

# Microscopic Foundations of the Curvature Feedback Model

From Quantum Geometry to Macroscopic Saturation  
The Lagrangian Derivation and Quantum Gravity Connection

Lukas Geiger<sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Independent Researcher, Bernau im Schwarzwald

February 2026

*Working Paper – Paper III in the CFM series [1, 2]*

## Zusammenfassung

Papers I and II of this series established the Curvature Feedback Model (CFM) as a phenomenologically successful alternative to  $\Lambda$ CDM, eliminating the entire dark sector through a geometric curvature return mechanism. The present paper addresses the outstanding theoretical challenge: *What is the microscopic origin of the saturation ODE?* We seek the quantum system whose macroscopic (thermodynamic) limit yields the curvature return equation  $d\Omega_\Phi/da = k[1 - (\Omega_\Phi/\Phi_0)^2]$ . We explore four candidate frameworks: (1) a scalar field with a double-well potential yielding tanh-type saturation via spontaneous symmetry breaking; (2) Loop Quantum Gravity, where holonomy corrections produce bounded curvature invariants; (3) Finsler geometry, where direction-dependent metrics naturally generate scale-dependent gravitational effects; and (4) information-theoretic spacetime, where the saturation ODE emerges from a maximum-entropy principle on causal sets. We derive the effective Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CFM}}$  that reproduces the extended Friedmann equation and discuss its implications for quantum gravity. We further propose a *fractal game theory* in which the Nash equilibrium structure is self-similar across three levels – spacetime bits, elementary particles, and cosmic expansion – suggesting that quantum mechanics, the Standard Model, and cosmological evolution are manifestations of the same optimization principle operating at different scales.

**Keywords:** Curvature Feedback Model, quantum gravity, Lagrangian formulation, Loop Quantum Gravity, Finsler geometry, saturation mechanism, fractal game theory, modified gravity

**Subject areas:** Theoretical Physics, Quantum Gravity, Mathematical Physics

---

<sup>\*</sup>Correspondence: Lukas Geiger, Geißbühlweg 1, 79872 Bernau, Germany.

# Inhaltsverzeichnis

<b>AI Disclosure</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 Introduction: The Central Question</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 The Effective Lagrangian</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Requirements . . . . .	5
2.2 Scalar Field Approach . . . . .	6
2.3 The Power-Law Term: Geometric Origin . . . . .	6
2.4 The Combined Action . . . . .	7
<b>3 Quantum Gravity Connections</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Why the Saturation ODE? . . . . .	7
3.2 Approach 1: Loop Quantum Gravity . . . . .	7
3.3 Approach 2: Finsler Geometry . . . . .	8
3.4 Approach 3: Information-Theoretic Spacetime . . . . .	8
3.5 Approach 4: Causal Set Theory . . . . .	9
3.6 Approach 5: Quantum Error Correction . . . . .	9
3.7 The Nature of the Null Space . . . . .	9
<b>4 The Geometric Phase Transition</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 From Dark Matter Phase to Dark Energy Phase . . . . .	10
4.2 Order Parameter and Symmetry Breaking . . . . .	10
4.3 Analogy to Spontaneous Magnetization . . . . .	11
4.4 Critical Exponents and Universality . . . . .	11
<b>5 Fractal Game Theory: Self-Similar Structure Across Scales</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 Three Levels of the Game . . . . .	12
5.2 Quantum Mechanics as Mixed Strategy Equilibrium . . . . .	12
5.3 The Standard Model as Nash-Optimal Toolkit . . . . .	13
<b>6 Testable Predictions from the Lagrangian</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1 Perturbation Equations . . . . .	14
6.2 Gravitational Slip Parameter . . . . .	14
6.3 Scalar Field Oscillations . . . . .	14
6.4 Modified Gravitational Waves . . . . .	14
6.5 Discriminating the Microscopic Candidates . . . . .	15
6.5.1 The Cosmic Birefringence Signal (Candidate B) . . . . .	15
6.5.2 Gravitational Wave Echoes (Candidate D) . . . . .	15
6.5.3 Current Experimental Scorecard . . . . .	16

<b>7</b>	<b>Connection to Known Frameworks</b>	<b>16</b>
7.1	Relation to $f(R)$ Gravity . . . . .	16
7.2	Relation to AeST . . . . .	16
7.3	Relation to Emergent Gravity . . . . .	16
<b>8</b>	<b>Discussion and Outlook</b>	<b>17</b>
8.1	Summary of the Three-Paper Program . . . . .	17
8.2	What Remains . . . . .	17
8.3	The Vision: Cosmology as Phase Transition . . . . .	17
8.4	Technological Horizons: The Age of Geometry . . . . .	18

## AI Disclosure

This paper was developed with intensive use of AI systems. Their contributions are disclosed in detail:

### **Claude Opus 4.6 (Anthropic)**

Co-writer: Text generation, mathematical derivations, code development.

### **Gemini (Google DeepMind)**

Reviewer: Critical feedback, quantum gravity connections, strategic recommendations.

*Note:* Despite the substantial machine contribution, final responsibility for the scientific content and interpretation rests with the human author.

# 1 Introduction: The Central Question

The Curvature Feedback Model (CFM) [1] and its MOND-compatible extension [2] have demonstrated remarkable phenomenological success:

- **Paper I:** The standard CFM replaces dark energy with a curvature return potential, achieving  $\Delta\chi^2 = -12.2$  vs.  $\Lambda$ CDM on Pantheon+ data.
- **Paper II:** The extended CFM eliminates the entire dark sector (both dark energy and dark matter) in a baryon-only universe, achieving  $\Delta\chi^2 = -26.3$  with a geometric “dark matter” term that scales as spatial curvature ( $\beta = 2.02 \pm 0.20$ ).

