

**A THEORY OF EMERGENT QUANTUM MECHANICS AND  
CLASSICAL EMERGENT GRAVITY**

Ricardo Gallego Torromé

Departamento de Matemática  
Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brazil

ABSTRACT. A type of regular Hamiltonian dynamical systems are considered as candidates for deterministic mathematical models of physical systems whose dynamics happen at a fundamental scale. Quantum systems are viewed as emergent systems from the fundamental degrees of freedom. The laws and rules of quantum mechanics are understood as an effective description, valid for the emergent systems and specially useful to handle probabilistic predictions of observables. After introducing the geometric theory of Hamilton-Randers spaces and reformulating it using Hilbert space theory *à la Koopman-von Neumann*, a Hilbert space structure is constructed from the Hilbert space formulation of the underlying Hamilton-Randers model and associated with the space of wave functions of quantum mechanical systems. In the general framework of this theory we can prove the emergence of the Born rule from ergodic considerations. A geometric mechanism for a natural spontaneous collapse of the quantum states based on the concentration of measure phenomena as it appears in metric geometry, is discussed. The conditions for the existence of concentration of measure are also fundamental to show the existence of stable vacua states for the quantized matter Hamiltonian. Another consequence of the concentration of measure is the emergence of a weak equivalence principle for one of the dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom. This fact, together with the existence in the theory of a maximal coordinate speed in a class of coordinate systems and the property of diffeomorphism invariance of the interaction driving the reduction of the quantum state, suggests that the reduction of the quantum state is driven by a gravitational type interaction. Moreover, since such interaction appears only in the dynamical domain when localization of quantum observables happens, it must be classical. Then it is shown that the operators associated with quantum observables follow the Heisenberg's equation of dynamics for matter. We discuss the double slit experiment in the context of the framework proposed, the interference phenomena in associated with a quantum system in an external gravitational potential, a mechanism explaining non-quantum locality and also provide an argument in favour of an emergent interpretation of every macroscopic time parameter. Entanglement is partially described in the context of Hamilton-Randers theory and how naturally Bell's inequalities should be violated, despite that the fundamental dynamics is deterministic and local in a radical sense.

**Keywords.** Emergent quantum mechanics, emergent gravity, emergence of the weak equivalence principle, diffeomorphism invariance, generalized Hamilton spaces, Randers spaces, maximal acceleration, concentration of measure, ergodicity, break of ergodicity, natural spontaneous collapse of the quantum state wave function, quantum measurement, quantum non-locality, number theory and quantum mechanics.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Motivation	1
1.2. Structure of the work	3
2. Assumptions for deterministic dynamical models at a fundamental scale	7
2.1. Non-reversibility at a fundamental level	7
2.2. Asymmetric metric structures	11
2.3. Causal structure	12
2.4. Characteristics of the fundamental dynamical systems	12
2.5. Remarks on the assumptions	13
2.6. Maximal proper acceleration	16
3. Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems	19
3.1. Geometric framework	19
3.2. Measure and metric structures	21
3.3. Deterministic dynamics for the ontological degrees of freedom	23
3.4. Notion of Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems	23
3.5. Interpretation of the $t$ -time parameter and the semi-period $T$	26
3.6. Emergence of the quantum energy-time relation	27
3.7. Properties of the $U_t$ flow	28
3.8. $t$ -time inversion operation	29
3.9. The $U_t$ flow Hamiltonian function	30
3.10. Notion of external time parameter $\tau$	31
3.11. On the relation between fundamental periods and primes	33
3.12. Further remarks on the notion of time in Hamilton-Randers theory	34
3.13. Generalities on the bare $U_\tau$ flow	35
3.14. Redefinition of the $\tau$ -time parameter and $U_t$ flow	37
3.15. A fundamental result in Hamilton-Randers theory	38
3.16. Macroscopic observers and metric structures	38
4. Hilbert space formulation of Hamilton-Randers systems	40
4.1. Hilbert space formulation of classical systems applied to Hamilton-Randers systems	40
4.2. Quantum Hamiltonian associated to a Hamilton-Randers system and the associated Heisenberg dynamics	42
4.3. Sub-quantum operators and quantum mechanical operators	44
4.4. Non-commutativity of the spacetime suggested by Hamilton-Randers Theory	45
4.5. On the operator interpretation of coordinate time	45
5. Rudiments of the quantum mechanics formalism from Hamilton-Randers systems	47
5.1. Quantum Hilbert space from Hamilton-Randers systems	47
5.2. Representations of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom	50
5.3. Emergence of the Born rule in the Heisenberg representation of the dynamics	50
5.4. Physical interpretation of the density $n^2(x)$	52

5.5.	Emergence of the classical $\tau$ -time diffeomorphism invariant constraint	53
5.6.	Heuristic proof that a free quantum state is a Hamilton-Randers system	53
5.7.	An example of interaction in Hamilton-Randers models	54
6.	Concentration of measure and measurement processes in Hamilton-Randers systems	56
6.1.	Concentration of measure	56
6.2.	Natural spontaneous collapse as concentration of measure phenomena	58
6.3.	Fundamental and highest quantum scale	59
6.4.	Notion of classical and quantum interaction	60
6.5.	Notion of natural spontaneous quantum state reduction	60
6.6.	Emergence of the classical domain	61
7.	Hamiltonian bound mechanism, the emergence of the weak equivalence principle and classical gravitational interaction	62
7.1.	Bound of the matter Hamiltonian	62
7.2.	Emergence of a weak equivalence principle in Hamilton-Randers theory	66
7.3.	On the fundamental scale and its relation with the validity of the weak equivalence principle	71
7.4.	On the emergent origin of the gravitational interaction	72
7.5.	Existence of a domain where gravity is 1-Lipschitz continuous	73
7.6.	Heisenberg dynamics of quantum observables	74
8.	Some conceptual problems in quantum mechanics from the point of view of Hamilton-Randers theory	76
8.1.	The two slit quantum experiment and its interpretation in Hamilton-Randers Theory	76
8.2.	Quantum interferometry in presence of an external gravitational field	80
8.3.	On the non-local quantum correlations	81
8.4.	On the emergence and ontological nature of the $\tau$ -time parameters	82
8.5.	Entangle states and correlations between sub-quantum degrees of freedom	84
8.6.	Measurement of observable using an entangled state	87
9.	Several further discussion. Open problems of the Hamilton-Randers theory	89
9.1.	Comparing Hamilton-Randers theory with others deterministic theories of quantum mechanics	89
9.2.	Comparison of Hamilton-Randers theory and de Broglie-Bohm theory	91
9.3.	Comparison of the gravitational theory in Hamilton-Randers theory with other theories of classical emergent gravity	92
9.4.	Formal predictions of the Hamilton-Randers theory	92
9.5.	Open problems in Hamilton-Randers theory	93
	Epilogue of the first part of Hamilton-Randers theory	97
	Acknowledgements	98



## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Motivation.** After the advent of general relativity, spacetime is dynamical, being affected and that affects the dynamics of matter fields. This is in sharp contrast with the usual description that quantum mechanics offers of physical phenomena, where the back-ground spacetime structure is fixed. Therefore, being general relativity and quantum mechanics theories aimed to be of universal validity, it could be expected that predictions associated to general relativity and in direct conflict with predictions of quantum mechanical models. Such problematic situation should be superseded by a consistent unified theory. It is strongly believed by many that such theory must be a quantum mechanical theory of gravity and that such quantum gravity theory will solve the singularities arising in general relativity.

Several research programs have been explored in the way to solve the incompatibility problem between general relativity and the quantum theory. Among them, string theory, loop quantum gravity are the most popular. However, despite these programs are based upon very attractive ideas, it is also accepted that they still do not provide a fully consistent and predictive picture of physical reality and are not yet completed in their respective programs and results. Hence it is safe to say that the problem of finding a consistent theory merging quantum mechanics and general relativity or suitable modifications of them is still elusive and remain open.

On the other hand, to find a consistent spacetime representation for the quantum measurement processes, the non-local quantum correlation phenomena and a geometric understanding of quantum entanglement appears as a remarkably difficult task, which lacks of satisfactory solution since the advent of quantum mechanics. In the case of the quantum measurement processes this is not surprising, since the standard *collapse postulate* of quantum mechanics involves the instantaneous reduction of the wave packet in each quantum measurement. A postulate that assumes the existence of instantaneous collapse processes is clearly against the spirit of the special and general theories of the relativity [23] and more generally, of a geometric spacetime representation of a process. This is even if theoretically one can not use such instantaneous processes and correlations to send information. One can ask always what are such correlations and for a mechanism behind them.

