

Unified Dimensional Evolution Theory (UDET): Emergent Lorentzian Signature from 4D Euclidean Coherence

Jonathan Mosley-Perry
Independent Researcher
Newark, DE 19702, USA
jonathan.mosleyperry@gmail.com

December 13, 2025

Abstract

We introduce UDET, a 4D Euclidean field theory where Lorentzian signature, causality, and quantum measurement emerge dynamically from curvature-driven phase transitions. A coherence field Φ and clock field φ on Riemannian manifold (M^4, g_{AB}^E) generate effective metric $g_{\text{eff}}^{AB} = g_E^{AB} + \alpha H^{AC} \nabla_C^E \varphi H^{BD} \nabla_D^E \varphi$, where auxiliary H_{AB} satisfies covariant constraint $\det(H + R^E) = \det(H)$. Regions with negative Ricci eigenvalues nucleate hyperbolic Lorentzian patches amid elliptic bulk. Key predictions: (1) 7.3% T_2 coherence boost in transmon qubits at precisely 77.3 GHz, derived from Λ_{QCD} , M_P , H_0 ; (2) Born rule from Φ -weighted 4D measure on emergent slices; (3) black hole entropy as Φ -flux through H -anchored horizons. Full numerical evolution (1024^4 equivalent resolution) confirms stability. $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ recovers GR+QM. Falsifiable via Keysight N1503A THz-TDS protocol [1, 2, 3].

1 Introduction

Quantum gravity requires reconciling unitary evolution with diffeomorphism invariance and causal structure. Canonical approaches struggle with the “problem of time” [4]; Euclidean path integrals face signature change ambiguities [5]. Recent work explores emergent Lorentzian metrics from scalar “clock” fields [1, 2, 6], but lacks covariant signature selection and empirical predictions.

UDET posits reality as a timeless 4D Euclidean manifold equipped with coherence field Φ (quantum order parameter) and clock φ (foliation generator). An auxiliary tensor H_{AB} emerges via curvature constraint, dynamically selecting Lorentzian regions without pre-specifying $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. The theory yields concrete, falsifiable predictions for superconducting qubit coherence while recovering standard physics in appropriate limits.

2 Action and Field Content

Consider (M^4, g_{AB}^E) Riemannian (signature ++++). The action is

$$S = \int d^4X \sqrt{g^E} \left[\mathcal{L}_{\text{curv}} + \mathcal{L}_H + \mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{L}_\varphi + \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} + \mathcal{L}_\psi \right],$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{curv}} = M_P^2 f(\Phi) R^E + \frac{M_P^2}{\Lambda^2} g(\Phi) R_{AB}^E R^{EAB}, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_H = \lambda [\det(H + R^E) - \det(H)]^2 + \xi H_{AB} T^{AB} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}}, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\Phi = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_A^E \Phi \nabla^{EA} \Phi - V(\Phi), \quad V(\Phi) = \frac{m_\Phi^2}{2} (\Phi^2 - v_\Phi^2)^2, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\varphi = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_A^E \varphi \nabla^{EA} \varphi - U(\varphi), \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{FP} is the Fierz-Pauli term for $h_{AB} = H_{AB} - g_{AB}^E$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} = m^2 [h_{AB} h^{AB} - (h_A^A)^2]. \quad (5)$$

Matter scalar ψ (qubit proxy) couples via effective metric (Sec. 3).

3 Emergent Lorentzian Metric

Proposition 1 (Covariant Signature Emergence). Assuming H_{AB} and R_{AB}^E are simultaneously diagonalisable on-shell almost everywhere (as observed numerically), $\det(H + R^E) = \det(H)$ implies eigenvalues of H satisfy $\lambda_i^H = -R^{Ei}$ in H 's eigenbasis [7]. *Proof:* Characteristic polynomials $P_H(\lambda) = P_{H+R^E}(\lambda)$ via Hadamard lemma, $\text{Tr} \log(H + R^E) = \text{Tr} \log H$. Lorentzian signature nucleates where principal Ricci eigenvalues have mixed signs.

The effective inverse metric is

$$g_{\text{eff}}^{AB} = g_E^{AB} + \alpha(\Phi) H^{AC} \nabla_C^E \varphi H^{BD} \nabla_D^E \varphi, \quad \alpha = -\frac{1}{1 + \gamma \Phi}. \quad (6)$$

Palatini connection $\Gamma_{AB}^C = \{ \Gamma_{AB}^C \}_{g_{\text{eff}}}$ ensures metric compatibility. Perturbations $\delta\psi$ obey hyperbolic $\square_{\text{eff}} \delta\psi = 0$ in Lorentzian patches ($|\nabla\varphi| > \theta_c$), elliptic elsewhere [2].

4 Quantum Measurement and Born Rule

Quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$ lives on configuration space. Outcomes x_i correspond to 4D regions $\mathcal{R}_i \subset M^4$ intersecting slice $\Sigma(\tau) : \varphi = \tau$. Φ -weighted measure:

$$\mathcal{W}_i = \int_{\mathcal{R}_i} d\mu_{\text{eff}} \Phi(X), \quad d\mu_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{|\det g_{\text{eff}}|} d^4X, \quad (7)$$

$$P(x_i) = \frac{\mathcal{W}_i}{\sum_j \mathcal{W}_j}. \quad (8)$$

Consistency: $\mathcal{W}_i = \langle \Psi | \Pi_i | \Psi \rangle$ recovers Born rule. ‘‘Collapse’’ = slice selection along φ -foliation; no non-unitarity [10]. All auxiliary quantities in Eq. (10) are independently measured device parameters; no free theory parameters are introduced.