Both results derive from a single dynamical equation – the *saturation ODE*:

$$\frac{d\Omega_\Phi}{da} = k \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\Omega_\Phi}{\Phi_0} \right)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

whose solution is the tanh function that provides the late-time acceleration. The extended model adds a power-law term  $\alpha \cdot a^{-\beta}$  representing the unsaturated (early-time) phase of the same geometric process.

The central question of this paper is:

*Which microscopic (quantum) system has the property that its macroscopic (thermodynamic) limit yields the saturation ODE (1)? And can the full extended Friedmann equation be derived from a Lagrangian?*

This question is not merely academic. Without a Lagrangian formulation, the CFM cannot:

1. Be consistently coupled to matter fields
2. Generate perturbation equations for  $C_\ell$  and  $P(k)$  predictions
3. Be connected to known quantum gravity frameworks
4. Be considered a complete physical theory

## 2 The Effective Lagrangian

### 2.1 Requirements

The effective Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{CFM}}$  must satisfy:

1. **Background:** The Euler-Lagrange equations, evaluated on the FLRW metric, must yield the extended Friedmann equation:

$$H^2(a) = H_0^2 \left[ \Omega_b a^{-3} + \Phi_0 \cdot f_{\text{sat}}(a) + \alpha \cdot a^{-\beta} \right] \quad (2)$$

2. **Saturation dynamics:** The scalar field equation of motion must reduce to  $d\Omega_\Phi/da = k[1 - (\Omega_\Phi/\Phi_0)^2]$  on the FLRW background.

3. **General covariance:** The action must be diffeomorphism-invariant.
4. **Correct limits:** In the limit  $k \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , the theory must reduce to GR with cosmological constant.

## 2.2 Scalar Field Approach

The most natural Lagrangian formulation introduces a scalar field  $\phi$  with a potential  $V(\phi)$ :

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{R}{16\pi G} - \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - V(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_m \right] \quad (3)$$

For the saturation ODE to emerge, we require  $V(\phi)$  such that the homogeneous field equation on FLRW yields tanh-type solutions.

**Proposition 1** (Double-Well Saturation Potential). *The potential*

$$V(\phi) = V_0 \left[ 1 - \tanh^2 \left( \frac{\phi}{\phi_0} \right) \right] = \frac{V_0}{\cosh^2(\phi/\phi_0)} \quad (4)$$

*produces a scalar field equation whose late-time solution on the FLRW background is  $\phi(a) \propto \tanh(k(a - a_{\text{trans}}))$ , reproducing the saturation term of the CFM.*

*Sketch of proof:* The Klein-Gordon equation on FLRW,

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) = 0 \quad (5)$$

with  $V'(\phi) = -2V_0 \tanh(\phi/\phi_0)/(\phi_0 \cosh^2(\phi/\phi_0))$ , admits the solution  $\phi = \phi_0 \tanh(\lambda t)$  in the slow-roll regime where  $\ddot{\phi} \ll 3H\dot{\phi}$ , with  $\lambda$  related to  $k$  and  $H_0$ . The energy density  $\rho_\phi = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)$  then maps to  $\Omega_\Phi(a) = \Phi_0 \cdot f_{\text{sat}}(a)$ .  $\square$

*Note:* The  $\cosh^{-2}$  potential is well known in quantum mechanics as the Pöschl-Teller potential. Its appearance here suggests a deep connection between quantum bound states and cosmological saturation.

## 2.3 The Power-Law Term: Geometric Origin

The geometric ‘‘dark matter’’ term  $\alpha \cdot a^{-\beta}$  with  $\beta \approx 2$  requires a separate origin. Two approaches are possible:

**Approach 1: Curvature-squared terms.** Adding a Gauss-Bonnet or  $R^2$  term to the action:

$$S_{\text{geom}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{R}{16\pi G} + \gamma R^2 + \delta R_{\mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu} \right] \quad (6)$$

produces corrections to the Friedmann equation that scale as  $a^{-2}$  in the radiation-to-matter transition era. The coefficient  $\gamma$  can be related to  $\alpha$ .

**Approach 2: Vector field (AeST-inspired).** Following Skordis & Złośnik [5], a timelike vector field  $A_\mu$  constrained by  $g^{\mu\nu} A_\mu A_\nu = -1$  contributes an effective energy density that scales non-standardly with  $a$ . The CFM power-law term may emerge as the cosmological background of such a vector field.

## 2.4 The Combined Action

Combining both contributions, the full CFM action reads:

$$S_{\text{CFM}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{R}{16\pi G} + \gamma R^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{V_0}{\cosh^2(\phi/\phi_0)} + \mathcal{L}_m \right] \quad (7)$$

where the  $R^2$  term generates the power-law (“dark matter”) contribution and the scalar field generates the saturation (“dark energy”) contribution. The game-theoretic equilibrium between null space and spacetime bubble is encoded in the balance between  $\gamma$  and  $V_0$ .

*Status:* This is a candidate action. Its consistency (ghost freedom, stability, correct Newtonian limit) must be verified. The full perturbation equations derived from (7) will determine whether the model can reproduce CMB and LSS observations.

## 3 Quantum Gravity Connections

### 3.1 Why the Saturation ODE?

The central puzzle is the specific form of the saturation ODE (1):  $dX/da = k(1 - X^2)$ . This equation has two fixed points ( $X = \pm 1$ ), of which  $X = +1$  is stable. The tanh solution is the unique trajectory connecting  $X = 0$  (zero curvature return) to  $X = 1$  (full saturation). We survey four frameworks that naturally produce such dynamics.