One cannot convincingly argue that quantum field theory provides an unification of relativity and quantum mechanics. The formal unification of quantum mechanics and special relativity achieved by relativistic quantum field theory, apart from the serious problems of mathematical consistency and rigorous mathematical formulation of the theory itself, excludes the description of quantum measurement processes. Moreover, the principles of general relativity are absent in current formulations of quantum field theory. Indeed, since general relativity supersedes special relativity as a description of spacetime arena, the theory to be unified with quantum mechanics is not special relativity but general relativity. The problem of the spacetime representation of quantum entanglement phenomena and quantum measurement processes is related with the logical and mathematical structure of

the quantum theory, with the ontological interpretation of the quantum physical processes and with the origin of spacetime and gravity.

The above possibility makes interesting to investigate alternative ways of understanding quantum mechanical phenomenology and gravity. A possible line of research is suggested under the common spell of *emergent quantum mechanics*. These theories share the common assumption that although quantum mechanics provides a very successful description of a physical system and phenomena, there is an underlying more radical level of physical reality from where quantum mechanics is obtained as an effective description. This situation could be analogous to the relation between thermodynamics and classical statistical mechanics [1, 26]. An specific sub-class of theories for emergent quantum mechanics are such that the degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale are deterministic and local [13, 24, 29, 34, 38, 56]. However, a fundamental difficulty in such approaches is that the associated Hamiltonian operators, being linear in the momentum operators, are not bounded from below. Therefore, in order to ensure the existence of stable minimal energy states, a natural requirement to the construction of viable quantum models of matter, a mechanism is need to stabilize the vacuum . One of the mechanism proposed in the literature involves a dissipative dynamics at the fundamental Planck scale [13, 24, 38]. It has been argued that the gravitational interaction plays an essential role as the origin of the information loss dynamics and must be present at the level of the fundamental scale. However, gravitational interaction could be a classical and emergent phenomenon s well, absent at the fundamental scale where it is assumed that the dynamics of the microscopic fundamental degrees of freedom takes place [43, 60]. In this case, it is not very natural to appeal from the beginning to gravity as the origin of the dissipation of information at a fundamental level.

A fundamental difficulty of deterministic quantum models for physics at the fundamental scale is the relation between the degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale and the degrees of freedom at the quantum scales, that includes not only the degrees of freedom of the standard model of particles or unification quantum field gauge theories but also, atomic and hadronic scales, for instance. Examples of models that can be described as deterministic models have been discussed in the literature. In particular, it was shown that massless non-interacting 4-dimensional first quantized Dirac neutrino particle can be identified with a deterministic system and that the free  $(1 + 1)$ -bosonic quantum field models and several string models can be interpreted as deterministic quantum models (see the recent publication [41] and references there). Such examples show that to describe the dynamics of non-trivial quantum systems as deterministic dynamical systems is at least feasible. A theory of emergent quantum mechanics has been constructed based on cellular automaton models [25, 41].

This work is the first part of a projected work on the foundations of quantum mechanics. It is based on the ideas first exposed in n deterministic systems as models for quantum mechanics [29] but supersedes it in several aspects. In [29] it was shown that any first order ordinary dynamical system with maximal speed and acceleration can be described using Hilbert space techniques, by a particular

application of Koopman-von Neumann theory of dynamical systems [47, 61]. In the present work it is shown how the fundamental elements of the quantum mechanical formalism are either derived from the underlying formalism of an specific type of deterministic dynamical models. Moreover, it is argued how an interaction with formal similarities with classical gravity emerges in Hamilton-Randers systems, in combination with the principle of *concentration of measure* as it appears in probability theory and metric geometry [35, 48, 59]. This interaction causes natural spontaneous collapse of the sub-quantum state. In contraposition with induced processes as in spontaneous collapse models [32, 31] and gravity induced collapse models [21, 50], in our theory the collapse of the quantum state is not necessarily induced by the measurement device and happens spontaneously and all the  $\tau$ -time, in a process of classical emergence. This emergence origin of the macroscopic states solves the measurement problem: at any macroscopic instant time the value of any observable is defined. The process of emergence is such that they also the characteristic quantum jumps can happen.

The way of how the emergent mechanism avoids Bell's inequalities depends on the assumptions on the dynamics and also, the particular use of Koopman-von Neumann theory. Indeed, the theory exposed in this work is build up on a new notion of time.

It is worthily to remark that the present state of our work is far from being in complete form. Several fundamental elements of the theory are far from being realized in the form of particular models and still are on the sphere of the assumptions. There are also many assumptions in the construction of the theory, indication that the theory is still far from being mature. Among the elements that need much more deep treatment let us mention the construction of concrete models for the underlying dynamics, a precise theory of emergent gravity and a development of connection between the underlying dynamics and elements of number theory. Thus our work is more a program that a complete develop body, although we will call it theory. Despite this incompleteness, we manage to describe falsifiable predictions of the whole theory.

**1.2. Structure of the work.** This work is organized in three parts. In the first part, which is developed in *section 2*, there is an heuristic introduction of the fundamental assumptions of the theory. This includes the introduction of the notion of asymmetric metric as a mathematical implementation of non-reversibility of the dynamical laws at the fundamental scale. This notion of metric is introduced first in a general way. The non-reversibility is justified from a naturalness point of view. Then a collection of assumptions for the degrees of freedom of our models and their dynamics are formulated. In particular properties associated with causality, determinism and locality of the dynamics of the systems that will be investigated in this work are introduced. Then it is argued heuristically that under such assumptions, there must exist a maximal proper acceleration. These conditions implies modification of the geometry [30]. In any case, the collection of assumption in which our theory is built on should not be seen as an axiomatic.



The second part of this work begins at *section 3* and expands until *section 5*. It describes the fundamental mathematical structure of Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems and the reconstruction of several fundamental notions of the mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics from Hamilton-Randers systems. *Section 3* provides a short exposition of generalized Hamilton spaces of Randers type. After a first step towards symmetrization of the dynamics, we show the relation of Hamilton geometry of Randers type with a specific type of dynamical systems described by first order ordinary differential equations. The particular case elaborated here are what we have called Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems (in short, HR-systems) and constitute our models for the dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom at the Planck scale.

An specific particularity of the dynamical systems is that they have a double dynamics  $U_t$  and  $U_\tau$ . This is similar to the situation with fast/slow dynamical systems, but here both dynamics and time parameters are formally independent from each other (there is no a bijection between them). This is of fundamental importance for the theory developed in this work, since our interpretation of the quantum phenomena relies on this double dynamics. Special care has been taken in uncover the notion of 2-dimensional time associated to the two dimensional parameter  $(t, \tau)$ . The existence of maximal acceleration and speed in HR-system is then shown. It is discussed the notion of emergence of the  $\tau$ -time, the need of external time diffeomorphism invariance of the theory and the relation of the fundamental cycles with the structure of prime numbers. As a consequence, a natural interpretation of the energy-time quantum relation emerges. In *Section 4*, a formulation of HR-systems by means of Hilbert space theory is described. This approach is an application of Koopman-von Neumann theory of dynamical systems defined in a tangent space manifold as the configuration space. This formalism allows to describe classical dynamical systems using quantum mechanical techniques. *Section 5* is devoted to the theoretical construction of the quantum states from the original degrees of freedom of the underlying HR-systems. This is carried out using the formalism of Hilbert spaces for Hamilton-Randers systems discussed in *section 4*. The transition from the description in terms of discrete degrees of freedom associated with HR-systems to continuous degrees of freedom associated with quantum wave functions is natural, if the difference between the fundamental scale and the quantum scale is large. We use the continuous formalism through this work. As a consequence of the theory a constructive approach to the quantum wave function is discussed. The construction admits a natural probabilistic interpretation and the associated quantum Hilbert space from the underlying HR-system structures is discussed. In particular we show how the Born rule in the Heisenberg picture of the dynamics of fundamental states emerges. It is also shown how the quantum  $\tau$ -time diffeomorphism invariance emerges from the fundamental  $\tau$ -time diffeomorphism invariance discussed in *section 3*.

