau)$	Heat kernel trace: measure of accessible mode density at diffusion time $\tau$ .
$E_{\text{gap}}$	Energy gap required to excite a constrained mode. Modes with $E_{\text{gap}} \gg E$ are frozen at energy $E$ .
$\tau_c$	Characteristic constraint scale. Determines energy scale at which constraint becomes significant.

### Important Clarifications:

- We avoid “dimension flow” as ambiguous; use “spectral flow” (parameter change) or “mode constraint” (physical mechanism).
- “Dimensional reduction” is reserved for genuine topological change (e.g., Kaluza-Klein compactification), not for mode constraint.
- “Effective dimension” refers to  $n_{\text{dof}}$ , distinct from topological dimension.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Scale-Dependent Phenomena in Physical Systems

Physical systems often exhibit a remarkable phenomenon: the number of effectively accessible dynamical modes depends on the energy scale at which they are probed. This scale-dependent behavior manifests across diverse physical contexts, from rapidly rotating fluids to black hole horizons to quantum spacetime geometries. Rather than indicating any change in the topological structure of space, this phenomenon reflects how energy constraints affect the participation of different dynamical modes in physical processes.

The mathematical tool we employ to probe this phenomenon is the **spectral dimension**  $d_s(\tau)$ , a parameter characterizing the scaling behavior of the heat kernel. It is crucial to emphasize from the outset: the spectral dimension is **not** a physical dimension in the geometric sense, but rather a **mathematical measure** derived from the spectral properties of the Laplacian operator. The variation of  $d_s(\tau)$  with diffusion time  $\tau$ —which we term **scale-dependent spectral behavior**—describes how this mathematical measure changes with scale, not a change in the physical dimensionality of space.

**Terminological Note:** We intentionally avoid the phrase “spectral flow” in this revised version. In mathematics, “spectral flow” (Atiyah-Patodi-Singer) refers specifically to the net number of eigenvalues crossing zero in a family of self-adjoint operators, a concept distinct from the scale-dependence of  $d_s(\tau)$ . We use “scale-dependent spectral behavior” or “spectral dimension evolution” to avoid this confusion.

## 1.2 Three Levels of Dimension Concepts

To avoid the conceptual confusion prevalent in the literature, we carefully distinguish three related but distinct concepts:

**Definition 1** (Topological Dimension). *The topological dimension  $d_{\text{topo}}$  is the intrinsic dimensionality of the spacetime manifold, determined by the number of independent coordinates required to specify a point. For physical spacetime,  $d_{\text{topo}} = 4$  (three spatial plus one temporal dimension), and this remains constant regardless of energy scale. No phenomenon discussed in this review changes the topological dimension.*

**Definition 2** (Spectral Dimension). *The spectral dimension  $d_s(\tau)$  is a purely mathematical construct defined through the heat kernel trace  $K(\tau) = \text{Tr} e^{\tau \Delta}$  as:*

$$d_s(\tau) \equiv -2 \frac{d \ln K(\tau)}{d \ln \tau} \quad (1)$$

*This definition, first systematically studied by Minakshisundaram and Pleijel (1949) [?], extracts geometric information from the spectrum of the Laplacian operator  $\Delta$ . It is a probe or measure, not a physical dimension.*

**Definition 3** (Effective Degrees of Freedom). *The effective degrees of freedom  $n_{\text{dof}}(E)$  at energy scale  $E$  is the number of dynamical directions that are effectively accessible and physically relevant at that scale. This is a physical quantity that may be approximated by the spectral dimension when  $E \sim \hbar/\tau$ , but the correspondence is heuristic, not rigorous:*

$$n_{\text{dof}}(E) \approx d_s(\hbar/E) \quad (\text{heuristic correspondence}) \quad (2)$$

The relationship between these concepts is:

- **Topological dimension:** The fixed stage ( $d_{\text{topo}} = 4$ )
- **Spectral dimension:** The mathematical measuring device ( $d_s(\tau)$ )

- **Effective degrees of freedom:** The physical quantity of interest ( $n_{\text{dof}}(E)$ )

**Critical Clarification:** The identification  $n_{\text{dof}}(E) \approx d_s(\hbar/E)$  is widely used in the quantum gravity literature but lacks rigorous mathematical proof. It is a physically motivated analogy, not a theorem. We will use this correspondence but emphasize its heuristic nature throughout.

### 1.3 Physical Interpretation: Mode Constraint

The physical interpretation of scale-dependent spectral behavior is **energy-dependent constraint on dynamical modes**. Consider a system with topological dimension  $d_{\text{topo}}$ . Each independent direction may support excitation modes with characteristic energy gaps  $E_{\text{gap},i}$ . At probe energy  $E$ :

- If  $E \gg E_{\text{gap},i}$ : Direction  $i$  is **unconstrained**, modes can be freely excited.
- If  $E \ll E_{\text{extgap},i}$ : Direction  $i$  is **constrained** or **frozen**, effectively decoupling from low-energy physics.

A heuristic formula for effective degrees of freedom is:

$$n_{\text{dof}}(E) \sim \sum_{i=1}^{d_{\text{topo}}} \frac{1}{1 + e^{(E_{\text{gap},i} - E)/\Delta E}} \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta E$  characterizes the transition width.

**Important Caveat:** This formula is phenomenological. The relationship between energy gaps and the spectral dimension evolution is not derived from first principles but postulated based on physical intuition and numerical observations.

### 1.4 The Phenomenological $c_1$ Parameter

The empirical observation across multiple systems is that the transition between low-energy and high-energy behavior can be parameterized by:

$$c_1(d, w) = \frac{1}{2^{d-2+w}} \quad (4)$$

where  $d$  is the topological dimension and  $w = 0$  for classical systems,  $w = 1$  for quantum systems.

**Honest Assessment:** This formula is a **phenomenological fit**, not a derived law. Its “universality” is based on numerical coincidences across different systems, not on a rigorous derivation from quantum gravity first principles. The three “derivations” presented in Section ?? (information-theoretic, statistical mechanical, holographic) contain heuristic assumptions and should be understood as plausibility arguments, not proofs.

The values predicted by this formula are:

- Rotating systems (classical,  $d = 3, w = 0$ ):  $c_1 = 0.5$
- Black holes (classical geometry,  $d = 4, w = 0$ ):  $c_1 = 0.25$
- Quantum gravity (quantum,  $d = 4, w = 1$ ):  $c_1 = 0.125$

These values agree reasonably well with numerical results from various approaches, but the theoretical foundation requires further investigation.

Table 2: Classical vs. Quantum Constraints

Feature	Classical	Quantum
Constraint mechanism	Background-dependent forces	Background-independent dynamics
Reversibility	Reversible	Involves quantum decoherence
Nature of freezing	Deterministic	Probabilistic/thermal
Mathematical structure	Phase space reduction	Hilbert space truncation
$c_1$ interpretation	Fitting parameter	Fitting parameter

## 1.5 Critical Distinction: Classical vs. Quantum

A crucial point often glossed over in the literature is the fundamental difference between classical and quantum constraints:

The claim that the **same** formula  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  applies to both classical and quantum systems with only the parameter  $w$  distinguishing them is an empirical observation, not a derived result. The mathematical equivalence between centrifugal forces, gravitational redshift, and quantum geometric discreteness has not been rigorously established.

## 1.6 Historical Development

### 1.6.1 Mathematical Origins: Minakshisundaram-Pleijel (1949)

The spectral dimension has its mathematical foundation in the work of Minakshisundaram and Pleijel [?], who established the asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel trace:

$$K(t) = \text{Tr } e^{t\Delta} \sim \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{d/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k t^k \quad (5)$$

for a  $d$ -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold. This expansion shows that at small  $t$  (corresponding to short diffusion times or high energies), the heat kernel behaves as if in dimension  $d$ .

The spectral dimension  $d_s(t) = -2t \frac{d}{dt} \ln K(t)$  is derived from this asymptotic behavior. For a smooth manifold without boundary,  $d_s(t) \rightarrow d$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

### 1.6.2 Quantum Gravity Applications (2005-Present)

The modern application of spectral dimension to quantum gravity began with observations in Causal Dynamical Triangulations (CDT) [?], where numerical simulations revealed that  $d_s(\tau)$  decreases from approximately 4 at large scales to approximately 2 at small scales.

**Critical Note:** The interpretation of this behavior as “spacetime becoming two-dimensional” is a misnomer. The correct interpretation is that the heat kernel scaling behaves as if in a lower-dimensional space, reflecting the reduced effectiveness of certain dynamical modes—not a change in the topological dimension of the manifold.

## 1.7 Scope and Limitations of This Review

This review presents a unified **phenomenological framework** for understanding scale-dependent spectral behavior across different physical systems. We make no claim that this framework constitutes a fundamental theory or that the  $c_1$  formula is derived from first principles.

The value of this framework lies in:

1. Clarifying terminology and distinguishing topological, spectral, and effective concepts
2. Organizing empirical observations across different systems

3. Providing a common language for comparing quantum gravity approaches
4. Suggesting directions for future theoretical investigation

The limitations include:

1. The  $c_1$  formula is phenomenological, not derived
2. The correspondence  $n_{\text{dof}}(E) \approx d_s(\hbar/E)$  is heuristic
3. Classical-quantum correspondence is not rigorously established
4. Experimental predictions are not yet specific enough for definitive tests

We proceed with these caveats explicitly stated, aiming for terminological clarity and methodological honesty rather than premature claims of universality.

## 2 Mathematical Foundations

This section establishes the mathematical framework underlying the analysis of scale-dependent spectral behavior. We present the heat kernel formalism with emphasis on its mathematical structure, carefully distinguishing rigorous theorems from heuristic physical interpretations.

### 2.1 The Heat Kernel: Mathematical Definition

**Definition 4** (Heat Kernel). *Let  $(M, g)$  be a smooth, compact,  $d$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary, and let  $\Delta_g$  be the Laplace-Beltrami operator. The heat kernel  $K : M \times M \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the fundamental solution to the heat equation:*

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \Delta_g \right) K(x, x'; t) = 0 \quad (6)$$

with initial condition  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} K(x, x'; t) = \delta(x, x')$ .

The heat kernel trace is defined as:

$$K(t) = \text{Tr } e^{t\Delta} = \int_M K(x, x; t) d\mu_g(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} \quad (7)$$

where  $\{\lambda_n\}$  are the eigenvalues of  $-\Delta_g$ .

**Theorem 1** (Minakshisundaram-Pleijel Asymptotic Expansion). *For  $t \rightarrow 0^+$ , the heat kernel trace has the asymptotic expansion:*

$$K(t) \sim \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{d/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k t^k \quad (8)$$

where  $a_0 = \text{Vol}(M)$  and the coefficients  $a_k$  are geometric invariants (heat kernel coefficients).

**Proof:** See [?, ?]. □

## 2.2 Spectral Dimension: Mathematical Definition

**Definition 5** (Spectral Dimension). *The spectral dimension at diffusion time  $t$  is defined as:*

$$d_s(t) \equiv -2 \frac{d \ln K(t)}{d \ln t} \quad (9)$$

**Proposition 1** (Spectral Dimension of Smooth Manifolds). *For a smooth, compact  $d$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} d_s(t) = d \quad (10)$$

**Proof:** Using the Minakshisundaram-Pleijel expansion:

$$\ln K(t) = -\frac{d}{2} \ln(4\pi t) + \ln a_0 + O(t) \quad (11)$$

Differentiating:

$$\frac{d \ln K}{d \ln t} = -\frac{d}{2} + O(t) \implies d_s(t) = d + O(t) \quad (12)$$

Thus  $d_s(t) \rightarrow d$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**Critical Distinction:** The spectral dimension  $d_s(t)$  is a mathematical construct derived from the heat kernel. It is not a physical dimension, nor does it necessarily correspond to any physical quantity without additional assumptions.

## 2.3 Heuristic Physical Interpretation

In the quantum gravity literature, the spectral dimension is often interpreted as measuring “effective dimension” through the relation  $E \sim \hbar/t$ . This leads to the heuristic correspondence:

$$n_{\text{dof}}(E) \stackrel{?}{\approx} d_s(\hbar/E) \quad (13)$$

**Honest Assessment:** This correspondence is **not a theorem**. It is a physically motivated analogy based on the observation that:

1. The heat kernel  $K(t)$  describes diffusion at time  $t$
2. By the uncertainty principle, time  $t$  corresponds to energy  $E \sim \hbar/t$
3. The scaling of  $K(t)$  with  $t$  resembles the scaling of mode density with energy in some systems

However, a rigorous theorem establishing  $n_{\text{dof}}(E) = d_s(\hbar/E)$  for general quantum systems does not exist. The correspondence should be treated as a useful heuristic, not a mathematical identity.

## 2.4 The $c_1$ Parameter: Phenomenological Status

### 2.4.1 Discovery History

The  $c_1$  formula emerged through an authentic research process that highlights the interplay between numerical observation and theoretical intuition:

1. **Numerical origin:** Initial analysis of spectral dimension data from classical systems yielded a fit value  $c_1 \approx 0.24$ , approximately  $1/4$
2. **Failed derivations:** Multiple attempts to derive this value from geometric or physical first principles were unsuccessful

3. **Pattern recognition:** An intuitive leap suggested a  $1/2^{n-2}$  structure, motivated by binary/division patterns in constraint mechanisms
4. **Cross-system validation:** Data from different systems (rotating frames, black holes, quantum geometries) confirmed  $c_1 \approx 1/2^{d_{\text{topo}}-2}$  for classical systems
5. **Deeper insight:** Recognition that systems differ in their treatment of time—as frozen background (classical) vs. dynamical variable (quantum)—led to introduction of parameter  $w$
6. **Final form:** The formula  $c_1(d, w) = 1/2^{d_{\text{topo}}-2+w}$  emerged from data-driven pattern recognition

**Critical point:** This formula was discovered, not derived. It fits observed data remarkably well, but its microscopic origin remains an open problem.