### 3.2 Approach 1: Loop Quantum Gravity

In Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) [6, 7], spacetime is quantized into discrete spin network states. The key feature for our purposes is the *bounded curvature* property: holonomy corrections replace curvature invariants  $R$  with bounded functions  $\sin(\mu R)/\mu$  (where  $\mu$  is related to the Planck area).

In Loop Quantum Cosmology (LQC) [8], the Friedmann equation becomes:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho \left( 1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_c} \right) \quad (8)$$

where  $\rho_c \sim \rho_{\text{Pl}}$  is a critical density. This has the structure of a saturation equation: the expansion rate is bounded as  $\rho \rightarrow \rho_c$ .

**Conjecture 1** (LQG–CFM Connection). *The saturation ODE (1) is the late-time, low-energy residual of the LQC curvature bound. In the early universe, the bound prevents singularities; in the late universe, the same mechanism produces the curvature return saturation. The parameters  $k$  and  $\Phi_0$  are related to the LQG area gap  $\Delta$  and the Barbero-Immirzi parameter  $\gamma_{\text{BI}}$ .*

*Evidence:* Both equations share the structure  $dX/dt \propto (1 - X^2)$ . In LQC,  $X$  is the curvature; in CFM,  $X$  is the curvature return potential. The mapping requires identifying  $\Omega_\Phi/\Phi_0$  with a normalized curvature invariant.

### 3.3 Approach 2: Finsler Geometry

Finsler geometry generalizes Riemannian geometry by allowing the metric to depend on both position and direction:  $F(x, \dot{x})$  instead of  $g_{\mu\nu}(x) dx^\mu dx^\nu$  [9]. This direction dependence can produce:

- Scale-dependent gravitational effects (mimicking MOND at galactic scales)
- Non-standard cosmological scaling (the  $a^{-\beta}$  term)
- A natural saturation mechanism when the directional dependence reaches a geometric bound

**Conjecture 2** (Finsler–CFM Connection). *The extended CFM Friedmann equation corresponds to a Finsler spacetime with a specific choice of Finsler function  $F$ . The “dark matter” term  $\alpha \cdot a^{-2}$  arises from the osculating Riemannian curvature of the Finsler metric, and the saturation term arises from the Finsler analog of the Ricci scalar reaching a geometric bound.*

*Note:* Finsler geometry has been applied to MOND [10] and to modified dispersion relations in quantum gravity [11]. The CFM may provide the cosmological realization of a Finsler spacetime.

### 3.4 Approach 3: Information-Theoretic Spacetime

If spacetime is fundamentally information-theoretic (as suggested by the holographic principle [12] and the ER=EPR conjecture [13]), then the saturation ODE can be reinterpreted as a *maximum entropy principle*:

- The curvature return potential  $\Omega_\Phi$  represents the “processed information” of the spacetime system.
- The saturation limit  $\Phi_0$  represents the maximum information capacity (holographic bound).
- The ODE  $dX/da = k(1 - X^2)$  is the logistic-type growth equation for information processing, where the rate of information gain decreases as the system approaches its capacity.

In this picture, the game-theoretic interpretation of Paper I [1] becomes literal: the null space and spacetime bubble are two subsystems of a quantum information network, and their Nash equilibrium is determined by the information-theoretic constraints of the holographic bound.

A closely related mechanism is *entanglement entropy saturation* [23]. If spacetime connectivity is built from quantum entanglement (the “ER=EPR” hypothesis [13]), then two points in space are “close” because their quantum states are entangled. Entanglement, however, is a finite resource subject to the monogamy constraint: a quantum system cannot be maximally entangled with arbitrarily many partners simultaneously. As the universe expands and new spacetime degrees of freedom are created, the entanglement budget per degree of freedom decreases. The saturation ODE then describes the approach to the entanglement capacity limit: when the “glue” (entanglement) that holds spacetime together reaches its maximum dilution, the expansion accelerates – not because of a new energy form, but because the binding capacity is exhausted.

### 3.5 Approach 4: Causal Set Theory

Causal set theory [14, 15] models spacetime as a discrete partial order of events. The key result for our purposes is the *Sorkin cosmological constant* [16]: in a causal set universe with  $N$  elements, the cosmological constant has fluctuations of order  $\Lambda \sim 1/\sqrt{N}$ , providing a natural explanation for the observed smallness of  $\Lambda$ .

**Conjecture 3** (Causal Set–CFM Connection). *In a dynamically evolving causal set, the curvature return potential  $\Omega_\Phi$  corresponds to the “effective cosmological constant” that changes as new elements are added to the set. The saturation at  $\Phi_0$  corresponds to the causal set reaching its equilibrium density. The power-law term  $\alpha \cdot a^{-2}$  reflects the initial transient before the set reaches equilibrium.*

### 3.6 Approach 5: Quantum Error Correction

A recent and particularly compelling framework interprets spacetime as a *quantum error-correcting code* [24, 25]. In this picture, the holographic principle is not merely a bound on information storage but a statement about *redundancy*: the bulk spacetime geometry is an error-protected encoding of the boundary (holographic) degrees of freedom.

The saturation mechanism acquires a natural interpretation:

- Every error-correcting code has a finite **code capacity** – a maximum rate at which it can protect information against noise (decoherence).
- As the universe expands and the information content grows (structure formation, increasing entropy), the code approaches its capacity limit.
- The saturation  $\Phi_0$  is the code capacity: the point at which the spacetime “code” can no longer accommodate additional complexity without becoming unstable.
- The accelerated expansion (dark energy) is the code’s **self-protection mechanism**: by diluting the information density, it prevents the code from exceeding its error-correction threshold.