The third part of the work presents the application of fundamental notions of metric geometry to the dynamics of HR-systems and its consequences in the form of

a theory of quantum measurement, a theory of emergent gravity and a theory of non-local quantum correlations. In *section 6* we apply the concentration of measure to introduce the natural spontaneous collapse of the wave function. This hypothetical process is somehow analogous to the spontaneous collapse of the quantum states that happen in collapse models [32, 31], but its origin, mechanism and mathematical explanation and formulation are rather different than such well known models. The main difference is that in our theory the *collapse of the state* happens spontaneously, independently of the interaction or not with another measurement device and not induced by it. It is of fundamental importance for our picture, since it defines the emergence of many observable magnitudes. In *section 7* it is shown how the Hamiltonian of a HR-system can be decomposed in a 1-Lipschitz continuous piece plus an additional non-Lipschitz piece. It is argued in general terms that the non-Lipschitz term should be associated to the matter Hamiltonian. This property is used to discuss a natural mechanism to bound from below the quantum Hamiltonian operator for matter in HR-systems. After this we discuss how a property that can be identified with the weak equivalence principle emerges in Hamilton-Randers theory by application of concentration of measure to a natural notion of *free falling systems*. Partially as a consequence of this discovery we argue that classical gravity can be interpreted as an emergent interaction. Therefore, the mechanism to stabilize the vacuum states of the matter Hamiltonian and the mechanism that produce the emergence of physical observable reality are related with classical gravity. But also, by the same mechanism that originates the emergence of the gravitational interaction, it is argued that gravity is classical and not a quantum interaction. The meaning of fundamental scale is discussed within the framework of Hamilton-Randers theory. It is also argued in *section 7* that the dynamics of observables are determined by the Heisenberg equation of motion for the matter Hamiltonian.

In *Section 8* several fundamental issues of quantum mechanics are discussed. It is first considered the quantum interference phenomena in the form of the *ideal quantum double slit experiment* [27], first without considering the gravitational field and then followed by a discussion of the gravitationally induced quantum interference experiments [18, 19, 53]. Then we show how non-locality emerges in Hamilton-Randers theory as a consequence of the projection mechanism from the 2-time description to the 1-time description in the mathematical formalism. The interpretation of entangled states and how Bell's inequalities should be violated in our theory is discussed, even if the complete description of the fundamental double dynamics is local. Finally, it is shown the emergent character of external time parameter. In *section 9*, the relation of our theory with other emergent quantum mechanical frameworks is briefly mentioned. Specifically, we discuss our theory and its relation with Bohmian mechanics and G.'t Hooft Cellular Automaton Theory. The main motivation has been an aim of clarification of our ideas to the reader by comparing them with current well known emergent theories. We also briefly discuss our suggestion of emergent gravity with Verlinde's suggestion with the same aim. We show that some criticism of Verlinde's theory [44] in principle are not applicable

to ours, since our theory of emergent classical gravity is not an entropic type gravitational theory. We also discuss possible falsifiable tests of the theory presented here. Finally, several open problems of our approach are briefly discussed. The most pre-eminent problem in our approach are concrete realizations of fundamental  $U_t$  flow and the relation between the non-Lipschitz piece of the Hamiltonian and conventional matter Hamiltonian. This is also related with the effective construction of quantum models as effective description of quantum mechanics.

## 2. ASSUMPTIONS FOR DETERMINISTIC DYNAMICAL MODELS AT A FUNDAMENTAL SCALE

In this section we introduce the elements and fundamental properties that we assume on the dynamical systems for the fundamental scale. The exposition is formal but not axiomatic. We do not fully discuss the logical dependence between the different assumptions and structures. This is not the goal of this work. We expose these assumptions in an open and clear way with the hope to clarify the starting points of our theory, still a working project. We hope that this procedure will also allow to understand which modifications of the theory are needed in the future. Indeed, it could be that in a more detailed and deep treatment a simplification of the presentation could be achieved.

**2.1. Non-reversibility at a fundamental level.** Prior to the introduction of our mathematical framework, we find useful to our purposes first briefly consider the following question,

*Is the dynamical evolution of fundamental systems at the fundamental scale reversible or non-reversible?*

A standard answer to the above question could be along the following lines. Although the standard model of particles is slightly not time inversion invariant, the dynamics of the model is reversible, since processes in both directions of time evolution are allowed, even if the probability transitions are different under time inversion. Supporting this reversible point of view of the dynamics there is the fact that general relativity provides a timeless description of the universe. In general relativity, there is no fundamental notion of time, events are represented by points of a four spacetime manifold  $M_4$  and the physical observables are insensitive to time diffeomorphisms.

The above arguments provide evidence that the fundamental laws of physics should be reversible. Otherwise, one will need to explain such highly successful reversible dynamical models and theories (standard model, general relativity,...) from non-reversible models and provide a mechanism for the emergence of reversibility of the dynamics<sup>1</sup>.

Despite the above argument, we think that the question of reversibility/non-reversibility for the dynamical laws of fundamental scales is still open. In order to motivate our point, let us remark that if the dynamical systems are to be constructed from scratch, as it is our purpose of the present work, the question on the reversibility/non-reversibility must be considered first, since depending on the assumption that one adopts, the mathematical structure of the theory shapes the physical content of the theory in different ways.

Indeed, it could be possible that even if our current laws of physics are reversible, the conjectured fundamental laws beneath quantum mechanics could be

---

<sup>1</sup>This problem is the converse to the classical problem of deriving the second law or a physical thermodynamical arrow of time from reversible dynamical laws.

non-reversible, maybe providing a natural explanation for the time evolution of the physical systems and universe. This is a rather speculative topic but essential in the construction from scratch of the fundamental dynamics. Therefore, we would like to have a criteria to decide which option is more natural from a formal point of view.

In order to discuss this problems it could be useful precise notion for reversible and of non-reversible dynamical evolution laws. The notion must be applicable to the dynamics of what we will declare as fundamental systems. A proposal for such general notion is developed in the following lines. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the *configuration space* of the dynamical system. It can be either a discrete set, a smooth manifold or a topological manifold, for instance. We will consider the discrete/continuous character of  $\mathcal{M}$  later when we discuss a specific class of dynamical models. The time parameters used in the description of the fundamental dynamics are defined in the ordered field [43]  $(\mathbb{K}, +, \cdot)$ .  $\mathbb{K}$  can be the field of real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  but it can also be a discrete ordered field such as the field of rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , for instance. The existence of the inverse operation for the binary operation  $\cdot : \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  is required in order to ensure the possibility of incremental quotients or derivatives. In this context, we propose the following

**Definition 2.1.** *A dynamics is a map*

$$\Phi : \widehat{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}, \quad (t, u) \mapsto \Phi_t(u)$$

such that

$$\Phi_{t_1} \circ \Phi_{t_2} = \Phi_{t_1+t_2}, \quad t_1, t_2 \in \widehat{\mathbb{K}},$$

where  $\Phi_t = \Phi(t, \cdot)$  and  $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{K}$ .

Since there is defined an order relation in  $\mathbb{K}$ , there is an induced order relation in  $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$ . Time evolutions from  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  to  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  along  $\Phi$  can be defined and a chronological order can be attached to the evolution. Note that  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \widehat{\mathbb{K}}}$  does not necessarily defines a group of transformations of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Thus in general, the set  $\{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \widehat{\mathbb{K}}}$  defines a semi-group of transformations of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Our definition of the fundamental dynamical systems assumes the existence of a time parameter, which is an ordered subset  $\widehat{\mathbb{K}}$  of  $\mathbb{K}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is the configuration space of the dynamical system. Indeed, we will impose an invariance of the observable quantities respect to the choice of the time parameter. Thus although for the description of the dynamics the introduction of time parameters is necessary, the theory will be constrained by time diffeomorphism invariance<sup>2</sup>.

The *conjugated dynamics* of  $\Phi$  is a map  $\Phi^c : \mathbb{K} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  such that if  $\Phi(t, A) = B$ , then  $\Phi^c(t, B) = A$ .

**Definition 2.2.** *Let  $M$  be a topological space. A dynamics  $\Phi : \mathbb{K} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is non-reversible if:*

- *There exists a map  $\Omega : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{K}}$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathbb{K}} \subset \mathbb{K}$ ,*
- *There is a time reversed map  $\Omega^c : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{K}}$ .*

---

<sup>2</sup>Also the theory will be invariant under spacetime diffeomorphism.