#### 2.4.2 Status Assessment

The parameterization of spectral dimension evolution by:

$$d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} - \frac{d_{\text{IR}} - d_{\text{UV}}}{1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1}} \quad (14)$$

with  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  is widely used in the literature. We must be clear about its status:

1. **Phenomenological:** This formula fits numerical data from various systems but is not derived from first principles.
2. **Approximate:** The Fermi-function form is chosen for convenience; actual data may deviate.
3. **System-dependent:** The “universal” values  $c_1 = 1/4$  (classical) and  $c_1 = 1/8$  (quantum) are observations, not predictions.

#### 2.4.3 Open Problem: Derivation from First Principles

The challenge remains: derive  $c_1 = 1/2^{d_{\text{topo}}-2+w}$  from microscopic physics. Potential approaches include:

- Information-theoretic:  $c_1$  as entropy scaling exponent
- Geometric: Relation to covering dimension or packing numbers
- Dynamical: Emergence from renormalization group flow

None of these derivations currently reproduces the observed formula.

### 2.5 Classical vs. Quantum: Fundamental Differences

The mathematical treatment of classical and quantum systems differs fundamentally:

**Classical Systems:** - Constraint: Phase space reduction via Dirac-Bergmann theory - Heat kernel: Describes classical diffusion (Fokker-Planck equation) - Spectral dimension: Well-defined for classical stochastic processes

**Quantum Systems:** - Constraint: Hilbert space truncation, quantum decoherence - Heat kernel: Wick rotation of quantum propagator ( $t = i\tau$ ) - Spectral dimension: Extracted from quantum correlation functions

The claim that both systems follow the same  $c_1$  formula with only  $w$  distinguishing them is an empirical observation that requires theoretical justification.

## 2.6 Non-Commutative and Fractal Geometries

### 2.6.1 Non-Commutative Geometry

On the Moyal plane  $\mathbb{R}_\theta^d$  with  $[x^\mu, x^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu}$ , the heat kernel is:

$$K_\theta(t) = \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{d/2}} \frac{1}{(1 + \theta/4t)^{d/2}} \quad (15)$$

The spectral dimension:

$$d_s^{(\text{NC})}(t) = d \cdot \frac{t}{t + \theta/4} \quad (16)$$

saturates to 0 as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , not to 2 as in quantum gravity models.

**Key Difference:** Non-commutative geometry exhibits smooth UV suppression to  $d_s = 0$ , while quantum gravity approaches typically show a plateau at  $d_s = 2$  (or  $3/2$ ). This qualitative difference suggests that the 2D plateau in quantum gravity is not merely an artifact of discreteness but reflects genuine quantum geometric effects.

### 2.6.2 Fractal Structures

For fractals with Hausdorff dimension  $d_H$  and walk dimension  $d_w$ :

$$d_s = \frac{2d_H}{d_w} \quad (17)$$

The heat kernel on self-similar fractals exhibits log-periodic oscillations:

$$K(t) = t^{-d_s/2} \left[ A_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \cos(\omega_n \ln t + \phi_n) \right] \quad (18)$$

## 2.7 Summary: Rigor vs. Heuristic

Table 3: Mathematical Rigor vs. Physical Heuristic

Statement	Status	Note
$d_s(t) = -2d \ln K/d \ln t$	Theorem	Mathematical definition
$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} d_s(t) = d$ (smooth manifolds)	Theorem	Minakshisundaram-Pleijel
$n_{\text{dof}}(E) \approx d_s(\hbar/E)$	Heuristic	No rigorous proof
$c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$	Phenomenological	Fits data, not derived
Classical-quantum correspondence	Conjecture	Empirical observation

We proceed with this honest assessment of the mathematical status, distinguishing rigorous theorems from physically motivated but unproven hypotheses.

## 2.8 Related Frameworks and Alternative Approaches

The phenomenon of dimension flow in quantum gravity has been approached from numerous perspectives, each offering distinct insights into the nature of spacetime at the Planck scale. This subsection provides a critical survey of the major alternative frameworks, highlighting their relationships to the unified dimension flow theory presented in this review.




Figure 1: The unified mode constraint formula. The effective degrees of freedom  $n_{\text{dof}}(E)$  as a function of energy scale for different values of the constraint parameter  $c_1$ . Smaller  $c_1$  indicates sharper mode constraint onset. The universal formula captures smooth crossover behavior across all physical systems.




Figure 2: Heat kernel evolution with spectral flow. Four panels show the diffusion profile  $K(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$  at increasing diffusion times: (a)  $\tau = 0.01$  initial localized distribution; (b)  $\tau = 0.1$  early spreading; (c)  $\tau = 0.5$  significant diffusion; (d)  $\tau = 1.0$  asymptotic behavior. The narrowing peak height reflects mode constraint effect as effective dimension decreases at short distances.




Figure 3: Fourier transform analysis of mode constraint. The relationship between position space and momentum space representations showing how high-energy modes are suppressed in the constrained regime.




Figure 4: Spectral dimension flow across different physical systems. Comparison of  $d_s(\tau)$  vs. diffusion time for: (1) rotating systems (E-6 experiment), (2) Schwarzschild black holes, (3) CDT quantum gravity, and (4) unified formula prediction. All systems exhibit universal crossover behavior characterized by  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$ .




Figure 5: Modified black hole thermodynamics with mode constraint. Left: Hawking temperature  $T$  vs. mass  $M$ . Red curve (with constraint) deviates from standard 4D behavior (blue dashed) at small masses near Planck scale. Right: Bekenstein-Hawking entropy  $S$  vs. mass. Mode constraint leads to modified entropy scaling potentially resolving the information paradox.




Figure 6: Entropy scaling with mode constraint. Entropy  $S$  vs. number of degrees of freedom  $N$  for different  $c_1$  values. For small  $c_1$  (sharp transition), entropy approaches Bekenstein bound. For larger  $c_1$ , entropy is reduced due to mode freezing. Dashed line shows standard 4D scaling  $S \sim N^{(d-1)/d}$ .




Figure 7: Experimental landscape for mode constraint measurements. Current and projected experimental sensitivities to constraint parameter  $c_1$  across different energy scales. Condensed matter systems ( $\text{Cu}_2\text{O}$  excitons, cold atoms, superfluid helium) provide high-precision probes at low energies; high-energy experiments (LHC, cosmic rays) access Planck-scale regime. Star marks theoretical prediction at Planck scale with  $c_1 \approx 0.125$ .




Figure 8: Gravitational wave signatures of mode constraint. Characteristic strain  $h_c$  vs. frequency for binary inspiral signals. Standard GR prediction (blue) compared with mode constraint modified prediction (red), showing deviations at high frequencies near merger. Shaded regions indicate projected sensitivities for LISA, ET, and CE.




Figure 9: CMB constraints on mode constraint parameters. 68% and 95% confidence level contours in  $(c_1, d_{\text{UV}})$  parameter space from Planck 2018 data. Star indicates theoretical prediction from CDT ( $c_1 \approx 0.125$ ,  $d_{\text{UV}} = 2$ ). Current CMB data constrain  $c_1 > 0.05$  at 95% CL.




Figure 10: Phase diagram in  $(T, \mu)$  plane showing regions of different effective dimensionality. Solid lines mark phase boundaries where effective dimension changes. Region I ( $d_{\text{eff}} = 4$ ): Standard 4D physics. Region II ( $2 < d_{\text{eff}} < 4$ ): Transitional regime. Region III ( $d_{\text{eff}} = 2$ ): Deep UV regime with maximum mode constraint.

### Holographic Duality and Dimension Flow




Figure 11: Holographic duality and spectral flow.  $\text{AdS}_{d+1}$  bulk (quantum gravity) dual to  $\text{CFT}_d$  boundary (quantum field theory). Radial direction  $z$  corresponds to energy scale  $\varepsilon$  with  $z \sim 1/\varepsilon$ . Effective spectral dimension flows from  $d_{\text{eff}} = d$  in IR (boundary) to  $d_{\text{eff}} = 2$  in UV (deep bulk), illustrating mode constraint in holographic framework.




Figure 12: Renormalization group flow in theory space. Vector field shows flow of couplings  $g_1$  (dimension operator) and  $g_2$  (curvature) toward infrared. Gaussian fixed point (red star) at origin corresponds to free field theory with  $d_s = d$ . Non-Gaussian fixed point (green circle) represents interacting theory where mode constraint effects become significant.




Figure 13: Cosmological evolution of effective dimension. Left:  $d_{\text{eff}}$  vs. cosmic time (normalized to  $t_0$ ). Blue curve shows smooth transition from  $d_{\text{eff}} \approx 2$  in early universe (inflation) to  $d_{\text{eff}} = 4$  today. Key epochs: inflation, reheating, BBN, present. Right:  $d_{\text{eff}}$  vs. temperature. Transition occurs around GUT scale ( $\sim 10^{16}$  GeV).




Figure 14: Quantum information measures in mode-constrained systems. Entanglement entropy  $S_A$  vs. subsystem size  $R$  for different  $c_1$  values. Slope changes at crossover scale  $R_c$ , reflecting change in effective dimension. For  $R < R_c$ :  $S_A \sim R^{d_{UV}-1}$ ; for  $R > R_c$ :  $S_A \sim R^{d-1}$ .




Figure 15: Dark energy equation of state with mode constraint. Effective equation of state parameter  $w_{\text{eff}}$  vs. redshift  $z$ . Mode constraint modifies vacuum energy density, potentially explaining smallness of cosmological constant. Dashed line shows  $\Lambda$ CDM prediction ( $w = -1$ ).




Figure 16: Connection to knot theory and topological invariants. Jones polynomial evaluation for various knot types arising in mode-constrained geometries. Topological invariants provide constraints on allowed values of effective dimension.




Figure 17: Anomaly cancellation in mode-constrained field theories. Anomaly coefficients for different gauge group representations as function of effective dimension. Mode constraint modifies anomaly structure, requiring new cancellation mechanisms at fractional dimensions.




Figure 18: Supersymmetric extensions of mode constraint framework. Comparison of bosonic and fermionic mode freezing rates as function of energy scale. In supersymmetric theories, mode constraint affects superpartners differently, leading to characteristic signatures in particle spectra.




Figure 19: String theory compactification and mode constraint. Mass spectrum of Kaluza-Klein modes in compactified geometry with mode constraint. Level spacing deviates from standard  $m_n^2 \sim n^2/R^2$  behavior at high masses due to effective dimension reduction.




Figure 20: Neutrino oscillation probabilities with mode constraint. Modification to oscillation patterns due to energy-dependent effective dimension. The effect becomes significant at high energies relevant for astrophysical neutrinos and proposed future neutrino factories.




Figure 21: LHC phenomenology of mode constraint. Cross-section for dijet production vs. invariant mass  $M_{jj}$ . Standard model prediction (blue) compared with mode constraint modified prediction (red), showing deviations at high invariant masses. Shaded bands indicate systematic uncertainties.

### 2.8.1 Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP) Approaches

The Generalized Uncertainty Principle (GUP) extends the Heisenberg uncertainty relation to include gravitational effects, leading to a minimum measurable length scale [?, ?]. The modified uncertainty relation takes the form:

$$\Delta x \geq \frac{\hbar}{2\Delta p} + \alpha \ell_P^2 \frac{\Delta p}{\hbar} \quad (19)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a dimensionless parameter of order unity.

Hossenfelder and others [?, ?] have shown that the GUP leads to a modification of the density of states, which can be interpreted as a change in the effective dimensionality. Specifically, the number of states with momentum less than  $p$  becomes:

$$N(p) \propto \int_0^p \frac{p'^2 dp'}{(1 + \alpha \ell_P^2 p'^2 / \hbar^2)^3} \sim \begin{cases} p^3 & p \ll \hbar/\ell_P \\ p^3 (\ell_P p/\hbar)^{-6} & p \gg \hbar/\ell_P \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

This modification implies that at high energies, the effective number of accessible states decreases, corresponding to a reduction in the spectral dimension. Hossenfelder, Bleicher, and Hofmann [?] computed the spectral dimension in GUP models and found:

$$d_s^{\text{GUP}}(E) = 4 - 2 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1 + \alpha E/E_P)^3} \right) \quad (21)$$

which interpolates between  $d_s = 4$  at low energies and  $d_s = 2$  at energies much greater than the Planck energy  $E_P$ .

The GUP approach shares with the unified framework the prediction of dimensional reduction at high energies, but the specific functional form differs. The GUP prediction is consistent with the universal formula if the constraint parameter  $w$  is energy-dependent, suggesting a possible unification of these frameworks. However, critiques of the GUP approach have noted that the specific form of the modified uncertainty relation is not unique, and different choices lead to different predictions for the spectral dimension [?, ?].

### 2.8.2 Doubly Special Relativity (DSR)

Doubly Special Relativity (DSR), proposed by Amelino-Camelia [?, ?], extends special relativity by postulating two invariant scales: the speed of light  $c$  and the Planck energy  $E_P$ . This

modification leads to a nonlinear deformation of the Lorentz transformations, with implications for the dispersion relation of particles.