**Conjecture 4** (QEC–CFM Connection). *The curvature return potential  $\Omega_\Phi$  measures the fraction of the spacetime error-correcting code’s capacity that is utilized. The saturation ODE  $dX/da = k(1 - X^2)$  describes the approach to code capacity. The accelerated expansion is the code’s autonomous response to impending saturation – it creates more “storage space” (volume) to maintain the code’s integrity.*

This interpretation connects directly to the game-theoretic framework of Paper I [1]: the null space’s “self-protection motive” is *literally* the error-correcting code’s drive to maintain integrity. The spacetime bubble is not merely a “daughter” of the null space – it is the null space’s mechanism for protecting its quantum information against decoherence, implemented as a holographic code whose capacity limit manifests as dark energy.

### 3.7 The Nature of the Null Space

Papers I and II postulated the null space as the “other player” in the cosmological game – the pre-geometric ground state from which the spacetime bubble emerges. With the quantum gravity approaches surveyed above, we can now characterize the null space more precisely.

**A-geometric:** The null space has no metric. There is no notion of distance, duration, or dimensionality. It is a *topological* or *algebraic* entity, not a geometric one. In LQG language, it is the state of maximal disorder among spin network nodes – all connections exist in superposition but none are realized.

**Superposition of all geometries:** Quantum-mechanically, the null space is the path-integral over all possible spacetime configurations, weighted equally. It is the state of maximal uncertainty about geometry – not “empty space” but “no space at all.”

**The energy reservoir:** In the game-theoretic framework, the null space possesses the total energy budget  $E_0$  but exists in a metastable state (the “bank” that holds the capital but does not invest it). A quantum fluctuation triggers the phase transition that creates the spacetime bubble.

**The code:** In the QEC interpretation, the null space is the *logical* quantum information that the spacetime code protects. The bulk spacetime (our universe) is the *physical* qubits of the code. The holographic boundary is the interface between the logical (null space) and physical (spacetime) layers.

**Definition 1** (Geometric Crystallization). *The emergence of spacetime from the null space is a geometric phase transition – analogous to the crystallization of water into ice. The null space is the disordered “liquid” phase (no geometry, all configurations in superposition). The spacetime bubble is the ordered “crystal” phase (definite geometry, metric structure). The saturation ODE describes the completion of this crystallization: the curvature return potential  $\Omega_\Phi$  is the order parameter, and its saturation at  $\Phi_0$  is the fully crystallized state (de Sitter equilibrium).*

In this picture, the question “What saturates?” has a unified answer: *the geometric order of spacetime*. Whether we describe this order in terms of spin alignment (LQG), entanglement connectivity (ER=EPR), information capacity (holography), or code utilization (QEC), the mathematical structure is the same – a cooperative system of discrete degrees of freedom approaching their collective equilibrium. The tanh function is the universal signature of this process, independent of the specific microscopic realization.

## 4 The Geometric Phase Transition

### 4.1 From Dark Matter Phase to Dark Energy Phase

Paper II [2] introduced the concept of a geometric phase transition: at early times, the curvature return potential behaves like dark matter ( $\alpha \cdot a^{-2}$ ), and at late times, it saturates into dark energy ( $\Phi_0 \cdot f_{\text{sat}}$ ). This section provides the theoretical underpinning.

### 4.2 Order Parameter and Symmetry Breaking

The saturation variable  $X = \Omega_\Phi / \Phi_0 \in [0, 1]$  can be interpreted as an *order parameter*:

- $X = 0$ : Disordered phase (no curvature return, geometric “DM” dominates)
- $X = 1$ : Ordered phase (full saturation, geometric “DE” dominates)
- The transition at  $a_{\text{trans}}$ : The crossover between phases

The saturation ODE  $dX/da = k(1 - X^2)$  has the form of a Ginzburg-Landau equation for a second-order phase transition with a double-well free energy  $F(X) = -k(X - X^3/3)$ . The “temperature” parameter is the scale factor  $a$ , and the transition occurs as  $a$  increases past  $a_{\text{trans}}$ .

### 4.3 Analogy to Spontaneous Magnetization

The mathematical structure is identical to the mean-field theory of ferromagnetism:

Ferromagnetism	CFM Cosmology	Variable
Magnetization $M$	Curvature return $\Omega_\Phi$	Order parameter
Temperature $T$	Scale factor $a$	Control parameter
Curie point $T_c$	Transition $a_{\text{trans}}$	Critical point
Spin interaction $J$	Curvature coupling $k$	Interaction strength
Saturation $M_s$	Saturation $\Phi_0$	Maximum value
$\tanh(J/k_B T)$	$\tanh(k(a - a_{\text{trans}}))$	Solution

This analogy suggests that the curvature return is driven by *cooperative phenomena*: individual spacetime degrees of freedom (area quanta in LQG, causal set elements, etc.) align collectively, producing a macroscopic saturation effect. The game-theoretic “equilibrium” of Paper I is the cosmological analog of thermal equilibrium in statistical mechanics.

### 4.4 Critical Exponents and Universality

If the analogy to phase transitions is more than formal, the CFM should exhibit *universality*: the saturation exponent and the transition shape should be robust against microscopic details. This would explain why the phenomenological tanh function fits the data well – it is the universal scaling function for a mean-field phase transition, regardless of the microscopic mechanism.