- *The relation*

$$(2.1) \quad \Xi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}, A \mapsto \sup_{X \in \mathcal{U}_A} \left\{ \lim_{X \rightarrow A, X^c \rightarrow A} (\Omega(X, A) - \Omega^c(A, X^c)) \right\} \neq 0$$

holds good for  $X = \Phi(t, A)$  and  $X^c = \Phi^c(A, t)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and where  $\mathcal{U}_A$  is an open neighborhood containing the point  $A$ .

Note that the number field  $\mathbb{K}$  does not need to be a continuous number field, but must allow for the notions of limits  $X \rightarrow A$  and  $X^c \rightarrow A$ . For example, the field of real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  and the discrete field of rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$  have well defined notions of limits.

If the condition (2.1) holds good for some scalar functions  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega^c$  in the whole domain  $\widehat{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathcal{M}$  we say that the dynamics described by the map  $\Phi$  is non-reversible. If there are no such functions  $\Omega, \Omega^c$  for a given open domain  $\mathcal{U}_A$ , then the dynamics is reversible locally at  $A$ . If the function is reversible for  $A \in \mathcal{U}$ , then we say that the function is reversible locally in the open set  $\mathcal{U}$ .

**Example 2.3.** Let  $(D_2, F)$  be a Finsler space [7], where  $D_2$  is the two dimensional disc and  $\mathbb{K}$  is the field of real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$ . For two infinitesimally close points  $A, X \in D_2$ , we consider the limits

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \Omega(X, A) &= \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \int_A^{X(s)} F(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) dt, \\ \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \Omega^c(X, A) &= \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \int_{X(s)}^A F(\tilde{\gamma}, -\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

The dynamics  $\Phi$  is given by the geodesic flow. Thus the parameterized curves  $\gamma$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}$  are geodesics, where  $\gamma$  is a curve joining  $A$  and  $X$  and realizing the minimal distance (and similarly for  $\tilde{\gamma}$ ). The local existence of such geodesics is guaranteed by Whitehead theorem [63]. However, these pair of geodesics are not related as in Riemannian geometry by  $\tilde{\gamma}(s) = \gamma(1-s)$ ,  $s \in [0, 1]$ , since in general the Finsler metric  $F$  is not reversible. We can consider the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi(A) &= \sup_{X \in \mathcal{U}_A} \left\{ \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \Omega(A, X) - \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \Omega^c(X, A) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \int_A^X (F(\gamma, \dot{\gamma}) - F(\tilde{\gamma}, -\dot{\tilde{\gamma}})) dt \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \Omega(A, X) - \Omega^c(X, A) = F(A, V) - F(A, -V)$$

along a given geodesic  $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$  passing through  $A$  and  $B$  and such that

$$\gamma(0) = A = \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \tilde{\gamma}, \quad \dot{\gamma}(0) = V = - \lim_{X \rightarrow A} \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}.$$

This example is related with the notion of reversibility function in Finsler geometry [51], which is a measure the non-reversibility of a Finsler metric.

The construction of *Example 2.3* in the case when  $(M, F)$  is a Riemannian structure, providing a reversible dynamics. In this case the dynamics is just the geodesic flow and  $\Omega(A, X) - \Omega^c(X, A) = 0$  along  $\Phi$ . Another non-trivial type of reversible dynamics is discussed in the following

**Example 2.4.** *The electroweak interaction of the standard model of particle physics violates the CP-symmetry. By the CPT-theorem, it must exist a slight violation of T-symmetry invariance. In particular, the transition amplitudes for processes under T-inversion have different probability than the initial amplitudes. However, in the limit  $\tau_A \rightarrow \tau_B$  the unitary evolution operators converge to the identity, before and after application of T-inversion operation. Henceforth, the corresponding limit (2.1) that one can define for any continuous observable in time evolution is zero. Since all the observables in quantum field theory follow continuous equations of motion (Heisenberg equations), it turns out that the electroweak dynamics is a reversible dynamics in the sense of definition (2.2). The same conclusion follows for any relativistic field theory whose observables obey Heisenberg equations. In particular, gauge theories are reversible dynamics in the sense of (2.2).*

Now that we have on hand a definition of non-reversible dynamics, let us discuss the reasons to postulate that the dynamics of fundamental systems should be non-reversible. This is because the notion of reversibility/non-reversibility that we are considering is attached to the possibility of defining a function  $\Omega$  with the property (2.1). If one finds such functions  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega^c$  one can provide a dynamical arrow of time by the following criteria:

**Definition 2.5.** *Given a non-reversible dynamics  $\Phi : \mathbb{K} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and the functions  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega^c$ , a dynamical arrow of time is the choice of a sign for the difference in the expression (2.1), where  $X = \Phi(t, A)$  and  $X^c = \Phi^c(A, t)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

Given a non-reversible dynamics as in 2.2, the sign of the function (2.1) is well defined, at least on local domains of  $\mathbb{K} \times \mathcal{M}$ . The existence of a dynamical arrow of time with constant sign defined in the whole configuration space  $\mathcal{M}$  is a non-trivial requirement. For example, for a non-reversible Finsler space, it is not guaranteed the uniformity of the sign in the difference (2.2) on the whole  $D_2$ . However, in this case, one can reduce the domain to the region with a given constant sign for the function  $\Xi$ .

The first supporting argument to consider that non-reversible dynamics as more natural than reversible dynamics is the fact that non-reversible dynamics are more general objects. Indeed, for the dynamical systems that we will consider, given the non-reversible dynamics, one can construct a reversible dynamics by *symmetrization*, a procedure that we will use for Hamilton-Randers models later. This argument can be applied to both, continuous and discrete dynamics.

There is a second argument supporting a non-reversible character of the underlying fundamental dynamics, at least if continuous models are considered. It is based in the ubiquity of the Finsler metrics in the category of differentiable manifolds. Finsler structures are natural in the sense that they can be defined on

any manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  with enough regularity and with some other additional natural topological conditions. This can be seen quite easily for metrics with Euclidean signature, where a Finsler structure of Randers type can be constructed from the Riemannian metric arising naturally from the atlas structure (see for instance [62]) plus additional conditions to ensure the existence of globally defined vector fields. For the case of Finsler spacetimes, one can follow a similar strategy but this case it is necessary to consider the topological restrictions that allow the definition of an underlying Lorentzian metric, from which it is deformed to a Randers type metric by the introduction of a vector field. In the case of metric with Euclidean signature a non-reversible dynamics is naturally defined on  $\mathcal{M}$ , namely, the geometric flow corresponding to the averaging process of the Finsler metric [28]. The final result of this dynamics is a Riemannian metric and the process itself is information loss, since many different Finsler metric evolve to the same Riemannian metric by such flows. This intrinsically defines an irreversible dynamics. Furthermore, in order to extend this argument to the case of interest for us, the extension of the flow to metrics with indefinite signature must be defined. This is an open current problem in the theory of averaging Finsler structures.

A consequence of the non-reversibility of the underlying fundamental dynamics is the emergent character of the physical systems that a macroscopic observer have direct access. This is manifest in several ways, probably the most stringent is the emergent character of the notion of time and of quantum system. Although this conclusion cannot serve as a motivation, it answers the question of the nature of arrow of time.

**2.2. Asymmetric metric structures.** The previous discussion on the neutrality of the non-reversibility property of dynamics and the *example 2.3* suggest to consider the following type of structures,

**Definition 2.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{T}$  be a set. An asymmetric topological metric is a function  $\varrho : \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  such that*

- (1)  $\varrho(u, v) \geq 0$ , for each  $u, v \in \mathbf{T}$ ,
- (2)  $\varrho(u, v) = 0$ , iff  $u = v \in \mathbf{T}$ ,
- (3)  $\varrho(u_a, u_c) \leq \varrho(u_a, u_b) + \varrho(u_b, u_c)$ , for each  $u_a, u_b, u_c \in \mathbf{T}$ .

Given an asymmetric metric structure, it is possible to define a topology on  $\mathbf{T}$  by considering the associated *open balls* and the corresponding topological basis.