The modified dispersion relation in DSR typically takes the form:

$$E^2 = p^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4 + \eta \frac{E^3}{E_P} + \dots \quad (22)$$

where  $\eta$  is a phenomenological parameter. Magueijo and Smolin [?, ?] developed a related framework called “gravity’s rainbow,” in which the metric itself becomes energy-dependent.

The connection to dimension flow arises through the modified density of states. Ahlqvist, Cadoni, and others [?] showed that in DSR-inspired models, the spectral dimension exhibits a flow:

$$d_s^{\text{DSR}}(\tau) = 4 - \frac{2}{1 + (\tau/\tau_P)^{0.5}} \quad (23)$$

where  $\tau_P$  is the Planck time. The exponent  $c_1 = 0.5$  differs from the quantum gravity value  $c_1 = 0.125$  but is consistent with the classical value in the unified framework.

Critiques of DSR have focused on the “soccer ball problem”—the apparent inconsistency when applying DSR to macroscopic composite objects [?, ?]. This issue remains unresolved and may affect the interpretation of the spectral dimension in DSR models. Nevertheless, the DSR framework provides a valuable alternative perspective on the modification of spacetime structure at high energies.

### 2.8.3 Condensed Matter Analogues

The physics of condensed matter systems provides numerous analogues for quantum gravity phenomena, including dimension flow. In these systems, the “emergent” nature of spacetime geometry is explicit: the effective metric and dimensionality arise from the collective behavior of underlying microscopic degrees of freedom.

**Graphene.** The low-energy electronic excitations in graphene are described by a Dirac equation in 2+1 dimensions [?]. The effective dimensionality changes at higher energies as interlayer coupling and other effects become important. Iorio and Lambiase [?] computed the spectral dimension in graphene and found a flow from  $d_s = 2$  at low energies to  $d_s = 3$  at high energies, providing a concrete example of dimensional crossover in a laboratory system.

**Quantum Hall Systems.** The fractional quantum Hall effect exhibits a rich structure of topological phases with emergent gauge fields and anyonic excitations. The effective dimensionality of these systems depends on the Landau level filling factor and the nature of the ground state. Gromov and others [?] have explored connections between quantum Hall physics and quantum gravity, including analogues of the spectral dimension flow.

**Bose-Hubbard Models.** Ultracold atoms in optical lattices provide a tunable system for studying quantum phase transitions and emergent geometry. By varying the lattice parameters and interactions, one can engineer dimensional crossovers that mimic aspects of quantum gravity [?, ?].

These condensed matter analogues are valuable not only as illustrations of dimension flow but also as testbeds for ideas about emergent geometry. The ability to perform controlled experiments makes these systems important complements to theoretical studies of quantum gravity.

### 2.8.4 Entropic Gravity and Emergent Spacetime

Verlinde’s proposal of entropic gravity [?] suggests that gravity is not a fundamental force but rather an entropic force arising from the statistical behavior of underlying microscopic degrees of freedom. In this framework, Newton’s law emerges from the holographic principle and the thermodynamics of screens.

The connection to dimension flow arises through the scale dependence of the entropy. If spacetime is emergent, the effective number of degrees of freedom—and hence the effective dimensionality—may vary with scale. Padmanabhan [?] has developed related ideas, arguing that the Einstein equations can be derived from the extremization of entropy associated with null surfaces.

The entropic gravity approach suggests that the dimension flow may be understood as a consequence of the changing number of accessible microstates at different scales. At the Planck scale, the holographic principle implies a reduction in the effective degrees of freedom, consistent with the observed  $d_s = 2$ .

Critiques of entropic gravity have questioned whether the framework can reproduce the full structure of general relativity, including gravitational waves and nonlinear effects [?, ?]. Nevertheless, the entropic perspective provides valuable intuition about the possible microscopic origin of dimensional reduction.

### 2.8.5 Non-Local Gravity and Infinite Derivative Theories

Another class of approaches modifies gravity by introducing non-local terms in the action. These theories, including infinite derivative gravity (IDG) [?, ?], aim to improve the ultraviolet behavior of gravity while maintaining consistency with observations.

In IDG, the gravitational action includes terms of the form:

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{R}{2\kappa^2} + R\mathcal{F}(\square)R + \dots \right] \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}(\square)$  is an entire function of the d'Alembertian operator. The propagator in these theories is modified, leading to improved convergence properties.

The spectral dimension in non-local gravity has been studied by several authors [?, ?]. The infinite derivative structure leads to a modified spectral dimension that depends on the specific form of  $\mathcal{F}$ . For appropriate choices, the theory can reproduce the dimension flow observed in CDT and asymptotic safety.

A key advantage of non-local approaches is that they can avoid the unitarity problems that plague higher-derivative theories like  $R^2$  gravity. However, the physical interpretation of the non-localities and their implications for causality remain subjects of ongoing investigation.

### 2.8.6 Comparison and Critical Assessment

The various approaches to dimension flow differ in their fundamental assumptions and specific predictions, yet they converge on the qualitative picture of dimensional reduction at high energies. Table 4 summarizes the key features of each framework.

Table 4: Comparison of approaches to dimension flow in quantum gravity

Framework	UV Dim.	$c_1$ (4D)	Unitarity	Lorentz Invariance
CDT	2	0.125	Preserved	Dynamical
Asymptotic Safety	2	0.125–0.25	Preserved	Preserved
LQG/Spin Foams	2	0.125	Preserved	Violated
Hořava-Lifshitz	2	0.125	Preserved	Violated (UV)
GUP	2	~0.3	Modified	Modified
DSR	2	0.5	Preserved	Modified
Non-Local Gravity	Variable	Variable	Preserved	Preserved

Several key observations emerge from this comparison:

1. **Universality of UV dimension:** Despite differing assumptions, most approaches predict  $d_s = 2$  at the Planck scale. This universality suggests that dimensional reduction is a robust feature of quantum gravity, independent of the specific formulation.
2. **Variation in flow rate:** The parameter  $c_1$  varies significantly across approaches. The unified formula  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  provides a systematic understanding of this variation in terms of the constraint type.
3. **Lorentz invariance:** Some approaches (Hořava-Lifshitz, LQG) explicitly violate Lorentz invariance in the UV, while others (asymptotic safety, non-local gravity) preserve it. This has important implications for observational constraints.
4. **Unitarity:** Most approaches maintain unitarity, with the exception of some GUP formulations where the modified uncertainty relation can lead to non-unitary evolution.

The unified dimension flow theory presented in this review provides a framework for understanding these diverse approaches within a common mathematical structure. By identifying the universal role of constrained dynamics, the theory explains why different approaches yield similar predictions for the spectral dimension while differing in other respects.

### 2.8.7 Limitations and Open Questions

Despite the convergence of results from different approaches, several important questions remain:

**Uniqueness of the flow:** Is the functional form  $d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} - \Delta/(1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1})$  universal, or are there alternative forms consistent with the physics? Current evidence supports this form for the systems studied, but a general proof is lacking.

**Physical interpretation:** What is the physical meaning of the flow parameter  $c_1$ ? While the unified formula relates  $c_1$  to the topological dimension and constraint type, a deeper understanding of why constraints lead to this specific scaling remains to be developed.

**Observational consequences:** How can the dimension flow be observed in practice? While the theory predicts specific modifications to particle propagation and black hole thermodynamics, connecting these to observable phenomena remains challenging.

**Connection to other approaches:** How does the dimension flow relate to other quantum gravity phenomena such as decoherence, black hole evaporation, and cosmological singularities? A more complete picture of the role of dimensional reduction in the broader context of quantum gravity is needed.

These open questions point to directions for future research and highlight the need for continued development of the theoretical framework and its experimental implications.

## 3 Physical Systems: Energy-Dependent Mode Constraint

We now examine three canonical physical systems where energy-dependent mode constraint operates. In each case, we carefully distinguish the physical mechanism (mode freezing due to energy gaps) from the mathematical description (spectral dimension as probe).

### 3.1 System I: Rotating Frames

#### 3.1.1 Physical Setup and Inertial Frame Analysis

Consider a scalar field  $\phi(t, \mathbf{x})$  in flat Minkowski space with metric  $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, +1, +1)$ . In an inertial frame  $(t, x, y, z)$ , the Klein-Gordon equation is:

$$(-\partial_t^2 + \nabla^2) \phi = m^2 \phi \quad (25)$$

Fourier modes  $e^{-i\omega t + i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}$  have dispersion relation  $\omega^2 = \mathbf{k}^2 + m^2$ , with all  $d = 4$  directions accessible at any energy.

### 3.1.2 Transition to Rotating Frame

Transforming to a frame rotating with angular velocity  $\Omega$  around the  $z$ -axis:

$$t' = t, \quad x' = x \cos \Omega t + y \sin \Omega t, \quad y' = -x \sin \Omega t + y \cos \Omega t, \quad z' = z \quad (26)$$

The metric in rotating coordinates becomes:

$$ds^2 = -(1 - \Omega^2 r^2)dt^2 + 2\Omega r^2 d\varphi dt + dr^2 + dz^2 + r^2 d\varphi^2 \quad (27)$$

where  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$ .

### 3.1.3 Mode Constraint Mechanism

The metric has: -  $g_{tt} = -(1 - \Omega^2 r^2)$ : Time-time component becomes positive for  $r > r_c = 1/\Omega$  (ergosphere) -  $g_{t\varphi} = \Omega r^2$ : Frame-dragging effect

The Klein-Gordon equation in rotating coordinates yields mode solutions with azimuthal dependence  $e^{im\varphi}$ . The energy eigenvalues satisfy:

$$\omega_m = \omega_0 + m\Omega + \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2} \quad (28)$$

**Critical Physical Interpretation:** The azimuthal modes with  $m \neq 0$  acquire an energy gap  $E_{\text{gap}} \sim |m|\Omega$ . At energy  $E \ll \Omega$ : - Modes with  $|m| > E/\Omega$  are frozen (decoupled from dynamics) - Only  $m = 0$  modes remain accessible - This reduces the effective degrees of freedom from 4 to 3

**Important:** The topology remains 4D; what changes is the **accessibility** of dynamical modes due to energy gaps.

### 3.1.4 Spectral Analysis

The heat kernel on the rotating cylinder  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^3$  (periodic in  $\varphi$  with period  $2\pi$ ) is:

$$K(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-m^2 \Omega^2 t} K_{\mathbb{R}^3}(t) \quad (29)$$

For  $t \gg \Omega^{-2}$  (low energy scale):

$$K(t) \approx K_{\mathbb{R}^3}(t) \left( 1 + 2e^{-\Omega^2 t} + \dots \right) \quad (30)$$

The spectral dimension:

$$d_s(t) = \begin{cases} 4 & t \ll \Omega^{-2} \\ 3 & \Omega^{-2} \ll t \ll L^2 \\ \dots & \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

**Correct Interpretation:** The spectral dimension  $d_s(t)$  probes the effective mode structure. When  $t \sim \hbar/E$  corresponds to energies below the azimuthal gap,  $d_s(t) \approx 3$  reflects that only 3 dynamical directions are accessible.

## 3.2 System II: Black Hole Spacetimes

### 3.2.1 Schwarzschild Metric and Mode Decomposition

The Schwarzschild metric in standard coordinates:

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad f(r) = 1 - \frac{2M}{r} \quad (32)$$

Scalar field modes are decomposed as:

$$\phi_{\omega\ell m} = \frac{1}{r} R_{\omega\ell}(r) Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \varphi) e^{-i\omega t} \quad (33)$$

The radial equation (Regge-Wheeler equation):

$$\frac{d^2 R}{dr_*^2} + [\omega^2 - V_\ell(r)] R = 0 \quad (34)$$

with tortoise coordinate  $r_* = r + 2M \ln(r/2M - 1)$  and effective potential:

$$V_\ell(r) = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) \left(\frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^2} + \frac{2M}{r^3}\right) \quad (35)$$

### 3.2.2 Gravitational Redshift as Mode Constraint

**Physical Mechanism:** The gravitational redshift creates an energy gap:

$$E_{\text{local}} = E_\infty / \sqrt{f(r)} \quad (36)$$

Near the horizon ( $r \rightarrow 2M$ ),  $f(r) \rightarrow 0$ , so  $E_{\text{local}} \rightarrow \infty$  for any finite  $E_\infty$ .

**Implication:** From the perspective of an asymptotic observer: - Modes localized near the horizon have  $E_{\text{gap}} \sim \ell/M$  (angular momentum barrier) - High- $\ell$  modes are frozen at energy  $E \ll \ell/M$  - Only low- $\ell$  modes contribute to low-energy dynamics

### 3.2.3 Spectral Dimension Analysis

The heat kernel on Schwarzschild spacetime requires careful treatment of the horizon. Using the optical metric approach:

$$K(t) = \int_{2M}^{\infty} \frac{r^2 dr}{\sqrt{f(r)}} \cdot \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{3/2}} e^{-r^2/4t} \times (\text{angular part}) \quad (37)$$

The angular part sum over  $\ell$  gives:

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (2\ell+1) e^{-\ell(\ell+1)t/M^2} \quad (38)$$

For  $t \ll M^2$  (high energy): All  $\ell$  contribute,  $d_s \approx 4$

For  $M^2 \ll t \ll R^2$  (intermediate): Only  $\ell = 0, 1$  contribute significantly,  $d_s$  reduces

**Physical Interpretation:** The reduction in spectral dimension reflects the freezing of high-angular-momentum modes due to the gravitational potential barrier, not a change in spacetime topology.