**Conjecture 5** (Universality of the Saturation Mechanism). *The tanh form of the curvature return potential is a universal consequence of any microscopic theory with:*

1. *A bounded curvature return (saturation limit  $\Phi_0$ )*
2. *A cooperative interaction between spacetime degrees of freedom (coupling  $k$ )*
3. *A single relevant direction (the scale factor  $a$ )*

*The specific microscopic mechanism (LQG, Finsler, causal sets) affects only the values of  $k$  and  $\Phi_0$ , not the functional form.*

## 5 Fractal Game Theory: Self-Similar Structure Across Scales

If the game-theoretic framework operates at the cosmological level (Papers I, II), a natural question arises: does the same logic apply at *all* scales? We argue that the Nash equilibrium structure is self-similar – a “fractal game” in which the same optimization principle governs spacetime bits, elementary particles, and cosmic expansion.

## 5.1 Three Levels of the Game

Level	Players	Game	Equilibrium
0: Substrate	Spacetime bits/spins	Alignment	Geometry (tanh saturation)
1: Quantum	Field excitations	Stability	Particles (Standard Model)
2: Cosmos	Geometry $\leftrightarrow$ null space	Gradient reduction	Expansion (CFM)

**Level 0 (Spacetime Substrate):** The fundamental degrees of freedom (area quanta in LQG, causal set elements, information bits) play a cooperative alignment game. When sufficiently many bits “align” (analogous to spins in a ferromagnet), the macroscopic result is the curvature return potential. The tanh function is the mean-field solution of this alignment game – the same mathematical structure that governs ferromagnetic ordering. The saturation limit  $\Phi_0$  is the state where all available bits are aligned.

**Level 1 (Quantum/Particle):** The excitations of the aligned substrate form stable patterns – elementary particles. In this picture, particles are not fundamental point objects but *topological defects* or *coherent excitations* of the spacetime substrate, analogous to magnons or phonons in condensed matter. Their stability is guaranteed by the same Nash-equilibrium logic: a particle persists because no local perturbation can lower the total “cost” (action) of the configuration.

**Level 2 (Cosmological):** The macroscopic geometry, composed of  $\sim 10^{120}$  substrate bits, plays the gradient-reduction game with the null space (Paper I). The expansion history – including the “dark matter” and “dark energy” phases – is the solution of this game. This is the level described in Papers I and II.

The self-similarity is not merely an analogy: if the tanh saturation arises from a mean-field cooperative game at Level 0, then the *same equation* governs both the microscopic alignment and the macroscopic expansion. The parameters  $k$  and  $\Phi_0$  are determined by the microscopic game (Level 0) and inherited by the cosmological game (Level 2).

## 5.2 Quantum Mechanics as Mixed Strategy Equilibrium

A striking connection exists between quantum mechanics and game theory:

- In game theory, a **mixed strategy** assigns probabilities to actions: a player does not commit to a single move but maintains a probability distribution. The Nash equilibrium of many games is *mixed* – pure strategies are suboptimal.
- In quantum mechanics, a particle in **superposition** does not commit to a single state but maintains a probability amplitude distribution. The system “chooses” a definite state only upon measurement (interaction).

**Conjecture 6** (Quantum-Game Duality). *Quantum superposition is the physical manifestation of a mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium at Level 1. The wavefunction  $\psi(x)$  is the strategy profile, the Born rule  $|\psi|^2$  is the strategy probability, and wavefunction collapse (measurement) is the payoff realization – the moment the game resolves into a definite outcome. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle is not a “defect” of nature but the strategic flexibility required for Nash-optimal play.*

This conjecture connects to the *path integral* formulation: Feynman's sum over all paths is the particle “considering” all possible strategies, with the classical path (stationary phase) being the Nash equilibrium of the local action game. Destructive interference eliminates non-Nash strategies; constructive interference reinforces the equilibrium path.

### 5.3 The Standard Model as Nash-Optimal Toolkit

If the universe’s objective function is entropy production (gradient reduction), then the specific particle content of the Standard Model is not arbitrary but *optimal*:

- **Quarks:** Enable nuclear binding and stellar fusion – the most efficient sustained entropy source in the universe. Without quarks, no stars, no sustained nucleosynthesis, no heavy elements.
- **Electrons:** Enable electromagnetic interactions, chemistry, and radiation thermalization. They are the “distribution network” that spreads entropy across space.
- **Neutrinos:** Serve as energy release valves during fusion and collapse processes, enabling rapid energy transport from dense cores (supernovae, neutron stars).
- **The four forces:** Represent the minimal set of interactions required for a stable, long-lived entropy-producing system:
  - *Strong force*: Binds energy into dense, long-lived storage units (nuclei)
  - *Weak force*: Provides the “ignition mechanism” for nuclear processes (beta decay)
  - *Electromagnetism*: Distributes energy across space (radiation)
  - *Gravity*: Provides the global geometry and collapse mechanism (structure formation)

The *fine-tuning* of particle masses and coupling constants – long regarded as the deepest mystery of physics – may then be the solution of a Nash optimization problem: the specific values are those that maximize the integrated entropy production over the lifetime of the universe. Any deviation would yield a less efficient “machine” and thus a suboptimal equilibrium.

**Conjecture 7** (Game-Theoretic Fine-Tuning). *The 19 free parameters of the Standard Model are not arbitrary but constitute the unique Nash equilibrium of the Level 1 game: the set of particle masses and couplings that maximizes the entropy production rate of the spacetime bubble over its full expansion history, subject to the constraint of global stability.*

*Note:* This conjecture is currently far from testable. However, it transforms the fine-tuning problem from a metaphysical puzzle (“why these numbers?”) into a mathematical optimization problem (“what values maximize entropy production?”) – which is, at least in principle, computable.

## 6 Testable Predictions from the Lagrangian

The effective action (7) generates specific predictions beyond the background expansion history:

## 6.1 Perturbation Equations

Linearizing the action around the FLRW background yields coupled equations for:

- The metric perturbations  $\Phi_N$  (Newtonian potential) and  $\Psi$  (curvature perturbation)
- The scalar field perturbation  $\delta\phi$
- The matter perturbations  $\delta_m$  and  $v_m$

The  $R^2$  term produces an *anisotropic stress* ( $\Phi_N \neq \Psi$ ), which is a testable prediction distinguishing the CFM from  $\Lambda$ CDM and from simple quintessence models.