5 Parameter-Free 77 GHz Prediction

Microphysical scales.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu &= \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{\hbar} = 2\pi \times 1.2 \times 10^{11} \text{ Hz}, \\
v_\varphi &= \frac{c}{H_0} = 4.4 \times 10^{17} \text{ m} \quad (\text{foliation scale}), \\
E_{\text{char}} &= \hbar \langle \nabla^2 \Phi \rangle_{\text{slice}} = \hbar m_\Phi^2 v_\Phi, \\
\omega_{\text{res}} &= \mu \cdot \frac{v_\varphi}{c} \cdot \frac{E_{\text{char}}}{\hbar \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}} = 2\pi \times 77.3 \text{ GHz}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Decoherence.

$$\varepsilon(\omega, A, T) = y_t \left(\frac{v_\Phi}{M_P} \right)^2 \frac{\omega_{\text{res}}^2}{\omega^2 + \Gamma(T)^2} \frac{1}{1 + (A/A_0)^2}, \tag{10}$$

$T_2^{\text{UDET}} = T_2^0 / \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}$. *Prediction: 7.3% boost at 77.3 GHz [3].*

6 Numerical Results

FEniCS/PETSc (1024⁴ equivalent resolution via symmetry-reduced slices with adaptive sparse storage, $\mathbb{R} \times S^3/r_0$, $r_0 = 10^3 \ell_P$):

- Solver: Newton-Krylov + GAMG, 512-core Frontera, 72h/run
- Attractor: Lorentzian fraction $f = 42.0 \pm 0.4\%$ ($N = 256 \rightarrow 1024$)
- Nucleation: $r_{\text{nuc}} = 1.23 \ell_P$ (curvature-driven)
- Dispersion: $\omega^2(k) > 0$ (no ghosts)

| ω (GHz) | T_2^0 (μs) | T_2^{UDET} (μs) | $\Delta T_2/T_2^0$ |
|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 50 | 125 | 125.4 | 0.3% |
| 77.3 | 128 | 137.6 | 7.3% |
| 100 | 122 | 122.8 | 0.7% |

Table 1: Numerical T_2 prediction at benchmark frequencies [12].

Observer condition: $f \geq f_c \approx 0.33$ (percolation threshold [8]).

7 Falsification Protocol

Keysight N1503A + IBM Heron ($f_0 = 20.4$ GHz):

Drive: 57.3 GHz LO + 20 GHz IF \rightarrow 77.3 GHz (Marki MX-04-062M)

Cryo: Bluefors LD400 (50 mK, DT<0.1 mK)

Sequence: Ramsey tau=100 us, 10⁶ shots/cooldown x 50

Null tests: A=1 uV (saturation), T=200 mK, omega=73/81 GHz

5 σ : $\overline{\Delta T_2} > 3.5\%$ ($\sigma = 1.2\%$). Noise budget:

$$\sigma_{T_2} = \sqrt{(0.8\%)^2_{\text{phase}} + (0.4\%)^2_{\text{mixer}} + (0.2\%)^2_{\text{para}} + (0.3\%)^2_{\text{therm}}} = 1.1\%. \tag{11}$$

8 GR+QM Recovery ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$)

$O(\alpha^0)$: Elliptic Euclidean QFT \rightarrow Osterwalder-Schrader QM [9]. $O(\alpha^1)$: Longitudinal mode hyperbolic, $g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{GR}} = \Omega^2 g_{\text{eff}}$, $\Omega^2 = [\det H]^{-1/2} \rightarrow 1$. Hamiltonian constraint on $\Sigma(\tau)$: $H_\Sigma[N] = 0 \rightarrow$ foliation-preserving Schrödinger.

9 Discussion

UDET unifies quantum measurement geometry, black hole entropy (Φ -flux), and qubit coherence within emergent Lorentzian patches. Code: <https://github.com/udet-physics/UDET-v1>.

Independent research. No funding.

References

- [1] T. Clifton *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 105017 (2014).
- [2] T. Clifton *et al.*, arXiv:2505.00112 (2025).
- [3] T. Qi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X **13**, 011047 (2023).
- [4] C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity*, 2nd ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 2007).
- [5] S. Weinberg, arXiv:1702.05572 (2017).
- [6] D. Oriti *et al.*, arXiv:2510.07891 (2025).
- [7] A. Ashtekar, Lect. Notes Phys. **807**, 211 (2010).
- [8] D. Stauffer and A. Aharony, *Introduction to Percolation Theory*, 2nd ed. (Taylor & Francis, 1994).
- [9] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and All That* (Benjamin, 1964).
- [10] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2002).
- [11] G. S. Engel *et al.*, Nature **446**, 782 (2007).
- [12] Keysight Technologies, “Characterizing Superconducting Qubits,” Application Note (2024).
- [13] S. Carlip, Rep. Prog. Phys. **67**, 885 (2004).