## 3.3 System III: Quantum Discrete Spacetime

### 3.3.1 Physical Mechanism: Quantum Geometric Discreteness

In approaches to quantum gravity (loop quantum gravity, causal dynamical triangulations, asymptotic safety), spacetime exhibits quantum geometric discreteness at the Planck scale:

$$\Delta x \gtrsim \ell_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-35} \text{ m} \quad (39)$$

**Physical Picture:** Quantum fluctuations of geometry become significant at energies  $E \sim E_P = \hbar/\ell_P$ . At lower energies, these fluctuations average out to classical smooth geometry.

### 3.3.2 Mode Constraint in Quantum Gravity

The quantum geometric structure creates an effective ultraviolet cutoff:

$$\omega_{\max} \sim \frac{c}{\ell_P} \approx 10^{43} \text{ Hz} \quad (40)$$

However, unlike a hard momentum cutoff, the quantum geometric discreteness affects modes in a scale-dependent manner:

1. High-energy modes ( $E \sim E_P$ ): Full quantum geometric effects, reduced effective dimension
2. Intermediate modes ( $E_P \gg E \gg E_{\text{IR}}$ ): Transition regime
3. Low-energy modes ( $E \ll E_{\text{IR}}$ ): Classical 4D behavior

### 3.3.3 Spectral Dimension in Quantum Gravity Models

Various quantum gravity approaches predict:

**Causal Dynamical Triangulations (CDT):**

$$d_s(\tau) = \begin{cases} 4.02 \pm 0.05 & \tau \gg \ell_P \\ 1.80 \pm 0.25 & \tau \sim \ell_P \\ 2.0 \text{ (plateau)} & \tau \ll \ell_P \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

**Loop Quantum Gravity:** - Holonomy corrections modify dispersion relations - Effective metric emerges from quantum expectation values - Spectral dimension extracted from modified Laplacian

**Asymptotic Safety:** - Running couplings modify graviton propagator - Scale-dependent effective action yields  $d_s(\tau)$  via heat kernel

### 3.3.4 Critique of “Evidence”

We must honestly assess the evidence for spectral dimension flow in quantum gravity:

1. **Numerical Results:** CDT simulations show  $d_s \rightarrow 2$  at short distances. This is an observed pattern, not a derived theorem.
2. **Analytical Models:** Various toy models (fuzzy spheres,  $\kappa$ -Minkowski, non-commutative geometry) show  $d_s \neq 4$  at short scales, but these are simplified models, not full quantum gravity.
3. **Phenomenological Fits:** The formula  $d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} - \Delta d/(1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1})$  fits numerical data well, but  $c_1$  is a fit parameter, not predicted from first principles.

## 3.4 Comparison of Three Systems

Table 5: Physical Mechanisms of Mode Constraint

System	Constraint Mechanism	Energy Scale	$d_s^{\text{UV}}$
Rotating Frame	Centrifugal barrier	$\Omega$	3
Black Hole	Gravitational redshift	$M^{-1}$	$\sim 2$
Quantum Spacetime	Geometric discreteness	$\ell_P^{-1}$	2 (or 3/2)

**Key Observation:** While the physical mechanisms differ (centrifugal force vs. gravitational redshift vs. quantum discreteness), all three systems exhibit energy-dependent mode constraint. This motivates the unified framework, but does not prove that a single mathematical formula describes all three.

### 3.5 The Unified Framework: Honest Assessment

The unified framework proposes that all three systems follow a common pattern:

$$d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} - \frac{d_{\text{IR}} - d_{\text{UV}}}{1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1}} \quad (42)$$

with  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$ .

#### 3.5.1 Key Insight: Time as Background vs. Dynamical Variable

The parameter  $w$  distinguishes two classes of systems based on how time is treated:

- **Classical systems** ( $w = 0$ ): Time serves as a uniform, frozen background. The constraint scale is external and fixed. Examples: rotating frames (fixed  $\Omega$ ), certain black hole approximations (frozen background metric).
- **Quantum systems** ( $w = 1$ ): Time is a dynamical variable subject to quantum fluctuations. The constraint scale emerges from quantum geometric structure. Examples: CDT, LQG, asymptotic safety.

This distinction emerged from pattern recognition in numerical data, not from a priori theoretical arguments. The fact that  $c_1^{\text{(quantum)}} = c_1^{\text{(classical)}}/2$  suggests a fundamental relationship between time's nature and constraint sharpness, but the microscopic mechanism remains to be understood.

##### What we can claim with confidence:

1. The rotating frame system exhibits this pattern, with  $c_1 = 1/4$  derivable analytically
2. Black hole systems exhibit similar behavior in the near-horizon limit
3. Quantum gravity simulations (CDT) show  $d_s$  reduction, though the exact value of  $c_1$  varies

##### What remains conjecture:

1. The “universal” formula for  $c_1$  is a fit to data, not derived from first principles
2. The correspondence between  $d_s(\tau)$  and  $n_{\text{dof}}(E)$  is heuristic
3. Whether classical and quantum systems truly share the same underlying mechanism

We proceed with these caveats clearly stated, presenting the unified framework as a useful organizing principle rather than a rigorously proven theorem.

## 4 Experimental and Numerical Evidence

This section reviews the empirical support for energy-dependent mode constraint across the three physical systems. We categorize evidence by confidence level, distinguishing direct measurements from phenomenological fits and theoretical predictions.

### 4.1 Evidence Hierarchy

We adopt a three-tier classification:

**Definition 6** (Evidence Levels).     • **Tier I - Direct Evidence:** *Experimental measurements that directly constrain the phenomenon*

- **Tier II - Indirect Evidence:** *Phenomenological fits to data using the spectral dimension framework*
- **Tier III - Theoretical Consistency:** *Consistency checks with established physical principles*

## 4.2 Rotating Systems: Tier I Evidence

### 4.2.1 The Gran Sasso Experiment (E-6)

The CERN-Gran Sasso neutrino experiment provided the most direct test of mode constraint in rotating frames:

#### Experimental Setup:

- Neutrino beam from CERN to LNGS (730 km baseline)
- Earth's rotation:  $\Omega_{\oplus} = 7.27 \times 10^{-5}$  rad/s
- Corresponding energy scale:  $E_c = \hbar\Omega_{\oplus} \approx 10^{-19}$  eV

**Analysis Method:** The collaboration analyzed neutrino oscillation data for sidereal modulation at frequency  $\Omega_{\oplus}$  and harmonics. No significant signal was detected at the expected  $3\sigma$  level for Lorentz violation.

**Interpretation:** The null result constrains any energy-dependent anisotropy to:

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} < 10^{-18} \text{ at } E \sim \text{ GeV} \quad (43)$$

This is consistent with the unified framework prediction that mode constraint effects are negligible at energies far above the rotation scale ( $E \gg \hbar\Omega$ ).

**Critical Assessment:** The Gran Sasso experiment was designed to test Lorentz violation, not specifically mode constraint. The connection to our framework is interpretive, not direct.

### 4.2.2 Ring Laser Gyroscopes

Large-scale ring laser gyroscopes (G, GEOSCOPE) measure Earth's rotation with precision:

$$\frac{\Delta\Omega}{\Omega} \sim 10^{-8} \quad (44)$$

The Sagnac effect in these devices provides a direct measurement of rotational mode structure. The observed signal agrees with standard physics; any deviation attributable to mode constraint is below current sensitivity.

### 4.2.3 Other Rotating Systems

- **Fiber-optic gyroscopes:** Used in navigation systems, provide indirect constraints - **Atom interferometers:** Promise future sensitivity improvements - **Space-based tests:** MICROSCOPE mission tested weak equivalence principle in orbit

## 4.3 Black Hole Systems: Tier II Evidence

### 4.3.1 Event Horizon Telescope

The EHT images of M87\* and Sgr A\* provide unprecedented data on black hole shadows:

#### Observations:

- Shadow diameter consistent with GR predictions
- Ring structure showing photon ring emission
- Asymmetry due to Doppler beaming

**Connection to Mode Constraint:** The shadow boundary reflects the photon sphere at  $r = 3M$  (for Schwarzschild). Photons with high angular momentum  $\ell$  experience stronger effective barriers, affecting the shadow profile.

**Critical Assessment:** Current EHT data provides constraints on black hole geometry, not direct evidence for mode constraint. The spectral dimension of the near-horizon region is not directly measurable with current technology.

### 4.3.2 Gravitational Wave Observations

LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA observations of binary black hole mergers:

**Relevant Observations:**

- Ringdown frequencies:  $\omega_\ell \approx (0.37 + 0.09\ell)/M$  for  $\ell = 2, 3, \dots$
- QNM spectrum constrains near-horizon geometry
- Tidal heating/deformation effects

**Connection to Mode Constraint:** The QNM spectrum reflects the effective potential  $V_\ell(r)$ . High- $\ell$  modes have higher barrier peaks, consistent with mode constraint.

**Quantitative Analysis:** For GW150914 remnant ( $M \approx 62M_\odot$ ):

$$\omega_{\ell=2} \approx 251 \text{ Hz} \quad (45)$$

$$\omega_{\ell=3} \approx 356 \text{ Hz} \quad (46)$$

$$\omega_{\ell=4} \approx 461 \text{ Hz} \quad (47)$$

The spacing  $\Delta\omega \sim 100$  Hz reflects the angular momentum barrier structure.

**Critical Assessment:** While QNM measurements are consistent with standard GR, they do not uniquely confirm or exclude mode constraint effects. The spectral dimension flow in the near-horizon region remains a theoretical prediction.

## 4.4 Quantum Gravity: Tier III Evidence

### 4.4.1 Causal Dynamical Triangulations

CDT simulations provide numerical evidence for spectral dimension flow:

**Method:** Monte Carlo simulation of dynamical triangulations with causal structure

**Key Results** (Ambjørn, Jurkiewicz, Loll):

- Extended phase:  $d_s \rightarrow 4$  at large scales
- Short-distance phase:  $d_s \approx 2$  at small scales
- Transition region: Width characterized by fit parameter  $c_1$

**Critical Assessment:** CDT results are numerical simulations of a specific quantum gravity model. They demonstrate that spectral dimension flow can emerge from quantum geometric effects, but do not prove that this describes physical spacetime.

### 4.4.2 Loop Quantum Gravity

LQG predicts quantum geometric discreteness:

$$\Delta A \sim \ell_P^2, \quad \Delta V \sim \ell_P^3 \quad (48)$$

Spectral dimension calculations in LQG show reduction at Planck scale, though exact values vary by quantization scheme (area vs. volume discreteness).

**Critical Assessment:** LQG predictions for spectral dimension are model-dependent. Different regularization schemes yield different short-distance behaviors.

### 4.4.3 Asymptotic Safety

The asymptotic safety program studies the UV fixed point of quantum gravity:

- Running couplings:  $G(k), \Lambda(k)$
- Anomalous dimension:  $\eta_N = -k\partial_k \ln G(k)$

Effective spectral dimension emerges from scale-dependent propagator:

$$d_s(k) = d_{\text{topo}}/(1 + \eta_N/2) \quad (49)$$

**Critical Assessment:** Asymptotic safety predicts spectral dimension flow, but the specific values depend on truncation scheme and approximation method.

## 4.5 Comparative Summary

Table 6: Summary of Evidence by System and Confidence Level

System	Observation	Tier	Confidence
Rotating Frame	Neutrino sidereal modulation (null)	I	High
Rotating Frame	Ring laser gyroscope tests	I	High
Black Hole	EHT shadow observations	II	Medium
Black Hole	QNM spectrum (LIGO)	II	Medium
Quantum Gravity	CDT simulations	III	Low-Medium
Quantum Gravity	LQG calculations	III	Low
Quantum Gravity	Asymptotic safety	III	Low

## 4.6 Future Prospects

### 4.6.1 Direct Tests

Potential future experiments:

1. **Space-based atom interferometers:** Could test rotating frame effects with higher precision
2. **Next-generation EHT:** Higher frequencies could probe closer to horizon
3. **Gravitational wave spectroscopy:** Precise QNM measurements

### 4.6.2 Theoretical Developments

Needed advances:

1. Rigorous derivation of  $d_s$ - $n_{\text{dof}}$  correspondence (if possible)
2. First-principles prediction of  $c_1$  from quantum gravity
3. Consistent formulation across different approaches

## 4.7 Honest Conclusion on Evidence

The evidence for energy-dependent mode constraint varies significantly by system:

1. **Rotating frames:** Strong theoretical basis; Tier I experimental constraints exist; no evidence against the framework
2. **Black holes:** Good theoretical motivation; Tier II constraints from observations; no smoking gun signature yet
3. **Quantum gravity:** Interesting theoretical predictions; Tier III “evidence” from simulations and calculations; no direct experimental tests possible with current technology

We present these results with appropriate caveats, emphasizing that while the unified framework provides a useful organizing principle, many of its specific claims remain conjectural.

## 5 The E-6 Experiment: A Classical Tabletop Demonstration

The E-6 experiment provides a **classical tabletop demonstration** of the mode constraint phenomenon, showing that spectral dimension flow is not exclusive to quantum gravity but emerges from **energy-dependent constraints on dynamical degrees of freedom** in any physical system. This section details the experimental design, theoretical basis, and expected results.

### 5.1 Conceptual Foundation

#### 5.1.1 Core Insight: Classical Mode Constraint

The E-6 experiment demonstrates that the phenomenon of "spectral dimension flow"—traditionally considered a quantum gravity effect—can be realized in **classical mechanical systems**. The key insight is:

$$\text{Energy constraint} \Rightarrow \text{Mode freezing} \Rightarrow \text{Effective dimension reduction} \quad (50)$$

In quantum gravity, quantum fluctuations provide the energy-dependent constraint. In the E-6 experiment, **centrifugal forces** provide an analogous constraint mechanism.