## 6.2 Gravitational Slip Parameter

The ratio  $\eta = \Phi_N/\Psi$  is predicted to deviate from unity:

$$\eta(a, k) = 1 + \delta\eta(a, k) \quad (9)$$

where  $\delta\eta$  depends on the  $R^2$  coupling  $\gamma$  and is scale-dependent. This can be tested by comparing weak lensing (sensitive to  $\Phi_N + \Psi$ ) with galaxy clustering (sensitive to  $\Psi$  alone).

## 6.3 Scalar Field Oscillations

The Pöschl-Teller potential (4) supports a discrete spectrum of bound states. In the cosmological context, these correspond to oscillatory corrections to the expansion rate at late times:

$$H^2(a) = H_{\text{smooth}}^2(a) [1 + \varepsilon \cdot e^{-\Gamma a} \cos(\omega a + \delta)] \quad (10)$$

with amplitude  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ . These oscillations, if detectable in high-precision BAO or SN data, would provide direct evidence for the quantum nature of the saturation mechanism.

## 6.4 Modified Gravitational Waves

The  $R^2$  term modifies the gravitational wave propagation equation:

$$\ddot{h}_{ij} + (3H + \Gamma_{\text{GW}})\dot{h}_{ij} + \left( \frac{k^2}{a^2} + m_{\text{GW}}^2 \right) h_{ij} = 0 \quad (11)$$

where  $\Gamma_{\text{GW}}$  and  $m_{\text{GW}}^2$  are corrections from the curvature-squared term. This predicts:

- A frequency-dependent gravitational wave speed ( $c_{\text{GW}} \neq c$  at high frequencies)
- A massive graviton mode with  $m_{\text{GW}} \propto \sqrt{\gamma}$

The LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA constraint  $|c_{\text{GW}}/c - 1| < 10^{-15}$  [19] places an upper bound on  $\gamma$ .

## 6.5 Discriminating the Microscopic Candidates

Each of the five microscopic approaches (Sections 3.2–3.6) produces a distinct experimental signature. Crucially, several of these tests have already been performed or are imminent:

Candidate	Signature	Instrument	Status
A: Holographic	Spacetime noise	Holometer (Fermilab)	<b>Null result</b> (2015). Simplest models excluded [27].
B: Spin networks	Vacuum birefringence	Planck CMB polarization	$2.4\sigma$ <b>hint</b> : $\beta \approx 0.35^\circ$ [26].
C: Entanglement	Gravity-induced collapse	Gran Sasso (underground)	Simple Diósi-Penrose <b>excluded</b> [28].
D: QEC codes	GW horizon echoes	LIGO/Virgo	$\sim 2.5\sigma$ <b>tentative</b> [29]. Contested.
E: Causal sets	$\Lambda$ fluctuations	Precision cosmology	Not yet testable at required precision.

### 6.5.1 The Cosmic Birefringence Signal (Candidate B)

The most promising existing signal is the *isotropic cosmic birefringence* reported by Minami & Komatsu [26] in reanalyzed Planck polarization data. They found a rotation of the CMB polarization plane by  $\beta = 0.35^\circ \pm 0.14^\circ$  ( $2.4\sigma$ ), which is anomalous in  $\Lambda$ CDM but has no established explanation.

In the CFM framework with spin-network microstructure (Candidate B), this signal has a natural interpretation: the saturating spacetime (the “aligning spins”) acts as a *birefringent medium*. As the vacuum transitions from the disordered (DM-like) phase to the ordered (DE-like) phase, the spin alignment produces a preferred direction that rotates the polarization of traversing photons. The rotation angle  $\beta$  should be proportional to the *degree of saturation*  $X = \Omega_\Phi/\Phi_0$  integrated along the photon path.

*CFM prediction:* If the cosmic birefringence is caused by the geometric phase transition, then:

1. The rotation angle should be *isotropic* (same in all directions) – consistent with the Minami-Komatsu measurement.
2. The rotation should be *frequency-independent* at CMB frequencies (since it is geometric, not dispersive) – testable by Simons Observatory ( $\sim 2025$ ) and LiteBIRD ( $\sim 2028$ ).
3. The rotation should be *redshift-dependent*: photons from higher redshift (less saturated vacuum) should show less rotation. This is testable with quasar polarization surveys across a range of redshifts.

### 6.5.2 Gravitational Wave Echoes (Candidate D)

Several groups [29] have reported tentative evidence ( $\sim 2.5\sigma$ ) for post-merger “echoes” in LIGO data from binary black hole coalescences. In the QEC interpretation (Candidate D), these echoes would be reflections from the information-theoretic structure at the horizon – the “hard boundary” of the error-correcting code. The upcoming LIGO A+ upgrade and the planned Einstein Telescope will either confirm or definitively exclude these signals.

*CFM prediction:* If echoes are real, their damping time should be related to the local saturation rate  $k$  – the same parameter that governs cosmological dark energy. This would link black hole physics directly to the cosmological saturation mechanism.

### 6.5.3 Current Experimental Scorecard

- Candidate A (holographic noise) is **disfavored** by the Holometer null result, unless the noise is correlated (not random) as the CFM would predict.
- Candidate B (spin networks) is **mildly favored** by the cosmic birefringence hint.
- Candidate C (entanglement) is **constrained** but not excluded; the simple models fail, but more sophisticated entanglement-saturation models remain viable.
- Candidate D (QEC) has **tentative** support from GW echoes, but the signal is contested.
- Candidate E (causal sets) remains **untested** at the required precision.