The main difference of an asymmetric metric with an ordinary metric function is that the symmetry condition of metrics has been dropped out. Moreover, the existence of an asymmetric metric on  $\mathbf{T}$  implies the existence of a natural symmetrized metric on  $\mathbf{T}$ , namely

$$(2.3) \quad \varrho_+ : \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (u, v) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} (\varrho(u, v) + \varrho(v, u)).$$

There is also associated the skew-symmetric function

$$(2.4) \quad \varrho_- : \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (u, v) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} (\varrho(u, v) - \varrho(v, u)).$$



**2.3. Causal structure.** A related aspect that we need to consider for our dynamical systems is the existence of causal structures. A general way to introduce a precise notion of it is the following,

**Definition 2.7.** *Given the configuration space  $\mathcal{M}$ , a causal structure is a collection*

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} := \left\{ \mathcal{C}_u, u \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \subset \mathcal{M} \right\}$$

*of subsets  $\mathcal{C}_u \subset \mathcal{M}$  such that there is defined on each set  $\mathcal{C}_u$  an internal addition law  $+$  that makes each  $(\mathcal{C}_u, +)$  an abelian monoid.*

A typical example is the case when  $\mathcal{M}$  is a smooth manifold endowed with a Lorentzian metric and  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is the associated causal structure. Clearly, this prototypical case persuade us to do not consider a stronger version of the definition by substituting monoid by group structure.

There are other interesting examples. One of them is the case when  $\mathcal{M}$  is a *modulus* in the sense of [37], *Chapter 2* and there is defined in the moduli a partial order [43]. A non-trivial causal order is the case when  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \mathcal{M}$ .

**2.4. Characteristics of the fundamental dynamical systems.** The following assumptions will be considered and implemented in the investigation of the properties of dynamical systems describing the physics at the conjectured fundamental scale. Rather than a set of formal axioms, the assumptions below must be considered as requirements that constraint the structure of the dynamical systems. Basically, the assumptions below constraint the systems to be causal, deterministic, local (in certain sense that will be explained later) and non-reversible dynamical systems. The assumptions are categorized in three different classes, according to the level of description, although we start with a 0-assumption on the existence of a fundamental scale.

- A.0. There is a fundamental scale from where all physical systems emerge.
- **Assumptions on the metric and measure structures.**
  - A.1. There is a discrete *model topological space*  $M_4$  which is the arena where standard observers can locate macroscopic phenomena, characterized as points in  $M_4$ .
  - A.2. There is a topological *configuration space*  $\mathcal{M}$  which is endowed with an asymmetric metric structure  $(\mathcal{M}, \rho)$  as in *definition (2.6)* and with a probability measure  $\mu_P$ .
- **Assumptions on the ontological structure of the models.** The *physical degrees of freedom* are by definition the degrees of freedom represented in the Hamiltonian of the fundamental system.
  - A.3. The physical sub-quantum degrees of freedom are identical, undistinguishable degrees of freedom composed by two *sub-quantum atoms*. Since the sub-quantum degrees of freedom are composed, we call them *sub-quantum molecules*.
  - A.4. There is a natural minimal coordinate scale  $L_{min}$ , which is of the order of the inverse of the fundamental mass scale. It is the universal

minimal coordinate difference for events defined in any ideal, instantaneous inertial frame co-moving with a given sub-quantum molecule.

- **Assumptions on the dynamics.** A dynamics is a map as given by *definition 2.1*.
  - A.5. There is a fundamental geometric flow that, together with a Hamiltonian function for the fundamental degrees of freedom, determines the full dynamics of the Hamilton-Randers system.
  - A.6. The following *locality condition* holds: given a system  $\mathcal{S}$  corresponding to a collection of sub-quantum molecules, there is a smallest neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  with  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}$  such that for any  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \supset \mathcal{U}$  the dynamical effect of any action of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  are the same.
  - A.7. *Causality condition*: in the configuration space  $\mathcal{M}$ , there is a non-trivial causal structure where the physical degree of freedom live.
  - A.8. The fundamental flow at the fundamental scale is non-reversible.
  - A.9. The fundamental dynamics is sensitive to initial conditions and with the appearance of metastable domains in the long time evolution.

In this work, a class of dynamical systems (Hamilton-Randers systems) fulfilling the above assumptions and the application to reconstruct several aspects of the quantum mechanical formalism is investigated. We will show that Hamilton-Randers systems are suitable candidates to describe systems at the fundamental scale, since from the dynamics of the Hamilton-Randers systems one can recover the dynamical systems of quantum mechanics and most of the phenomenological properties of the quantum theory can be explained in terms of more clear geometric notions.

**2.5. Remarks on the assumptions.** Assumption A.0 is the fundamental idea of any emergent framework for quantum mechanics. Indeed, the idea of a fundamental scale is not natural for theories of emergent quantum mechanics. On the contrary, it is ubiquitous in many approaches to quantum gravity. Therefore, to take the existence of such scale that it is fundamental in some sense to be made precise by the theory must be taken by guaranteed without too many problems. Other thing is which is the fundamental scale. Usual quantum gravity theory put it the Planck scale. We will left open this issue until we have developed further our ideas. We will see that indeed this fundamental scale is related with the emergence of gravity.

The assumption A.2 on the existence of an asymmetric metric structure is useful for our constructions for several reasons. First, note that if an asymmetric metric structure is defined on  $\mathcal{M}$ , then there is a well defined topological structure on  $\mathcal{M}$ . In particular, there is defined a topology associated with the asymmetric metric function  $\varrho$ . In addition, the notions of Cauchy sequence and completeness associated to the asymmetric metric  $\varrho$  are well defined, although they are no symmetric structures. A similar situation happens for the analogous constructions in Finsler geometry [7]. Second, an asymmetric metric as fundamental metric structure of the configuration space  $\mathcal{M}$  can be used to describe the fundamental irreversible

dynamics and hence accommodate assumption A.8 by linking the dynamics with the metric structure of the fundamental configuration space.

The typical example of asymmetric metric in the category of smooth manifolds are Randers spaces, a class of geometries originally introduced by G. Randers in an attempt to describe the irreversibility of the universe as a fundamental property of the spacetime arena [52]. In this work the theory of *dual Randers spaces* is introduced and applied as models for deterministic, local, causal and non-reversible dynamics at the fundamental scale in a continuous approximated description. It is remarkable that the same insight of Randers is applied in a very different contest than the original theory.

Note that although the mathematical formulation of the theory that we present in this work is developed in terms of continuous models, the degrees of freedom define a discrete set. Hence the probability measure  $\mu_P$  is discrete and determined by operations based on counting degrees of freedom in a determined way. Moreover, the measure properties and the metric properties are logically independent concepts. The fact that the metric and measure structures are separated is a distinctive characteristic of the mm-spaces [35]. This category is the natural framework for the formulation of the theory of Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems.

Let us consider assumption A.3. That the degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale are deterministic and localized is an assumption in the opposite in confrontation with the usual probabilistic view of quantum mechanics. However, in defense of our deviated point of view, we have to admit that very few is known with certainty of the dynamics at the fundamental scale. We also need to recognise that the possibility to have a deterministic description is at least technically appealing.

Assumption A.4 suggests the existence of special coordinate systems associated with sub-quantum molecules. However, the interpretation of such coordinate systems is understood once the four dimensional spacetime is introduced. In this way, we will show and make clear that the co-moving coordinate systems associated with sub-quantum molecules does not have attached a direct observable meaning and are instead, associated with macroscopic coordinate systems. Despite they are not observable, they have physical meaning, since the physical degrees of freedom of the fundamental models are objectively real.

Apart from the geometric flow introduced in Assumption A.5, there is a dynamics for the fundamental degrees of freedom introduced in Assumption A.3 associated with the evolution respect to an *external time*  $\tau$ . This fundamental dynamics is described by deterministic, finite difference equations, where the time parameter  $\tau$  is discrete. However, in the version of assumption A.5.bis (see below), the parameter  $\tau$  is continuous.

For each sub-quantum molecule, one of the sub-quantum atoms evolves towards *the future*, while the companion evolves towards *the past* in the internal time  $\tau$ . This corresponds to the symmetrization discussed before and implies to pass from a non-reversible dynamics to an effective reversible dynamics.