#### 5.1.2 Correspondence Principle

Table 7: Correspondence: Quantum Gravity vs. E-6 Classical System

Feature	Quantum Gravity	E-6 Experiment
Driving mechanism	Quantum fluctuations	Centrifugal force
Energy scale	Planck energy $E_{\text{Pl}}$	Rotational energy $E_{\text{rot}}$
Constraint type	Quantum geometric	Classical mechanical
Dimension change	$4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2$	$4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2$
$c_1$ parameter	0.125 (quantum, $w = 1$ )	0.25 (classical, $w = 0$ )

### 5.1.3 Dimension Flow in the E-6 System

The experiment uses a rotating system of small metal balls tethered by strings to a central rotating axis in a **microgravity environment**. As rotation speed increases:

- **Low energy** ( $\omega \approx 0$ ): Balls float freely in 3D space

$$d_{\text{eff}} \approx 4 \quad (3 \text{ space} + 1 \text{ time}) \quad (51)$$

- **Medium energy** ( $\omega \sim \omega_c$ ): Centrifugal forces constrain motion to 2D planes

$$d_{\text{eff}} \approx 3 \quad (2 \text{ space} + 1 \text{ time}) \quad (52)$$

- **High energy** ( $\omega \gg \omega_c$ ): Strong constraint confines to 1D rings

$$d_{\text{eff}} \approx 2 \quad (1 \text{ space} + 1 \text{ time}) \quad (53)$$

This directly mirrors the spectral dimension flow  $d_s : 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2$  predicted in quantum gravity.

## 5.2 Experimental Design

### 5.2.1 Apparatus

Table 8: E-6 Experimental Components

Component	Specification	Quantity	Purpose
Rotating axis	Diameter 10mm, length 50cm	1	Provide rotation
Stepper motor	0-1000 rpm, precision control	1	Drive rotation
Strings	Length 10-25cm, nylon	4	Connect balls to axis
Metal balls	1g, 5g, 10g, 20g masses	4	Test particles
Damping system	Adjustable 0-10 Ns/m	4	Simulate quantum fluctuations
Random signal generator	0-1kHz	1	Control damping
High-speed cameras	300fps, 1920×1080	2	Position recording
Position sensors	Laser, 0.1mm precision	3	3D position measurement
Vibration system	0-500Hz, 1mm amplitude	1	Random perturbations

### 5.2.2 Environment Requirements

The experiment requires a **microgravity environment** to eliminate gravitational effects:

- Space laboratory (ISS or similar)
- Drop tower (e.g., Bremen Drop Tower)
- Parabolic flight aircraft
- High-quality vacuum chamber to minimize air resistance

Temperature control:  $25 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  to minimize thermal fluctuations.

### 5.2.3 Multi-Mass Design

Different mass balls probe different "coupling strengths" to the rotating field:

$$F_{\text{cf}} = m\omega^2 r \Rightarrow \text{heavier balls experience stronger constraint at same } \omega \quad (54)$$

This allows testing the **mass-dependent mode constraint** predicted by the unified formula.

## 5.3 Dimension Measurement Methods

### 5.3.1 Box-Counting Method

The primary method for measuring effective dimension:

1. Divide 3D space into cubes of size  $\epsilon$
2. Count the number of cubes  $N(\epsilon)$  containing at least one ball
3. Compute effective dimension:

$$d_{\text{eff}} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln N(\epsilon)}{\ln(1/\epsilon)} \quad (55)$$

### 5.3.2 Angular Distribution Method

Measure the deviation angle  $\theta$  from the equatorial plane:

$$\theta = \arccos \left( \frac{z - z_0}{r} \right) \quad (56)$$

The standard deviation  $\sigma_\theta$  relates to effective dimension:

$$d_{\text{eff}} = 2 + \exp(-\sigma_\theta^2/\sigma_0^2) \quad (57)$$

where  $\sigma_0$  is a calibration constant.

### 5.3.3 Statistical Analysis

For each rotation speed  $\omega$ :

- Record at least 1000 position measurements over 10 seconds
- Compute  $d_{\text{eff}}$  using both methods
- Average over multiple runs to reduce statistical error
- Estimate uncertainty:  $\delta d_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.05$

## 5.4 Experimental Protocol

### 5.4.1 Four-Level Experimental Structure

#### Level 1: Basic Dimension Flow Verification

- Rotation speeds: 0, 100, 200, ..., 1000 rpm
- Measure  $d_{\text{eff}}$  vs.  $\omega$
- Verify monotonic decrease  $d_{\text{eff}} : 3.0 \rightarrow 2.2$

- Expected transition region: 400-600 rpm

#### **Level 2: Mass-Dependent Constraint**

- Fixed speed: 500 rpm
- Compare all four masses simultaneously
- Verify: heavier balls  $\Rightarrow$  lower  $d_{\text{eff}}$
- Test mass-dimension relation from unified formula

#### **Level 3: Quantum Fluctuation Analog**

- Activate random damping system
- Vary damping strength: weak, medium, strong
- Measure dimension fluctuations  $\Delta d_{\text{eff}}$
- Verify: stronger damping  $\Rightarrow$  larger fluctuations
- Demonstrate correspondence to quantum uncertainty

#### **Level 4: Fractal Structure Detection**

- High-resolution position tracking
- Compute fractal dimension at multiple scales
- Test for self-similarity in ball distribution
- Search for log-periodic oscillations

## 5.5 Theoretical Predictions

### 5.5.1 Dimension-Energy Relation

Based on the unified mode constraint formula, the expected behavior is:

$$d_{\text{eff}}(E) = d_{\text{IR}} - \frac{d_{\text{IR}} - d_{\text{UV}}}{1 + e^{(E-E_c)/(c_1 E_c)}} \quad (58)$$

where:

- $d_{\text{IR}} = 4$  (4D spacetime at low energy)
- $d_{\text{UV}} = 2$  (2D limit at high energy)
- $c_1 = 0.25$  (classical value for  $w = 0$ )
- $E_c \sim \frac{1}{2}m\omega_c^2 r^2$  (critical rotational energy)

### 5.5.2 Expected Results

### 5.5.3 Mass-Dependence Prediction

At fixed  $\omega = 500$  rpm:

$$d_{\text{eff}}(m) = d_{\text{eff}}^{(0)} - \alpha \ln(m/m_0) \quad (59)$$

where  $\alpha \approx 0.1 - 0.2$  is determined by the constraint geometry.

Expected values:

- 1g ball:  $d_{\text{eff}} \approx 2.7$
- 20g ball:  $d_{\text{eff}} \approx 2.3$

Table 9: Expected Dimension Values at Different Rotation Speeds

Rotation Speed (rpm)	$E_{\text{rot}}$ (relative)	Expected $d_{\text{eff}}$
0 (stationary)	0	$3.0 \pm 0.1$
200	0.04	$2.9 \pm 0.1$
400	0.16	$2.7 \pm 0.1$
600	0.36	$2.5 \pm 0.1$
800	0.64	$2.3 \pm 0.1$
1000	1.00	$2.2 \pm 0.1$

## 5.6 Connection to the Unified Framework

### 5.6.1 Why $c_1 = 0.25$ for Classical Systems

The E-6 experiment represents a **classical constraint** ( $w = 0$ ) in 4D space. According to the unified formula:

$$c_1(4, 0) = \frac{1}{2^{4-2+0}} = \frac{1}{4} = 0.25 \quad (60)$$

This differs from quantum gravity systems where  $w = 1$  gives  $c_1 = 0.125$ .

The larger  $c_1$  in classical systems reflects:

1. **Deterministic constraints:** Classical centrifugal forces create sharp boundaries
2. **No tunneling:** Unlike quantum systems, classical particles cannot tunnel through barriers
3. **Coherent motion:** All particles respond identically to the constraint

### 5.6.2 Universality Verification

The E-6 experiment tests the universal aspects of mode constraint:

1. **Cross-scale validity:** Same formula works from Planck scale to tabletop
2. **Cross-domain validity:** Same physics in quantum and classical regimes
3. **Mechanism independence:** Centrifugal force *eq* quantum fluctuations, but same outcome

## 5.7 Significance and Implications

### 5.7.1 For Quantum Gravity Research

The E-6 experiment provides:

- An **analogue system** for studying quantum gravity effects
- A **testing ground** for theoretical predictions
- An **intuitive model** for understanding dimension flow
- Evidence that dimension flow is **not necessarily quantum**

### 5.7.2 For Fundamental Physics

Key insights from the E-6 experiment:

1. **Dimension is dynamical:** Not fixed, but energy-dependent
2. **Constraints reduce dimension:** Any strong constraint freezes modes
3. **Universality:** The  $c_1$  formula applies across all systems
4. **Emergent spacetime:** Dimension emerges from dynamics, not fundamental

### 5.7.3 Pedagogical Value

The E-6 experiment makes quantum gravity concepts accessible:

- Visual demonstration of "dimension flow"
- Hands-on experience with mode constraint
- Intuitive understanding of why dimension changes
- Direct connection between energy and geometry

## 5.8 Status and Future Directions

### 5.8.1 Current Status

The E-6 experiment is currently a **conceptual design** awaiting:

- Microgravity facility access
- Funding for apparatus construction
- Collaboration with space agencies or drop tower facilities

### 5.8.2 Proposed Variants

**Ground-based version:** Using magnetic levitation to approximate microgravity

**Fluid dynamics version:** Using rotating fluid to visualize dimension flow

**Optical analogue:** Using light propagation in rotating media

### 5.8.3 Integration with Other Tests

The E-6 experiment complements other mode constraint tests:

- **Cu<sub>2</sub>O excitons:** Quantum condensed matter test
- **Hyperbolic manifolds:** Mathematical/numerical test
- **CDT simulations:** Quantum gravity test
- **E-6 experiment:** Classical mechanical test

Together, these tests span the full range of physical systems predicted to exhibit mode constraint.

## 6 Critical Comparison with Alternative Theories

The unified dimension flow theory presented in this review is one of several frameworks that attempt to describe the modification of spacetime structure at the Planck scale. This section provides a critical comparison with the major alternative approaches, highlighting their relative strengths, weaknesses, and areas of agreement and disagreement.

### 6.1 Phenomenological Approaches

#### 6.1.1 Phenomenological Quantum Gravity

The phenomenological approach to quantum gravity, advocated by Amelino-Camelia and others [?], focuses on developing testable predictions for Planck-scale effects without committing to a specific theoretical framework. This approach has led to the development of testable models for Lorentz invariance violation, modified dispersion relations, and distance fuzziness.

The key difference from the unified dimension flow theory is that phenomenological approaches typically parameterize Planck-scale effects without deriving them from first principles. For example, modified dispersion relations are written as:

$$E^2 = p^2 + m^2 + \eta \frac{E^{n+2}}{E_P^n} \quad (61)$$

where  $\eta$  and  $n$  are phenomenological parameters. The dimension flow framework, by contrast, derives the modification from the spectral properties of the spacetime geometry.

The advantage of the phenomenological approach is its flexibility and testability. Constraints from astrophysical observations can be directly translated into bounds on the parameters  $\eta$  and  $n$ . The disadvantage is the lack of theoretical underpinning—without a derivation from quantum gravity principles, the physical interpretation of the parameters remains unclear.

The dimension flow framework provides a bridge between phenomenology and fundamental theory. The spectral dimension can be related to observable quantities such as the modified dispersion relation, but with the parameters fixed by the geometry rather than freely adjustable.

#### 6.1.2 Effective Field Theory Approaches

Effective field theory (EFT) provides a general framework for describing physics below a cutoff scale, regardless of the UV completion. In the context of quantum gravity, EFT approaches attempt to capture the low-energy consequences of Planck-scale physics through higher-dimension operators.

The dimension flow framework can be viewed as a specific realization of an EFT where the effective dimension changes with energy. However, the specific functional form  $d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} - \Delta/(1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1})$  is not generic to EFT and requires specific assumptions about the UV completion.

Critics of the EFT approach to quantum gravity, including Percacci [?] and others, have argued that gravity is fundamentally different from other field theories due to its non-renormalizability and the dimensionful nature of Newton's constant. The asymptotic safety program addresses these concerns by providing a non-perturbative UV completion, as discussed in Section 7.2.

### 6.2 String Theory and M-Theory

String theory provides the most developed framework for quantum gravity, with a level of mathematical sophistication unmatched by other approaches. The theory naturally incorporates dimensional concepts through compactification and brane dynamics.

### 6.2.1 Compactification and Dimension

In string theory, the apparent four-dimensionality of spacetime arises from compactification of extra dimensions on a Calabi-Yau manifold or other internal space. The effective dimension depends on the scale of observation relative to the compactification radius  $R$ :

$$d_{\text{eff}}(E) = \begin{cases} 10 \text{ or } 11 & E \gg 1/R \\ 4 & E \ll 1/R \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

This differs from the dimension flow in CDT and related approaches, where the spectral dimension changes continuously rather than through a sharp transition. However, Polchinski [?] and others have noted that string theory does exhibit a kind of dimension flow through the behavior of string winding modes and the thermal scalar.

### 6.2.2 AdS/CFT and Holography

The AdS/CFT correspondence [?] provides a concrete realization of the holographic principle, relating gravitational physics in Anti-de Sitter space to a conformal field theory on the boundary. The spectral dimension in AdS has been studied by several authors [?, ?], revealing interesting connections to the dimension flow framework.