The CFM framework is agnostic about which candidate provides the microscopic basis – the tanh saturation is universal across all of them (cf. Section 4). However, the cosmic birefringence signal provides a compelling reason to pursue the spin-network interpretation as the primary candidate for detailed quantitative predictions.

## 7 Connection to Known Frameworks

### 7.1 Relation to $f(R)$ Gravity

The action (7) with the  $R^2$  term is a special case of  $f(R) = R + \gamma R^2$  gravity (Starobinsky model) [17]. The CFM adds the scalar field with the Pöschl-Teller potential, breaking the degeneracy between  $f(R)$  models.

### 7.2 Relation to AeST

The relativistic MOND theory AeST [5] contains a scalar field  $\phi$  and a constrained vector field  $A_\mu$ . The CFM scalar field may be identified with (or related to) the AeST scalar field, while the  $R^2$  term may encode the cosmological effect of the AeST vector field. A precise mapping between the two theories is a key objective.

### 7.3 Relation to Emergent Gravity

Verlinde’s emergent gravity proposal [18] derives MOND-like effects from the entanglement entropy of de Sitter space. The CFM’s game-theoretic framework shares the core idea that gravity (and its “dark” extensions) are emergent phenomena, not fundamental forces. The saturation mechanism may be the cosmological realization of Verlinde’s entropy-area relation.

## 8 Discussion and Outlook

### 8.1 Summary of the Three-Paper Program

The CFM program now spans three papers:

1. **Paper I** [1]: Game-theoretic foundation, standard CFM, dark energy replacement. Validated against Pantheon+.
2. **Paper II** [2]: MOND unification, extended CFM, baryon-only universe, Decaying Dark Geometry hypothesis. Validated against Pantheon+.
3. **Paper III** (this work): Lagrangian formulation, quantum gravity connections, phase transition interpretation, testable predictions.

Together, these papers propose a *complete cosmological framework* in which:

- The dark sector is eliminated (Paper II)
- The expansion history is explained by geometric curvature return (Papers I, II)
- The microscopic origin is a tanh-type phase transition of spacetime geometry (Paper III)
- The Lagrangian is  $R + \gamma R^2$  plus a Pöschl-Teller scalar field (Paper III)

### 8.2 What Remains

Despite the theoretical progress, critical steps remain:

1. **CMB power spectrum:** Computing  $C_\ell$  from the perturbation equations of the full action (7). This is the single most important test.
2. **Ghost analysis:** Verifying that the action (7) is free of ghost instabilities (negative kinetic energy modes). The  $R^2$  term introduces the scalaron, which must be checked for stability.
3. **Solar system tests:** The  $R^2$  modification produces a Yukawa correction to Newton's law. The coupling  $\gamma$  must be small enough to satisfy solar system constraints.
4. **Numerical verification:** Solving the full perturbation equations numerically (using a modified CLASS/CAMB code) to predict  $C_\ell$ ,  $P(k)$ , and  $f\sigma_8$ .
5. **Quantum gravity:** Deriving  $k$ ,  $\Phi_0$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\beta$  from one of the microscopic frameworks (LQG, Finsler, causal sets) – or from a new framework suggested by the tanh structure.

### 8.3 The Vision: Cosmology as Phase Transition

If the program succeeds, the history of the universe becomes a *geometric phase transition*:

1. **Big Bang:** Emergence of the spacetime bubble from the null space (game-theoretic nucleation).
2. **Early universe:** Unsaturated curvature return dominates – geometry behaves like “dark matter” ( $a^{-2}$ ), providing gravitational scaffolding for structure formation.

3. **Transition:** The curvature return approaches saturation ( $a \approx a_{\text{trans}}$ ) – the geometric phase transition from DM-like to DE-like behavior.
4. **Late universe:** Saturated curvature return dominates – geometry behaves like “dark energy” (accelerated expansion).
5. **Far future:** Full saturation  $\Omega_\Phi \rightarrow \Phi_0$  – the Nash equilibrium is reached, the null space gradient is neutralized, and expansion approaches de Sitter.

The entire history of cosmic acceleration and structure formation is then described by a single equation – the saturation ODE – whose form is universal (a consequence of mean-field phase transition theory) and whose parameters are determined by quantum gravity.

## 8.4 Technological Horizons: The Age of Geometry

If the CFM framework is confirmed and the saturation mechanism is understood at the microscopic level, the technological implications would be profound. We outline four speculative but logically consistent possibilities, ordered by increasing ambition:

1. **Nash Optimization Hardware.** The saturation ODE is a physical analog computer that solves Nash equilibria. If we can build mesoscopic systems governed by the same  $dX/dt = k(1 - X^2)$  dynamics, we obtain hardware that solves NP-hard optimization problems (logistics, protein folding, resource allocation) by “relaxing” into equilibrium – not by computation, but by physics. This is analogous to quantum annealing but exploits the geometric saturation mechanism rather than quantum tunneling.
2. **Precision Cosmography.** A validated CFM+MOND framework with a Lagrangian would enable computing the full perturbation spectrum ( $C_\ell$ ,  $P(k)$ ,  $f\sigma_8$ ) from first principles. This would transform cosmological parameter estimation: instead of fitting  $\Lambda$ CDM parameters, we would determine the geometric parameters ( $k$ ,  $\Phi_0$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ ) with unprecedented precision from CMB, BAO, and LSS data, yielding a complete dynamical model of cosmic evolution.
3. **Metric Engineering.** If the curvature return potential is a manipulable physical quantity (not just a passive geometric property), then local modifications of the saturation state become conceivable in principle. Desaturation ( $\Omega_\Phi \rightarrow 0$ ) would increase local gravitational attraction; forced saturation ( $\Omega_\Phi \rightarrow \Phi_0$ ) would produce local expansion. This is the physical basis for what has been termed “metric engineering” [20] – manipulating spacetime geometry rather than moving objects through it. The CFM provides the first concrete physical mechanism (saturation control) for such manipulation, though the required energy scales remain to be determined.
4. **Vacuum Energy Access.** In the game-theoretic framework, the null space represents an energy reservoir coupled to the spacetime bubble. The saturation parameter  $k$  governs the coupling strength. If  $k$  can be locally enhanced, the energy flow from the null space to the bubble would increase – effectively “tapping” the vacuum energy. This possibility comes with obvious stability concerns: uncontrolled desaturation could trigger a local vacuum decay. Any such technology would require a complete understanding of the Lagrangian stability conditions.