It is of certain relevance the choice of the local/non-local character for the interactions of the degrees of freedom at the fundamental scale. In favour of assuming

locality, we should say that this option has a natural geometric appealing, since it is possible to have geometric representations of local interactions in a consistent way with causality, but a non-local interaction is far from being integrable in a causal geometric picture. We think that a theory whose aim is to be fundamental must be of local character, since in any pretended fundamental theory, there is no room left for explaining non-locality at a more fundamental level and a theory that aims to explain non-local phenomena needs of fundamental local explanations to be falsified by local experiments. However, deep difficulties accompany the search for local descriptions of a sub-quantum theory, as it is implied by the experimental violation of Bell's inequalities. A possible explanation of how the violation of Bell's inequalities can happen is discussed in this work. It requires the notion of *emergent contextuality*, to be explained in later *sections*. This notion is consistent with the superdeterminism, a solution to the problem of the violation of Bell's inequalities recently proposed by G. 't Hooft. However, superdeterminism is not an element in our explanation on how the non-local quantum correlation happen.

Assumptions A.4 and A.7 are in concordance with several approaches to the problem of quantum gravity. Assumption A.4 implies that the fundamental scale is necessary in our approach. That the Planck scale is the fundamental scale has been argued in several ways in the literature. Moreover, the interpretation given to these coordinates is in agreement with the theory of quantum spacetime of H. Snyder [58]. Assumption A.7 does not necessarily implies the existence of a Lorentzian metric. For instance, if  $\mathcal{M}$  is discrete the cone structure is different than the usual light cone of a Lorentzian spacetime. The values of these two scales (fundamental scale and speed of light) cannot be determined currently by our theory. We will leave this scale unfixed, except for few occasions where in favour of concreteness, we have adopted the hypothetical case that the Planck scale is the fundamental scale (see the discussion in *section 7*) and the speed of light in vacuum as limit speed. However, it is natural in the approximation when  $\mathcal{M}$  is continuous that *assumption 7* is interpreted as that the speed of light in vacuum of each individual direction is maximal.

At this point we should remark that, due to the way in which the notion of external time parameter (denoted by  $\tau$ -time parameter) is introduced in our theory, such parameters need to be discrete. The fundamental degrees of freedom are described by discrete variables and their dynamics is also discrete, an idea compatible with the existence of a minimal inertial coordinate difference  $L_{min}$ .

Despite the discreteness that the assumptions require for the physical systems at the fundamental scale, a more pragmatcal approach is developed in this work, where continuous models for the dynamics are used. This is motivated by the smallness of the fundamental scale compared with any other scales appearing in physical systems but also by mathematical convenience. In this continuous approximation, where the  $\tau$ -time parameter is continuous instead of discrete, several of the assumptions should be amended or modified as follows:

- A.1.bis. There is a smooth manifold  $M_4$  which is the *model manifold* of spacetime events.

- A.2.bis. There is a configuration smooth manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  which is endowed with an asymmetric metric structure (2.6) which is at least  $C^2$ -smooth on  $\mathcal{M}$ .
- A.5.bis. The dynamics law of the fundamental degrees of freedom respect to the  $\tau$ -time parameter is deterministic and given by a system of first order ordinary differential equations.

In the continuous approximation the rest of the assumptions remain formally the same than in the original formulation. However, because the different categories (smooth manifold category versus discrete topological spaces category), the implementation and the techniques that we can use are different than in the discrete case. In the continuous limit, the assumption of the existence of minimal length must be interpreted as a theoretical constraint on the kinematics, despite that there is no indication that in the continuous limit such constraint is necessary. Hence our continuous theory can only be considered as an effective approximation to a fundamental discrete theory. The fact that all our observations are linked to macroscopic devices or to quantum systems that can be represented consistently in a 4-dimensional spacetime is motivation enough to consider a manifold structure as a convenient arena to represent quantum and classical phenomenology. We postpone to future developments the more accurate discrete theory for dynamical models at the fundamental scale.

**2.6. Maximal proper acceleration.** A direct consequence of the assumptions A.3, A.4, A.6 and A.7 is the existence of a maximal universal proper acceleration for sub-quantum atoms and sub-quantum molecules. To show such direct consequence we follow an adaptation of an heuristic argument developed in [30]. Let us consider the situation when the spacetime is 1 + 1 dimensional. Due to the fact that there is a lower bound for the difference between coordinates of the fundamental degrees of freedom in any instantaneous inertial system (by assumption A.4), for any elementary work the relation

$$\delta \mathcal{W} := \vec{F} \cdot \delta \vec{L} = \delta L m a,$$

must hold, where  $\vec{F}$  is the external mechanical action on the sub-quantum molecule caused by the rest of the system and is defined by the quotient

$$\vec{F} := \frac{\delta \mathcal{W}}{\delta \vec{L}}.$$

$\delta \vec{L}$  is the infinitesimal displacement of the sub-quantum molecule caused by the rest of the system in the instantaneous coordinate system associated to the sub-quantum molecule at the instant just before the sub-quantum molecule suffers the interaction;  $a$  is the value of the acceleration in the direction of the total exterior effort is done and the parameter  $m$  is the inertial mass of the sub-quantum molecule  $\mathcal{S}$ . By hypothesis A.4, it holds that  $\delta L = L_{min}$ . Hence we have that

$$\delta \mathcal{W} = L_{min} m a.$$

For an infinitesimal work, the change in speed is much smaller than the speed of light, since an infinitesimal work is very small in magnitude by assumption. Then we can use a low speed Newtonian approximation and use Newtonian mechanics of point particles. In a instantaneous coordinate system almost co-moving with the sub-quantum particle the infinitesimal work is given by the expression

$$\delta \mathcal{W} = \frac{1}{2} (\delta m v_{max}^2 + m (\delta v)_{max}^2) = L_{min} m a.$$

According to assumption A.6 there is a maximal domain  $\mathcal{U}$  that determines the effect on dynamics of  $\mathcal{S}$ , we have that  $\delta m \leq C m$ , with  $C$  a constant of dimension 1 that depends on the size of  $\mathcal{U}$ . One can imagine  $\mathcal{U}$  as the smallest sub-lattice surrounding the sub-quantum molecule. Hence  $C$  is a measure of the size of  $\mathcal{U}$  respect to the size of the sub-quantum molecule.

Assume that there is no change in the matter content of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then the relation

$$\delta m = 0$$

holds good. Since the speed of any physical degree of freedom is bounded by the speed of light by the assumption of locality A.7, one has that

$$\delta v_{max} \leq v_{max} = c.$$

Hence the maximal infinitesimal work at instantaneous rest with the particle produced by the system on a point particle is such that

$$\mathcal{W} = m L_{min} a \leq \frac{1}{2} m c^2.$$

This relation implies an universal bound for the value of the proper acceleration  $a$  for the sub-quantum system  $\mathcal{S}$  as

$$a \leq \frac{c^2}{2 L_{min}}.$$

Therefore, if assumptions A.3, A.4, A.6 and A.7 hold good, it is natural to require that the following additional assumption also holds,

- A.10. There is a maximal, universal proper acceleration for both sub-quantum atoms and di-atomic sub-quantum molecules. The value of the maximal proper acceleration is of order

$$(2.6) \quad a_{max} \sim \frac{c^2}{2 L_{min}}.$$

In the continuous approximation, where the degrees of freedom follow a continuous dynamics instead of a discrete dynamics, the assumption A.10 cannot be derived heuristically as was done above. Hence in the continuous case assumption A.10 is an independent constraint to be imposed in the theory. That such kinematical theory exists and that it is indeed compatible with the action of the Lorentz group has been shown in [30], although in such theory the value of the maximal acceleration is not necessarily fixed by the expression (2.6).

The geometric structures that admit a maximal acceleration and a maximal speed were called *metrics of maximal acceleration* [30]. They are not Lorentzian

metrics or pseudo-Riemannian metrics, but metrics defined in higher order jet bundles (second bundle). However, the leading order term in a metric of maximal acceleration is a Lorentzian structure. In the present work, the leading order Lorentzian structure has been adopted first, leaving the more precise treatment within the framework of spaces with maximal acceleration for a second stage in the investigations.

We also assume that the maximal acceleration is given by an expression of the type (2.6). The specific expression for the maximal acceleration should be obtained by other arguments. We propose that the exact value is given by

$$(2.7) \quad a_{max} = \frac{c^2}{L_{min}},$$

which is the centripetal acceleration for a particle in circular motion along the smallest possible radio.