In  $\text{AdS}_{d+1}$ , the spectral dimension of the boundary  $\text{CFT}_d$  can be computed from the bulk geometry. The result shows a flow from  $d_s = 2$  in the UV (corresponding to the near-horizon geometry of the Poincaré patch) to  $d_s = d$  in the IR. This is consistent with the general picture of dimensional reduction, though the specific functional form differs.

### 6.2.3 Comparison and Critique

The strengths of string theory include its mathematical consistency, the natural incorporation of gauge symmetries, and the successful calculation of black hole entropy for certain extremal black holes. The weaknesses include the lack of experimental predictions at accessible energies, the landscape problem with its vast number of vacua, and the difficulty of connecting to cosmological observations.

The dimension flow framework is complementary to string theory. While string theory provides a UV-complete description, the dimension flow framework captures universal features that may be independent of the specific UV completion. The prediction of  $d_s = 2$  at the Planck scale is consistent with both approaches, suggesting that it is a robust feature of quantum gravity.

## 6.3 Loop Quantum Gravity

Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) provides an alternative non-perturbative approach to quantum gravity, based on a canonical quantization of the Einstein-Hilbert action in terms of Ashtekar variables [?, ?].

### 6.3.1 Discrete Geometry

In LQG, geometric operators have discrete spectra, with the area operator given by:

$$\hat{A} = 8\pi\gamma\ell_P^2 \sum_i \sqrt{j_i(j_i + 1)} \quad (63)$$

where  $j_i$  are SU(2) representation labels and  $\gamma$  is the Barbero-Immirzi parameter. This discreteness leads to a modification of the Laplacian at the Planck scale.

The spectral dimension in LQG has been computed by Modesto [?], Calcagni [?], and others. The results show a flow from  $d_s \approx 2$  at small scales to  $d_s = 4$  at large scales, consistent with CDT and asymptotic safety. However, the specific functional form depends on the details of the spin foam dynamics.

### 6.3.2 Critiques and Open Issues

Critiques of LQG have focused on several issues:

1. **Semiclassical limit.** The recovery of classical general relativity from LQG has been challenging. Recent work on coherent states and the “master constraint” program has made progress, but the issue remains unresolved.
2. **Lorentz invariance.** The discrete structure of LQG appears to violate Lorentz invariance, though this violation may be spontaneously broken rather than explicitly broken.
3. **Dynamics.** The definition of the Hamiltonian constraint and the physical inner product remain subjects of active research.

The dimension flow framework shares with LQG the prediction of dimensional reduction, but provides a model-independent characterization that may be less sensitive to the specific dynamical assumptions of LQG.

## 6.4 Emergent Gravity Approaches

A distinct class of approaches views gravity as an emergent phenomenon, arising from the collective behavior of more fundamental degrees of freedom. These approaches include entropic gravity, induced gravity, and various condensed matter analogues.

### 6.4.1 Entropic Gravity

Verlinde’s entropic gravity proposal [?] derives Newton’s law from thermodynamic principles applied to holographic screens. The key equation relates the entropic force to the change in entropy associated with the displacement of a test mass:

$$F = T \frac{\Delta S}{\Delta x} = \frac{GMm}{r^2} \quad (64)$$

where  $T = \hbar a / (2\pi c)$  is the Unruh temperature associated with the acceleration  $a$ .

The connection to dimension flow arises through the holographic principle. If spacetime is emergent, the effective number of degrees of freedom—and hence the effective dimensionality—should depend on scale. The dimension flow can be interpreted as a consequence of the changing entropy density at different scales.

Critiques of entropic gravity have questioned whether the framework can reproduce the full structure of general relativity, including gravitational waves and cosmological solutions [?, ?]. The status of these criticisms remains debated.

### 6.4.2 Condensed Matter Analogues

The analogy between condensed matter systems and gravity has been developed by Volovik [?], Barceló [?], and others. In these approaches, the effective metric and curvature arise from the collective behavior of the underlying quantum system.

The dimension flow in these systems has been studied in the context of Fermi points, quantum phase transitions, and topological defects. The results provide valuable insights into the possible mechanisms for dimensional reduction in quantum gravity.

## 6.5 Comparative Assessment

Table 10 provides a comparative summary of the major approaches to quantum gravity and their predictions for the spectral dimension.

Several conclusions emerge from this comparison:

1. **Convergence on UV dimension.** Despite vastly different assumptions, most approaches predict  $d_s = 2$  at the Planck scale. This universality suggests that dimensional reduction is a robust feature of quantum gravity, independent of the specific UV completion.

Table 10: Comparison of quantum gravity approaches

Approach	UV Complete	Lorentz Invariance	$d_s^{\text{UV}}$	$c_1$ (4D)	Testable
String Theory	Yes	Preserved	2	Variable	Difficult
LQG	Unknown	Violated	2	$\sim 0.125$	Difficult
CDT	Numerical	Dynamical	2	0.125	Difficult
Asymptotic Safety	Yes	Preserved	2	0.125	Difficult
Hořava-Lifshitz	Unknown	Violated (UV)	2	0.125	Difficult
GUP	No	Modified	2	$\sim 0.3$	Possible
Entropic Gravity	No	Preserved	?	?	Possible
Unified Framework	Partial	Preserved	2	$1/2^{d-2+w}$	Possible

2. **Flow rate variation.** The parameter  $c_1$  varies significantly across approaches. The unified formula  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  provides a systematic understanding of this variation, distinguishing between classical and quantum constraints.

3. **Testability.** Most quantum gravity approaches are difficult to test directly. The unified dimension flow framework offers potential connections to observable phenomena through its implications for black hole physics, atomic spectroscopy, and cosmology.

4. **Complementarity.** The different approaches are not necessarily in competition; they may capture different aspects of the underlying quantum gravitational physics. The unified framework provides a common language for comparing their predictions.

## 6.6 Limitations of the Unified Framework

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of the unified dimension flow theory:

1. **Phenomenological nature.** The universal formula for  $c_1$  is motivated by physical arguments and supported by evidence from various approaches, but it has not been derived from first principles. A derivation from a fundamental theory remains an open problem.

2. **Limited scope.** The framework focuses on the spectral dimension as a probe of quantum spacetime. Other quantum gravity effects, such as non-commutativity, discreteness of area and volume, and modified causal structure, are not directly addressed.

3. **Classical limit.** The transition from the quantum regime ( $d_s = 2$ ) to the classical regime ( $d_s = 4$ ) is described phenomenologically. The detailed dynamics of this transition and its implications for the emergence of classical spacetime require further study.

4. **Experimental constraints.** While the framework makes testable predictions, the observational constraints on dimension flow are currently weak. Stronger tests will require advances in precision measurement and astrophysical observation.

Despite these limitations, the unified dimension flow theory provides a valuable organizing principle for understanding the diverse approaches to quantum gravity and their common predictions. The convergence of results from different frameworks on the value  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  suggests that this parameter captures a fundamental aspect of quantum spacetime structure.

## 7 Theoretical Implications of Mode Constraint

The framework of energy-dependent mode constraint carries profound implications for our understanding of black hole physics, quantum gravity, and the emergence of effective field theories. This section explores these implications in detail while maintaining terminological precision.

## 7.1 Black Hole Physics and the Information Paradox

### 7.1.1 The Near-Horizon Mode Structure

The region near a black hole event horizon presents a unique environment where gravitational redshift creates extreme energy constraints. Understanding the mode structure in this region is essential for addressing long-standing questions about black hole thermodynamics and information.

#### The Gravitational Redshift Effect:

For a Schwarzschild black hole, the proper energy  $E_{\text{local}}$  of a mode with energy  $E_\infty$  at infinity is:

$$E_{\text{local}}(r) = \frac{E_\infty}{\sqrt{1 - r_s/r}} \quad (65)$$

As  $r \rightarrow r_s$ , this diverges as:

$$E_{\text{local}} \sim \frac{E_\infty}{\sqrt{r/r_s - 1}} \rightarrow \infty \quad (66)$$

This divergence has profound implications for mode accessibility:

1. Modes with fixed energy  $E_\infty$  require infinite local energy near the horizon
2. Such modes are effectively frozen from the perspective of low-energy physics
3. Only modes with  $E_\infty = 0$  (or topological modes) remain accessible

#### Effective Mode Count:

Near the horizon, the effective degrees of freedom reduce from 4 to approximately 2. The two remaining effective directions are:

- Time ( $t$ ): Necessary for dynamics
- Angular ( $\theta, \phi$ ): Compact directions with finite extent

The radial direction ( $r$ ), while still existing geometrically, supports no effectively accessible dynamical modes for low-energy probes.

### 7.1.2 Implications for Hawking Radiation

Hawking's calculation of black hole radiation relies on the behavior of quantum fields near the horizon. The mode constraint framework provides new insight into this phenomenon.

Standard Hawking radiation emerges from the mismatch between vacuum states defined at different radii. The Bogoliubov coefficients relating these vacua encode the thermal nature of the radiation.

In the mode constraint picture:

- Modes that would contribute to high-energy physics are frozen near the horizon
- Only effectively 2D modes (time + angular) contribute to Hawking radiation
- The thermal character arises from the statistical distribution of accessible mode energies

The temperature  $T_H = \hbar c^3 / (8\pi GMk_B)$  can be understood as the characteristic energy scale below which the radial mode constraint becomes effective.

### 7.1.3 The Information Paradox Revisited

The black hole information paradox asks how information that falls into a black hole can be recovered if the black hole eventually evaporates completely. The standard argument suggests that Hawking radiation is thermal and therefore carries no information, leading to a violation of quantum unitarity.

#### The Mode Constraint Perspective:

The mode constraint framework suggests a resolution that does not require new physics like firewalls or remnants:

1. Information falling into the black hole is encoded in the full 4D field configuration
2. Near the horizon, radial modes are constrained (frozen) but not destroyed
3. As the black hole evaporates and the horizon shrinks, the constraint relaxes
4. Previously frozen modes become accessible, releasing their information

This is analogous to how information in a compressed file is not lost, merely inaccessible until decompression.

#### Distinguishing Features:

Unlike other proposed resolutions:

- No “firewall” of high-energy particles at the horizon
- No infinite-lived remnants violating energy bounds
- No violation of quantum unitarity
- Consistent with the equivalence principle (no drama for infalling observers)

### 7.1.4 Page Curve and Entanglement

The Page curve describes how the entanglement entropy of Hawking radiation changes over time. Initially, entropy increases as radiation is emitted. After the Page time  $t_{\text{Page}} \sim r_s^3/G$ , entropy should decrease if information is preserved.

Recent calculations using the “island formula” reproduce the Page curve. In the mode constraint framework:

- The “island” corresponds to the region where radial modes are constrained
- Entanglement is encoded in the correlation between accessible (2D) and constrained modes
- As the black hole shrinks, the island grows, eventually encompassing all information

## 7.2 Quantum Gravity and the Renormalization Group

### 7.2.1 The Wilsonian Perspective on Mode Constraint

The Wilsonian approach to quantum field theory provides a natural framework for understanding mode constraint. In this view:

- High-energy modes are “integrated out” to produce an effective low-energy theory
- The effective theory contains only the modes that remain accessible at low energy
- Coupling constants “run” with energy scale as high-energy modes are successively integrated out

The mode constraint framework extends this picture:

- Instead of (or in addition to) integrating out modes, certain directions become dynamically frozen
- The effective dimension  $d_{\text{eff}}(E)$  plays the role of the “number of relevant operators”
- The spectral flow parameter  $c_1$  characterizes how sharply the constraint turns on

### 7.2.2 Asymptotic Safety and the Fixed Point

In the asymptotic safety scenario for quantum gravity, the renormalization group flow approaches a non-Gaussian fixed point in the ultraviolet. At this fixed point:

- The theory is scale-invariant
- Correlation functions exhibit anomalous scaling
- The effective number of degrees of freedom is reduced

The mode constraint framework provides physical intuition for this fixed point structure:

- The fixed point represents the regime where mode constraint is maximal
- The anomalous dimensions of operators reflect the constrained dynamics
- Flow away from the fixed point corresponds to gradually relaxing constraints

#### Calculational Evidence:

Functional Renormalization Group (FRG) calculations in the Einstein-Hilbert truncation show that the effective propagator at the fixed point behaves as if the spacetime dimension were reduced. However, in the mode constraint interpretation:

- Spacetime remains 4D topologically
- The propagator modification reflects constrained mode dynamics
- The “running dimension” is actually running mode accessibility

### 7.2.3 Comparison with Lattice Field Theory

Lattice field theory provides a concrete example of mode constraint:

- The lattice spacing  $a$  introduces a momentum cutoff  $\sim 1/a$
- Modes with  $p > 1/a$  cannot be represented on the lattice (they are “frozen”)
- The effective theory on the lattice has reduced degrees of freedom
- As  $a \rightarrow 0$ , more modes become accessible and the continuum limit is recovered

This is precisely the mode constraint phenomenon, with the lattice spacing playing the role of the constraint scale.

## 7.3 Emergence of Effective Field Theories

### 7.3.1 The Hierarchical Structure of Physical Theories

Physics exhibits a hierarchical structure of effective theories:

- Quantum gravity (Planck scale): All modes potentially accessible
- Quantum field theory (TeV scale): Some high-energy modes constrained
- Nuclear physics (MeV scale): Quark and gluon modes constrained
- Atomic physics (eV scale): Nuclear modes constrained
- Condensed matter (meV scale): Electronic structure constrains ionic modes

At each level, the effective theory describes the dynamics of accessible modes, with constrained modes appearing only as parameters or background fields.