*Caveat:* These technological horizons are *logical extrapolations*, not predictions. They depend on the CFM being correct at a fundamental level (not merely phenomenological), on the saturation mechanism being locally controllable, and on energy scales being accessible. We include them to illustrate the scope of the framework, not as a technology roadmap.

## Literatur

- [1] Geiger, L. (2026). Game-Theoretic Cosmology and the Curvature Feedback Model: Nash Equilibria Between Null Space and Spacetime Bubble. Working Paper. <https://github.com/lukisch/cfm-cosmology>.
- [2] Geiger, L. (2026). Eliminating the Dark Sector: Unifying the Curvature Feedback Model with MOND. Working Paper.
- [3] Scolnic, D. et al. (2022). The Pantheon+ Analysis: The Full Data Set and Light-curve Release. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 938(2), 113.
- [4] Milgrom, M. (1983). A modification of the Newtonian dynamics as a possible alternative to the hidden mass hypothesis. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 270, 365–370.
- [5] Skordis, C. & Złośnik, T. (2021). New Relativistic Theory for Modified Newtonian Dynamics. *Physical Review Letters*, 127(16), 161302.
- [6] Rovelli, C. (2004). *Quantum Gravity*. Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Thiemann, T. (2007). *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity*. Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Ashtekar, A. & Singh, P. (2011). Loop Quantum Cosmology: A Status Report. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 28(21), 213001.
- [9] Bao, D., Chern, S.-S. & Shen, Z. (2000). *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*. Springer.
- [10] Chang, Z. & Li, X. (2009). Modified Friedmann model in Randers-Finsler space of approximate Berwald type. *Physics Letters B*, 676(4-5), 173–176.
- [11] Girelli, F., Liberati, S. & Sindoni, L. (2007). Planck-scale modified dispersion relations and Finsler geometry. *Physical Review D*, 75(6), 064015.
- [12] Bousso, R. (2002). The holographic principle. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 74(3), 825–874.
- [13] Maldacena, J. & Susskind, L. (2013). Cool horizons for entangled black holes. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 61(9), 781–811.
- [14] Bombelli, L., Lee, J., Meyer, D. & Sorkin, R. D. (1987). Space-time as a causal set. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(5), 521–524.
- [15] Sorkin, R. D. (2003). Causal Sets: Discrete Gravity. In *Lectures on Quantum Gravity*, Springer, 305–327.

- [16] Sorkin, R. D. (1991). Spacetime and causal sets. In *Relativity and Gravitation*, World Scientific, 150–173.
- [17] Starobinsky, A. A. (1980). A new type of isotropic cosmological models without singularity. *Physics Letters B*, 91(1), 99–102.
- [18] Verlinde, E. (2017). Emergent Gravity and the Dark Universe. *SciPost Physics*, 2(3), 016.
- [19] Abbott, B. P. et al. (LIGO/Virgo & Fermi GBM) (2017). Gravitational Waves and Gamma-Rays from a Binary Neutron Star Merger: GW170817 and GRB 170817A. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 848(2), L13.
- [20] Alcubierre, M. (1994). The warp drive: hyper-fast travel within general relativity. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 11(5), L73–L77. DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/11/5/001.
- [21] Wheeler, J. A. (1990). Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. In *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, Addison-Wesley, 3–28.
- [22] Feynman, R. P. (1948). Space-Time Approach to Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 20(2), 367–387.
- [23] Van Raamsdonk, M. (2010). Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 42(10), 2323–2329. DOI: 10.1007/s10714-010-1034-0.
- [24] Almheiri, A., Dong, X. & Harlow, D. (2015). Bulk Locality and Quantum Error Correction in AdS/CFT. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2015(4), 163. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP04(2015)163.
- [25] Pastawski, F., Yoshida, B., Harlow, D. & Preskill, J. (2015). Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: Toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2015(6), 149. DOI: 10.1007/JHEP06(2015)149.
- [26] Minami, Y. & Komatsu, E. (2020). New Extraction of the Cosmic Birefringence from the Planck 2018 Polarization Data. *Physical Review Letters*, 125(22), 221301. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.221301.
- [27] Chou, A. S. et al. (Holometer Collaboration) (2017). First Measurements of High Frequency Cross-Spectra from a Pair of Large Michelson Interferometers. *Physical Review Letters*, 117(11), 111102. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.111102.
- [28] Donadi, S. et al. (2021). Underground test of gravity-related wave function collapse. *Nature Physics*, 17(1), 74–78. DOI: 10.1038/s41567-020-1008-4.
- [29] Abedi, J., Dykaar, H. & Afshordi, N. (2017). Echoes from the Abyss: Tentative evidence for Planck-scale structure at black hole horizons. *Physical Review D*, 96(8), 082004. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.96.082004.