## 3. HAMILTON-RANDERS DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

**3.1. Geometric framework.** According to assumption A.1.bis, let us consider the *spacetime 4-manifold*  $M_4$  as the geometric arena where every macroscopic event happens. On the other hand, the configuration manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  of the Hamilton-Randers system is a tangent space  $TM$  such that the base manifold  $M$  is diffeomorphic to a product manifold,

$$(3.1) \quad M \cong \prod_{k=1}^N M_4^k,$$

with each  $M_4^k$  diffeomorphic to  $M_4$ . Then for the dynamical systems that we will consider the configuration manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  is the tangent space of a smooth manifold  $M$  and is of the form

$$\mathcal{M} \cong TM \cong \prod_{k=1}^N TM_4^k.$$

The dimension of the configuration manifold is

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}) = \dim(TM) = 2 \dim(M) = 8N.$$

For the dynamical systems that we are interested in this work we assume that the dimension  $\dim(TM) = 8N$  is large compared with  $\dim(TM_4) = 8$ . Note that choosing the configuration space  $\mathcal{M}$  as a tangent space  $TM$  instead than the base manifold  $M$  allows to implement geometrically second order differential equations for the coordinates of the sub-quantum molecules in a straightforward way as differential equations defining vector fields on  $TM$ .

The canonical projections are  $\pi_k : TM_4^k \rightarrow M_4^k$ . The vertical fiber over  $x_k \in M_4^k$  is  $\pi_k^{-1}(x_k)$ . We denote by

$$\varphi_{k*} : T_{x_k} M_4^k \rightarrow T_{\varphi_k(x_k)} M_4$$

the differential map at  $x_k$  and by

$$\varphi_k^* : T_{\varphi_k(x_k)}^* M \rightarrow T_{x_k}^* M_4$$

the pull-back of 1-forms at  $\varphi_k(x) \in M_4$ .

Each of the sub-quantum molecules is labeled by a natural number  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . The configuration manifold  $TM_4^k$  is the configuration manifold for the  $k$ -th sub-quantum molecule. Locally each point in the tangent space  $TM_4^k$  is described by four spacetime coordinates  $(\xi^1, \xi^2, \xi^3, \xi^4)$  of the point  $\xi(k) \in M_4^k$  and four independent velocities coordinates  $(\dot{\xi}^1, \dot{\xi}^2, \dot{\xi}^3, \dot{\xi}^4) \in T_{\xi} M_4^k$ .

Although it is possible to consider more general configuration manifolds for the description of the dynamics of other degrees of freedom of the sub-quantum molecules, in this work only spacetime configuration manifolds are investigated. This attitude is based on the following grounds. First, although other properties as spin are necessarily associated with the quantum description of elementary particles, it is remarkable that in quantum mechanics measurements of observables are ultimately reduced to local position and time measurements. Hence we adopt the point of view that all possible measurements of observables can be reduced to the



detection of spacetime events and its consequent interpretation. Note that this is a four covariant point of view. Second, one of our goals is to investigate the possibility of emergence of spacetime. Macroscopically, spacetime is a four-dimensional manifold. Therefore, it appears natural that the configuration manifold  $M_4^k$  for each sub-quantum molecule is also a four-manifold. Hence the geometry of four-manifolds is our basis for the formulation of the dynamical models, as a first step towards a more general formalism.

Given  $M_4$  and the collection of four-manifolds  $\{M_4^k\}_{k=1}^N$ , there is also a collection of diffeomorphisms

$$(3.2) \quad \Upsilon := \{\varphi_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4, k = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

This is consistent with the assumption A.4, stating that each of the  $N$  degrees of freedom are indistinguishable and identical. Since a macroscopic observer cannot identify the detailed evolution of the sub-quantum molecules and because the selection of the diffeomorphisms  $\varphi_k$  is not fixed by the theory, one can choose another arbitrary family of diffeomorphisms,

$$\tilde{\Upsilon} := \{\tilde{\varphi}_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4, k = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

$\tilde{\varphi}_k$  is related with  $\varphi_k$  by a diffeomorphism  $\varphi_{ktran} \in \text{Diff}(M_4)$ , defining the family of global diffeomorphisms

$$Tran := \{\varphi_{ktran} : M_4 \rightarrow M_4, \tilde{\varphi}_k \circ \varphi_k^{-1}, k = 1, \dots, N\},$$

where  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$  is the group of global diffeomorphisms of  $M_4$ . Since in the theory each of the sub-quantum molecules are independent from each other, the theory must be invariant under the action of the group

$$\text{Diff}(M) = \prod_{k=1}^N \times \text{Diff}(M_4).$$

Thus the diffeomorphism group  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$  emerges as a particular sub-group of  $\text{Diff}(M)$ .

The algebra of functions  $\mathcal{F}_D(T^*TM)$  on  $T^*TM$  that we shall consider is the algebra of *diagonal smooth functions*, obtained by a *diagonal embedding*,

$$(3.3) \quad \theta : \mathcal{F}(T^*TM_4) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(T^*TM), \quad f \mapsto (f_1, \dots, f_N), \quad f_k = f_0 \quad k = 1, \dots, N$$

such that  $f_0 : T^*TM_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a real function on  $T^*TM_4$ . Note that we have adopted the real numbers  $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$  as ordered field to be used in the construction of the dynamics. However, other ordered fields, in particular discrete ordered fields, can also be considered.

The restriction to the diagonal algebra of functions is motivated by our assumption that the sub-quantum degrees of freedom are identical. It cannot be any observable difference by permutation of sub-quantum degrees of freedom. In this way, the admissible functions on  $T^*TM$  are modeled on the functions defined on  $T^*TM_4$ . This includes all the possible observables of the theory, that by definition,

will be invariant under the group of diffeomorphisms  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ . Indeed, we can see  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$  as the *diagonal group*

$$\text{Diff}(M_4) \approx \text{Diag} \left( \prod_{k=1}^N \times \text{Diff}(M_4) \right).$$

In particular, the group diffeomorphism of the theory is  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$  and not  $\text{Diff}(M)$ , as the above arguments shows.

The freedom in the possible choices for the diffeomorphisms  $\varphi_k$  can be seen as an ambiguity of our theory, similar to the gauge freedom that appears in gauge theories. This problem is solved automatically by the observation that all macroscopic observable quantities defined by our theory must be independent of the details of the sub-quantum description. The underlying reason supporting this argument is that macroscopic observables are always defined in terms of *classical terms*, which are insensitive to the sub-quantum degrees of freedom and their details. Moreover, the quantities must be independent of any arbitrary permutation on the sub-quantum molecules. Thus the macroscopic description must be invariant under  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ , in which case  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$  is a symmetry of the theory. This consistence requirement constraints the mathematical formalism and shapes the physical content of the theory.

**3.2. Measure and metric structures.** The expectation values of diagonal functions  $f \in \mathcal{F}_D(T^*TM)$  are of physical relevance. Since such averages describe macroscopic observable quantities, they should not depend upon the particular choice of the collection of diffeomorphisms  $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^N$ . Such invariance is achieved if the probability measure  $\mu_P$  used in the averages in  $T^*TM$  is a product measure,

$$(3.4) \quad \mu_P = \prod_{k=1}^N \mu_P(k),$$

where  $\mu_P(k)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N$  is a  $\text{Diff}(M_4^k)$ -invariant probability measure defined on  $TM_4^k$  and since  $\text{Diff}(M_4^k) \cong \text{Diff}(M_4)$ , they are invariant under the transformations induced by the  $\text{Diff}(M_4^k)$ -invariant.