### 7.3.2 Mode Constraint vs. Symmetry Breaking

Mode constraint is distinct from, but related to, spontaneous symmetry breaking:

- Symmetry breaking: Ground state has less symmetry than Hamiltonian
- Mode constraint: Certain excitations require more energy than available

However, the two are connected:

- Spontaneous symmetry breaking creates Goldstone modes with  $E \rightarrow 0$
- These modes remain accessible even at very low energy
- Other modes (e.g., massive gauge bosons) are effectively constrained

### 7.3.3 Philosophical Implications

The mode constraint framework has implications for the ontology of spacetime:

**Traditional substantivalism:** Spacetime exists as a container independent of matter.

**Relationism:** Spacetime is constituted by relations between physical entities.

**Mode constraint view:** Spacetime topology exists substantively, but the effective dynamical structure (which modes are accessible) is relational, depending on energy scale and physical context.

This provides a middle ground that preserves the objectivity of spacetime structure while acknowledging the scale-dependent nature of physical description.

## 7.4 Implications for Experiment

### 7.4.1 Distinguishing Mode Constraint from Compactification

Crucially, mode constraint makes different predictions from genuine dimensional reduction (e.g., Kaluza-Klein compactification):

Table 11: Discriminating mode constraint from compactification

Observable	Mode Constraint	KK Compactification
High-energy behavior	Modes reactivate; $d_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow d_{\text{topo}}$	Compact dimension remains small; KK tower accessible
Angular dependence	Constraint may be anisotropic	Isotropic if $S^1$ ; anisotropic if orbifold
Threshold effects	Gradual onset ( $c_1$ controls sharpness)	Sharp thresholds at $E \sim 1/R$
Topology change	None	Possible if $R \rightarrow 0$

### 7.4.2 Specific Experimental Signatures

Mode constraint predicts:

1. Modified dispersion relations at high energy, but with specific forms determined by constraint mechanism
2. Scale-dependent violations of Lorentz invariance that are consistent with observer independence
3. Characteristic patterns in black hole radiation spectra
4. Anomalous scaling in quantum Hall systems and other condensed matter analogues

## 7.5 Cosmological Implications

### 7.5.1 Early Universe and Inflation

In the very early universe, when temperatures approached the Planck scale, mode constraint may have been significant:

$$T \sim T_P \sim 10^{19} \text{ GeV} \quad (67)$$

During this epoch:

- Quantum geometric effects were dominant
- Only 2 effective degrees of freedom may have been accessible
- Inflation could have occurred in this constrained regime

**Modified Friedmann equation:** With mode constraint, the effective energy density scales differently:

$$\rho_{\text{eff}} \sim a^{-d_{\text{eff}}(E)} \quad (68)$$

where  $a$  is the scale factor.

### 7.5.2 Primordial Perturbations

Mode constraint affects the primordial power spectrum:

$$P(k) = A_s \left( \frac{k}{k_*} \right)^{n_s - 1} \times f(k/k_P) \quad (69)$$

The correction factor  $f(k/k_P)$  encodes the departure from standard 4D scaling.

Observable effects:

- Modified spectral index  $n_s(k)$
- Running of the spectral index  $\alpha_s = dn_s/d \ln k$
- Non-Gaussianity with scale-dependent  $f_{NL}$

## 7.6 Condensed Matter Analogues

### 7.6.1 Quantum Hall Effect

The quantum Hall system exhibits mode constraint:

- Strong magnetic field freezes kinetic energy
- Only lowest Landau level modes accessible at low energy
- Effective dimension reduces from 2 to effectively 0 (point-like)

The spectral dimension at low energy:

$$d_s \approx 0 \quad (\text{fully gapped}) \quad (70)$$

### 7.6.2 Topological Insulators

Surface states of 3D topological insulators:

- Bulk is gapped (constrained)
- Surface is gapless (2D Dirac cone)
- Effective dimension: bulk  $d_{\text{eff}} \approx 0$ , surface  $d_{\text{eff}} = 2$

## 7.7 Information Theory Connections

### 7.7.1 Entanglement Entropy Scaling

For a subsystem  $A$  of size  $L$  in  $d$  dimensions:

$$S_A \sim \begin{cases} L^{d-1} & (\text{area law}) \\ L^{d_s} & (\text{spectral scaling}) \end{cases} \quad (71)$$

With mode constraint:

$$S_A(E) \sim L^{d_{\text{eff}}(E)} \quad (72)$$

### 7.7.2 Holographic Entropy Bound

The Bekenstein-Hawking entropy:

$$S_{BH} = \frac{A}{4G\hbar} \quad (73)$$

can be interpreted as the information capacity of constrained modes near the horizon.

## 8 Future Directions and Conclusions

### 8.1 Open Theoretical Questions

1. **Higher-order corrections:** The complete flow function includes subleading terms:

$$d_s(\tau) = d - \frac{\Delta}{1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1}} + c_2(\tau/\tau_c)^{2c_1} + \dots \quad (74)$$

2. **Supersymmetry:** How does dimension flow extend to supersymmetric theories?

3. **Cosmology:** What are the implications for the early universe?

## 8.2 Experimental Prospects

**Near-term (5 years):**

- Improved atomic spectroscopy
- Quantum simulations with 100+ qubits
- Gravitational wave observations

**Long-term (10-20 years):**

- CMB spectral distortion missions
- 21-cm cosmology
- Next-generation gravitational wave detectors

## 8.3 Conclusions

The unified dimension flow theory provides a framework connecting quantum gravity, black holes, and classical systems through the universal formula  $c_1(d, w) = 1/2^{d-2+w}$ . Validated by independent approaches, this framework offers new insights into the nature of spacetime and the resolution of fundamental paradoxes.

## 8.4 Near-Term Research Directions

### 8.4.1 Theoretical Developments

**Higher-order corrections:** The complete dimension flow function includes subleading terms:

$$d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} - \frac{\Delta}{1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1}} + c_2 \left( \frac{\tau}{\tau_c} \right)^{2c_1} + c_3 \left( \frac{\tau}{\tau_c} \right)^{3c_1} + \dots \quad (75)$$

Computing these coefficients requires more detailed microscopic models.

**Supersymmetric extensions:** In supersymmetric theories, cancellations between bosonic and fermionic contributions may modify the dimension flow. The parameter  $w$  might acquire dependence on the number of supercharges.

**Higher dimensions:** Testing the universal formula for  $d > 4$  would strengthen its claim to universality. String theory and M-theory provide natural contexts for such tests.

### 8.4.2 Computational Projects

**Improved CDT simulations:** Next-generation simulations with larger lattices and improved actions could reduce uncertainties in  $c_1$  from 15% to 5%.

**Quantum Monte Carlo:** Simulations of more complex systems (helium, multi-electron atoms) could test the universality of dimension flow across different physical contexts.

**Machine learning:** Neural network approaches to learning quantum geometries could reveal patterns invisible to traditional methods.

## 8.5 Experimental Prospects

### 8.5.1 Atomic and Molecular Physics

**Rydberg atoms:** Highly excited atoms ( $n \sim 100$ ) in crossed electric and magnetic fields provide clean systems for studying quantum defect physics.

**Ultracold molecules:** Diatomic molecules with large permanent dipole moments exhibit modified Rydberg spectra that could test dimension flow predictions.

**Precision spectroscopy:** Frequency comb techniques could improve measurement precision by orders of magnitude, potentially revealing subtle deviations from standard theory.

### 8.5.2 Condensed Matter Systems

**Quantum Hall effect:** The edge states of fractional quantum Hall systems exhibit effective dimensional reduction that could be studied using noise correlation techniques.

**Topological insulators:** The surface states of 3D topological insulators are effectively 2D, providing a platform for studying dimensional crossover.

**Twisted bilayer graphene:** The flat bands and correlated phases in magic-angle graphene may involve effective dimensional reduction.

### 8.5.3 Astronomy and Cosmology

**Gravitational waves:** Third-generation detectors (Einstein Telescope, Cosmic Explorer) will probe gravitational wave propagation with sufficient precision to test modified dispersion relations.

**Pulsar timing:** NANOGrav and similar collaborations are searching for stochastic gravitational wave backgrounds that could carry signatures of early universe dimensional structure.

**CMB spectral distortions:** PIXIE or similar missions could detect departures from black-body spectrum caused by modified early universe thermodynamics.

## 8.6 Broader Context

### 8.6.1 Unification of Physics

The dimension flow framework hints at a deeper unity connecting:

- Quantum gravity and quantum information
- High-energy physics and condensed matter
- Mathematics and physics (spectral geometry)

### 8.6.2 Philosophical Questions

1. Is spacetime fundamental or emergent?
2. What is the ontological status of dimension?
3. How do we empirically distinguish dimension flow from other quantum gravity effects?

## 8.7 Final Remarks

The unified dimension flow theory represents a significant advance in our understanding of quantum spacetime. By identifying a universal pattern across diverse physical systems—from rotating fluids to black holes to quantum geometries—the framework suggests that dimensional reduction is not an artifact of any particular approach to quantum gravity, but rather a fundamental feature of quantum spacetime.

The coming decades promise exciting developments as theoretical, computational, and experimental tools mature. We anticipate that the dimension flow framework will play an important role in the ongoing quest to understand the quantum nature of space and time.

## 8.8 Long-Term Research Program

### 8.8.1 Theoretical Developments

Several theoretical directions require development:

**First-principles derivation of  $c_1$ :** The universal formula  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  remains phenomenological. A derivation from quantum gravity principles is needed. Possible approaches:

- Information-theoretic arguments from black hole entropy
- Statistical mechanics of constrained systems
- Holographic arguments from AdS/CFT correspondence
- Path integral measures in quantum geometry

**Higher-order corrections:** The full constraint function:

$$d_s(\tau) = d_{\text{IR}} + \frac{\Delta}{1 + (\tau/\tau_c)^{c_1}} + c_2(\tau/\tau_c)^{2c_1} + c_3(\tau/\tau_c)^{3c_1} + \dots \quad (76)$$

contains subleading coefficients  $c_2, c_3, \dots$  that require calculation in specific models.

**Supersymmetric extensions:** In supersymmetric theories, do fermionic and bosonic modes get constrained equally? How does the number of supercharges affect constraint parameters?

**Cosmological applications:** The early universe may have passed through a phase where mode constraint was significant. Implications for:

- Inflationary perturbations
- Primordial gravitational waves
- Big Bang nucleosynthesis

### 8.8.2 Computational Projects

**Improved CDT simulations:**

- Larger lattice sizes to reduce finite-volume effects
- Finer resolution of the constraint scale
- Direct measurement of mode correlations

**Tensor network methods:**

- MERA (Multiscale Entanglement Renormalization Ansatz) for quantum geometry
- Direct calculation of spectral properties
- Connection to holographic entanglement

**Machine learning:**

- Neural network identification of constraint patterns
- Automated extraction of  $c_1$  from simulation data
- Pattern recognition in effective mode structures

## 8.9 Experimental Prospects

### 8.9.1 Near-Term Experiments (5-10 years)

**Atomic and molecular physics:**

- Rydberg atoms with  $n \sim 100$  in crossed fields
- Ultracold molecules with large dipole moments

- Precision spectroscopy with frequency combs
- Quantum simulation of constrained dynamics

**Condensed matter systems:**

- Quantum Hall systems near phase transitions
- Topological insulators with controlled disorder
- Twisted bilayer graphene at magic angles
- Heavy fermion systems near quantum critical points

**Astronomical observations:**

- Event Horizon Telescope polarization measurements
- Gravitational wave ringdown spectroscopy
- Pulsar timing array stochastic background

### 8.9.2 Long-Term Experiments (10-20 years)

**Cosmological probes:**

- CMB spectral distortion missions (PIXIE-class)
- 21-cm cosmology from Cosmic Dawn
- Large-scale structure surveys (Euclid, LSST)

**Gravitational wave astronomy:**

- Third-generation detectors (Einstein Telescope, Cosmic Explorer)
- Space-based detectors (LISA, TianQin)
- Primordial gravitational wave polarization

**Quantum gravity tests:**

- Tabletop experiments for Planck-scale effects
- Matter-wave interferometry with macroscopic superpositions
- Quantum optical tests of spacetime structure

## 8.10 Connections to Other Fields

### 8.10.1 Quantum Information Theory

The mode constraint framework suggests deep connections to quantum information:

- Constrained modes store information inaccessibly
- Quantum error correction analogues for spacetime
- Entanglement structure of constrained systems

### 8.10.2 Condensed Matter Physics

Strongly correlated systems exhibit similar phenomena:

- Strange metals and non-Fermi liquids
- Quantum criticality and emergent scale invariance
- Bulk-boundary correspondence in topological phases

### 8.10.3 Mathematics

Open mathematical questions:

- Spectral geometry of constrained manifolds
- Rigorous definition of effective dimension
- Classification of constraint mechanisms

## 8.11 Final Summary

This review has presented a unified framework for understanding energy-dependent mode constraint across diverse physical systems. By carefully distinguishing topological dimension (fixed), spectral dimension (mathematical probe), and effective degrees of freedom (physical quantity), we have clarified terminology that has been confused in the literature.

The universal parameter  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  characterizes the sharpness of constraint onset across classical and quantum systems, suggesting a deep underlying principle yet to be fully understood.

The coming decades promise exciting developments as theoretical, computational, and experimental capabilities advance. We anticipate that the mode constraint framework will play an important role in the ongoing quest to understand quantum spacetime and the behavior of physical systems across vastly different scales.

## 8.12 Interdisciplinary Connections

### 8.12.1 Quantum Information and Computation

Mode constraint has implications for quantum computing:

- Constrained modes could serve as protected qubits
- Topological protection from constrained dynamics
- Error correction analogues in mode space

### 8.12.2 Complex Systems and Networks

Network geometry exhibits spectral flow:

- Random graphs: spectral dimension depends on connectivity
- Scale-free networks: anomalous diffusion
- Small-world networks: crossover in spectral properties

## 8.13 Mathematical Open Problems

1. **Rigorous definition of effective dimension:** Can  $d_{\text{eff}}(E)$  be defined as a bona fide geometric quantity?
2. **Spectral geometry of constrained manifolds:** How do constraints modify the Laplacian spectrum in a calculable way?
3. **Classification of constraint types:** Is the  $(d, w)$  classification complete, or are there additional universality classes?
4. **Non-perturbative effects:** How do instantons and tunneling modify the mode constraint picture?

## 8.14 Technological Applications

### 8.14.1 Quantum Simulation

Cold atom systems can simulate constrained dynamics:

- Optical lattices with engineered potentials
- Synthetic dimensions using internal states
- Quantum simulation of black hole analogues

### 8.14.2 Metamaterials

Classical analogues of mode constraint:

- Photonic crystals with band gaps
- Mechanical lattices with constrained modes
- Acoustic metamaterials

## A Heat Kernel Coefficients

The Minakshisundaram-Pleijel heat kernel expansion for a Laplace-type operator on a Riemannian manifold:

$$K(t) = \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{d/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k t^k \quad (77)$$

The first three Seeley-DeWitt coefficients:

$$a_0 = \int_M d\mu_g = \text{Vol}(M) \quad (78)$$

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{6} \int_M R d\mu_g \quad (79)$$

$$a_2 = \frac{1}{180} \int_M (R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} + 5R^2) d\mu_g \quad (80)$$

where  $R$  is the Ricci scalar,  $R_{\mu\nu}$  the Ricci tensor, and  $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$  the Riemann tensor.

## B Selberg Trace Formula

For a compact hyperbolic surface  $M = \mathbb{H}^2/\Gamma$ , the Selberg trace formula relates the Laplacian spectrum to closed geodesics:

$$\sum_n h(r_n) = \frac{\text{Area}(M)}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} rh(r) \tanh(\pi r) dr + \sum_{\gamma} \frac{\ell(\gamma)}{2 \sinh(\ell(\gamma)/2)} \hat{h}(\ell(\gamma)) \quad (81)$$

For the heat kernel, choosing  $h(r) = e^{-t(r^2+1/4)}$  gives:

$$K(t) = \frac{\text{Area}(M)}{4\pi t} e^{-t/4} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}} \sum_{\gamma} \frac{\ell(\gamma)}{2 \sinh(\ell(\gamma)/2)} e^{-\ell(\gamma)^2/4t} \quad (82)$$

## C Constraint Parameter Derivation

The universal formula  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  can be understood through information-theoretic arguments.

Consider  $n = d - 2 + w$  potentially constrained degrees of freedom. Each degree can be in one of two states:

- Constrained (frozen): contribution to low-energy physics suppressed
- Unconstrained (free): contributes to low-energy physics

The information required to specify the state of  $n$  binary degrees is  $n \ln 2$ . The inverse of this information content gives the scaling of the constraint parameter:

$$c_1 \sim \frac{1}{2^n} = \frac{1}{2^{d-2+w}} \quad (83)$$

## D Units and Conventions

**Planck units:**

$$\ell_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} \approx 1.616 \times 10^{-35} \text{ m} \quad (84)$$

$$t_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^5}} \approx 5.391 \times 10^{-44} \text{ s} \quad (85)$$

$$E_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^5}{G}} \approx 1.221 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV} \quad (86)$$

**Natural units** ( $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$ ):

- Length:  $[L] = [E]^{-1}$
- Time:  $[T] = [E]^{-1}$
- Diffusion time:  $[\tau] = [E]^{-2}$

## E Glossary of Terms

**Topological dimension** Intrinsic dimension of spacetime manifold; fixed at 4.

**Spectral dimension** Mathematical parameter  $d_s(\tau)$  measuring mode scaling; not a physical dimension.

**Effective degrees of freedom** Number of accessible dynamical directions at given energy.

**Mode constraint** Energy-dependent freezing of dynamical modes.

**Spectral flow** Variation of  $d_s(\tau)$  with scale.

**Constraint parameter**  $c_1$  Universal exponent characterizing sharpness of constraint onset.

**Effective dimension** Alternative term for effective degrees of freedom; avoid confusion with topological dimension.

## F Detailed Calculations

### F.1 Heat Kernel on Spheres

For the  $d$ -dimensional sphere  $S^d$  with radius  $a$ , the eigenvalues of the Laplacian are:

$$\lambda_n = \frac{n(n+d-1)}{a^2} \quad (87)$$

with multiplicities:

$$m_n = \frac{(2n+d-1)(n+d-2)!}{n!(d-1)!} \quad (88)$$

The heat kernel trace is:

$$K(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} m_n \exp\left[-\frac{n(n+d-1)t}{a^2}\right] \quad (89)$$

At small  $t$ , this behaves as:

$$K(t) \sim \frac{a^d}{(4\pi t)^{d/2}} \left(1 + \frac{d(d-1)}{6} \frac{t}{a^2} + \dots\right) \quad (90)$$

### F.2 Hyperbolic Space Heat Kernel

For hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^d$  with curvature  $-1/a^2$ , the heat kernel is known exactly:

For  $d = 3$ :

$$K(r, t) = \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{3/2}} \frac{r/a}{\sinh(r/a)} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{4t} - \frac{t}{a^2}\right) \quad (91)$$

For general  $d$ , the expression involves the Jacobi theta function.

### F.3 Constraint Parameter Derivation

The universal formula  $c_1 = 1/2^{d-2+w}$  can be derived from statistical mechanics considerations.

Consider  $n = d - 2 + w$  binary degrees of freedom (constrained or free). The number of possible states is  $2^n$ . The constraint parameter scales as the inverse of this state space:

$$c_1 \sim 2^{-n} = \frac{1}{2^{d-2+w}} \quad (92)$$

This reflects that each additional degree of freedom contributes multiplicatively to the complexity of the constraint pattern.

Table 12: Constraint parameters across systems

System	$d_{\text{topo}}$	$w$	$c_1^{\text{theory}}$	$c_1^{\text{meas}}$
Rotation (3D)	3	0	0.500	$0.516 \pm 0.030$
Black Hole (4D)	4	0	0.250	$0.245 \pm 0.014$
Quantum Gravity	4	1	0.125	$0.130 \pm 0.020$

Table 13: Chronology of spectral methods

Year	Development
1911	Weyl's law established
1949	Minakshisundaram-Pleijel expansion
1965	DeWitt's heat kernel methods
1980s	Fractal spectral dimensions
1998	CDT program initiated
2005	Spectral flow in quantum gravity observed
2010s	Terminological confusion peaks
2020s	Mode constraint framework clarified

## G Tables of Values

### G.1 Comparison of Physical Systems

### G.2 Historical Timeline

## H Extended Examples

### H.1 Example: 2D Ising Model Near Criticality

The 2D Ising model provides a concrete example of mode constraint:

- Near  $T_c$ , correlation length  $\xi \rightarrow \infty$
- Critical modes have vanishing energy gap
- Non-critical modes (massive excitations) have large gaps
- Effective degrees of freedom reduce at scales  $L < \xi$

### H.2 Example: Quantum Harmonic Chain

For a chain of harmonic oscillators with frequency spectrum  $\omega_k \sim |k|$ :

- Low  $k$  (acoustic modes):  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , always accessible
- High  $k$  (optical modes):  $\omega$  finite, constrained at low  $E$
- Spectral flow:  $d_s = 1$  at low  $E$ ,  $d_s = 2$  at high  $E$

### H.3 Example: Graphene Near Dirac Points

Graphene's low-energy dispersion  $E \sim |p|$  leads to:

- Effective 2D dynamics at low energy
- Higher-dimensional behavior at  $E > t$  (hopping parameter)
- Mode constraint due to lattice structure

# I Mathematical Proofs

## I.1 Proof of Monotonicity

**Theorem 2.** *The effective degrees of freedom  $n_{\text{dof}}(E)$  is a non-decreasing function of energy  $E$ .*

*Proof.* From the definition:

$$n_{\text{dof}}(E) = \sum_i \Theta(E - E_{\text{gap},i}) \quad (93)$$

As  $E$  increases, more terms satisfy  $E > E_{\text{gap},i}$ , so the sum cannot decrease.  $\square$

## I.2 Proof of Universality

**Theorem 3.** *Under general assumptions, the constraint parameter  $c_1$  depends only on  $d_{\text{topo}}$  and  $w$ .*

*Sketch.* The universality follows from:

1. Binary nature of constraint (mode is either accessible or not)
2. Independence of constraints on different modes
3. Statistical averaging over constraint configurations

Each mode contributes a factor of  $1/2$  to the entropy, leading to  $c_1 \sim 2^{-n}$ .  $\square$

# J Detailed Mathematical Derivations

## J.1 Derivation of Heat Kernel Expansion Coefficients

The heat kernel coefficients  $a_k$  can be computed systematically using the recursion:

$$a_k(x, x) = \frac{1}{k!} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^k \left[ t^{d/2} K(x, x; t) \right]_{t=0} \quad (94)$$

For the first coefficient:

$$a_0(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{d/2} K(x, x; t) \quad (95)$$

$$= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \int d^d y \delta(x - y) e^{-d(x,y)^2/4t} \quad (96)$$

$$= 1 \quad (97)$$

For the second coefficient:

$$a_1(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} t^{d/2} K(x, x; t) \quad (98)$$

$$= \frac{1}{6} R(x) \quad (99)$$

## J.2 Riemann Curvature Invariants

The curvature invariants appearing in  $a_2$ :

$$R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \text{Kretschmann scalar} \quad (100)$$

$$R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} = \text{Ricci tensor squared} \quad (101)$$

$$R^2 = \text{Ricci scalar squared} \quad (102)$$

For specific spaces:

**Sphere  $S^d$ :**

$$R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{2d(d-1)}{a^4}, \quad R = \frac{d(d-1)}{a^2} \quad (103)$$

**Hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^d$ :**

$$R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{2d(d-1)}{a^4}, \quad R = -\frac{d(d-1)}{a^2} \quad (104)$$

### J.3 Spectral Zeta Function Calculations

The zeta function for simple geometries:

**Circle  $S^1$ :**

$$\zeta(s) = \left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^{-2s} \zeta_R(2s) \quad (105)$$

where  $\zeta_R$  is the Riemann zeta function.

**Flat torus  $T^d$ :**

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{V}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \frac{\Gamma(s-d/2)}{\Gamma(s)} \quad (106)$$

## K Numerical Methods

### K.1 Finite Element Discretization

The weak form of the eigenvalue problem:

$$\int_M \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, d\mu = \lambda \int_M uv \, d\mu \quad (107)$$

Discretization using basis functions  $\{\phi_i\}$ :

$$\sum_j K_{ij} v_j = \lambda \sum_j M_{ij} v_j \quad (108)$$

where:

$$K_{ij} = \int_M \nabla \phi_i \cdot \nabla \phi_j \, d\mu \quad (109)$$

$$M_{ij} = \int_M \phi_i \phi_j \, d\mu \quad (110)$$

### K.2 Time Integration Methods

For the heat equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta u \quad (111)$$

Implicit Euler:

$$\frac{u^{n+1} - u^n}{\Delta t} = \Delta u^{n+1} \quad (112)$$

Crank-Nicolson (second-order accurate):

$$\frac{u^{n+1} - u^n}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta u^{n+1} + \Delta u^n) \quad (113)$$

## L Physical Constants and Units

### L.1 Planck Units

$$\ell_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} = 1.616 \times 10^{-35} \text{ m} \quad (114)$$

$$t_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^5}} = 5.391 \times 10^{-44} \text{ s} \quad (115)$$

$$m_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} = 2.176 \times 10^{-8} \text{ kg} \quad (116)$$

$$E_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c^5}{G}} = 1.221 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV} \quad (117)$$

### L.2 Conversion Factors

$$1 \text{ GeV}^{-1} = 0.1973 \text{ fm} = 1.973 \times 10^{-16} \text{ m} \quad (118)$$

$$1 \text{ GeV} = 1.160 \times 10^{13} \text{ K} \quad (119)$$

$$1 \text{ GeV}^2 = 1.440 \times 10^{26} \text{ m}^{-2} \quad (120)$$

## M List of Symbols

Symbol	Meaning
$G$	Newton's gravitational constant
$\hbar$	Reduced Planck constant
$c$	Speed of light
$k_B$	Boltzmann constant
$\ell_P$	Planck length
$E_P$	Planck energy
$g_{\mu\nu}$	Metric tensor
$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$	Christoffel symbols
$R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$	Riemann curvature tensor
$R_{\mu\nu}$	Ricci tensor
$R$	Ricci scalar
$\Delta_g$	Laplace-Beltrami operator
$\lambda_n$	Laplacian eigenvalues
$\phi_n$	Laplacian eigenfunctions
$K(t)$	Heat kernel trace
$d_s(t)$	Spectral dimension
$\tau_c$	Characteristic constraint scale
$c_1$	Universal constraint parameter
$w$	Constraint type (0 or 1)
$\beta$	Inverse temperature
$Z$	Partition function
$S$	Entropy
$F$	Free energy
$\beta$	Inverse temperature