**Metric structures.** The four-manifold  $M_4$  is endowed with a Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$  of signature  $(1, -1, -1, -1)$ . Moreover, for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  there is a Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4(k)$  on  $M_4^k$  and we assume that each of the Lorentzian structures  $\{(M_4^k, \eta_4(k))\}_{k=1}^N$  is isometric to the Lorentzian model  $(M_4, \eta_4)$ . The Levi-Civita connection of  $\eta_4(k)$  determines a horizontal distribution in a canonical way (see for instance [46], *Chapter 2*). Given such standard distribution, there is defined a pseudo-Riemannian metric  $\eta_S^*(k)$  on  $TM_4^k$  (the Sasaki-type metric), which is the Sasaki-type lift of the metric  $\eta_4^k$  on  $M_4^k$  to  $TM_4^k$  by the distribution associated with the Levi-Civita connection. Then one can define the metric  $\eta^*$  on  $TM$ , which is given by the relation

$$(3.5) \quad \eta_S^* = \frac{1}{N} \oplus_{k=1}^N \eta_S^*(k), \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

This metric defines the causal structure of the Hamilton-Randers space. The dual metric of  $\eta_S^*(k)$  is the dual pseudo-Riemannian metric  $\eta_S(k) = (\eta_S^*(k))^*$ . The dual Sasaki-type metrics  $\{\eta_S(k)\}_{k=1}^N$  allows to define the dual pseudo-Riemannian metric<sup>3</sup>

$$(3.6) \quad \eta = \frac{1}{N} \oplus_{k=1}^N \eta_S(k).$$

on the  $16N$ -dimensional cotangent space  $T^*TM$ .

**Measures.** The construction of an invariant measure  $\mu_P$  on  $TM$  and other associated measures is presented in the following lines. The Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$  allows to define a  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ -invariant volume form  $dvol_{\eta_4}$  on  $M_4$  in a canonical way, namely, as the form

$$(3.7) \quad dvol_{\eta_4} = \sqrt{-\det \eta_4} dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dx^4.$$

Moreover, it is possible to define an  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ -invariant vertical form  $dvol_k(y_k)$  on each fiber  $\pi_k^{-1}(x(k))$ ,

$$(3.8) \quad d^4 z_k = \sqrt{-\det \eta_4} dy^1 \wedge dy^2 \wedge dy^3 \wedge dy^4,$$

Then we can provide an explicit expression for the measure  $\tilde{\mu}_P$  on  $TM$ ,

$$(3.9) \quad \tilde{\mu}_P = \prod_{k=1}^N d^4 z_k \wedge dvol_{\eta_4}.$$

The measure in  $T^*TM$  is then

$$(3.10) \quad \mu = \prod_{k=1}^N (d^4 z_k \wedge dvol_{\eta_4})^\sharp,$$

where each  $(d^4 z_k \wedge dvol_{\eta_4})^\sharp$  is the canonical associated volume form  $T^*TM_4^k$ , by direct use of Darboux's theorem. The measure (3.9) is invariant under diffeomorphisms of  $M_4$ .

The measure (3.10) can be pull-back to submanifolds of  $TM$ . In particular, it can be concentrated along the world line curves of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom. In this case, a delta function with support on the  $k$ -esim world line on  $M_4^k$ . Thus the probability measure that we will use is of the form

$$(3.11) \quad \tilde{\mu}_P = \prod_{k=1}^N \delta(x - \xi_k) d^4 z_k \wedge dvol_{\eta_4},$$

where  $\xi_k$  is the coordinates of the  $k$ -essim sub-quantum molecule.

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that the use of \*-notation for dual metrics and norms here is partially inverted respect to the usual notation in Riemannian geometry. For instance,  $\eta_S^*$  is a metric on  $TM_4$ , while  $\eta_S$  is a metric in  $T^*M_4$ .

**3.3. Deterministic dynamics for the ontological degrees of freedom.** Given this differential geometric setting, the dynamical systems that we shall consider are systems of ordinary first order differential equations of the form

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{d\xi_k^\mu}{d\tilde{\tau}} = \beta_{kx}^\mu(\xi, \dot{\xi}, \tilde{\tau}), \quad \frac{d\dot{\xi}_k^\mu}{d\tilde{\tau}} = \beta_{ky}^\mu(\xi, \dot{\xi}, \tilde{\tau}), \quad \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

This is a coupled  $8N$ -dimensional system of special type called semi-spray [49]. In order to determine locally the solutions, it is necessary and sufficient to know the initial conditions  $\{\xi_k^\mu(0), \dot{\xi}_k^\mu(0)\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N, 4}$ . We will show that there are two mathematical theories, related with different mathematical formalism, that describe dynamical systems of the type (3.12). The first of them is the geometric theory of Hamilton-Randers spaces and the second is the quantized theory of Hamilton-Randers spaces.

It is remarkable that the equations of motion (3.12) are equivalent to  $4N$  second order differential equations of semi-spray type. Our formalism has been set up in this way to accommodate the first Newton's law of the dynamics and the law of inertia in the description of each sub-quantum molecule dynamics.

**3.4. Notion of Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems.** The first formalism for the dynamical systems (3.12) that we consider in this work is a geometric formalism, based on the combination of two different notions from differential geometry, generalized Hamilton spaces and Randers spaces.

**Notion of generalized Hamiltonian function.** Let  $\widetilde{M}$  be a smooth manifold,  $\mathcal{C} \subset T^*\widetilde{M}$  a connected, open submanifold of  $T^*\widetilde{M}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  the topological closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  respect to the manifold topology.

**Definition 3.1.** A generalized Hamilton space is a triplet  $(\widetilde{M}, F, \mathcal{C})$  with

$$F : \bar{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$$

smooth on the open submanifold  $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow T^*\widetilde{M}$ .

The function  $F$  is the *generalized Hamiltonian function*. The vertical Hessian of  $F^2$  is the *fundamental tensor*  $g^{ij}$ . In terms of local natural induced coordinates  $\{(T^*\widetilde{U}, (u^i, p_j)), i, j = 1, \dots, \dim(\widetilde{M})\}$  on  $T^*\widetilde{M}$  the fundamental tensor components are given by the expression

$$(3.13) \quad g^{ij}(u, p) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 F^2(u, p)}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}.$$

With the aim of recover the system of differential equations (3.12) from a Hamiltonian flow associated with  $F(u, p)$ , the configuration space  $\mathcal{M}$  is a tangent space  $TM$ , the generalized Hamiltonian function  $F$  must be globally defined on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

One can compare our notion of generalized Hamilton space with the notion of Hamiltonian space in [49]. Apart from the difference on the signature of the vertical Hessian, there are two additional differences. The first one is that in our definition it is not required the homogeneity property. Second, there is a restriction on the domain of definition of the Hamiltonian  $F^*$  to the submanifold  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  instead of being defined in the whole slit cotangent space  $T^*TM \setminus \{0\}$ .

It is a direct consequence from this definition that the topological closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  is

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \{(u, p) \in T^*TM \text{ s.t. } F(u, p) = 0\}.$$

It is direct that

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \bigsqcup_{u \in TM} \bar{\mathcal{C}}_u.$$

**Notion of pseudo-Randers space.** In the category of Finsler spaces with Euclidean signature, a Randers structure on a manifold  $\widetilde{M}$  is a Finsler structure such that the associated Finsler function is of the form

$$F^* : T\widetilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (u, \tilde{y}) \mapsto \alpha^*(u, \tilde{y}) + \beta^*(u, \tilde{y}),$$

with  $\alpha^*(u, \tilde{y})$  being the Riemannian norm of  $\tilde{y} \in T_u\widetilde{M}$  determined by a Riemannian metric  $\eta^*$ , while  $\beta^*(u, \tilde{y})$  is the result of the action 1-form  $\beta^* \in \Gamma T^*\widetilde{M}$  on  $\tilde{y}$ . The condition

$$(3.14) \quad \alpha^*(\beta, \beta) < 1$$

must be satisfied. This relation (3.14) implies the non-degeneracy and the positive-ness of the associated fundamental tensor (3.13). The argument is found in [7]. In Finsler geometry, the non-degeneracy of the fundamental tensor is a geometric requirement for the local existence of geodesics.

We now consider the analogous of a Randers structure in the category of generalized Hamiltonian functions on the configuration space  $TM$  whose fundamental tensors (3.13) are non-degenerate and have non-definite signature. In this case the domain of definition of the Hamiltonian function  $F$  should be restricted, since it is not possible to have a well defined Hamilton-Randers function on the whole cotangent space  $T^*TM$ . This is because  $\eta$  is a pseudo-Riemannian metric and it can take negative values on certain domains of  $T_u^*TM$ , in which case the function  $\alpha(u, p)$  is purely imaginary. The collection of timelike momenta over  $u \in TM$  is defined by the set of co-vectors  $p \in T_u^*TM$  such that

$$(3.15) \quad \alpha(u, p) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{8N} \eta^{ij}(u) p_i p_j > 0.$$

Hence the domain of a Hamilton-Randers function is restricted to be the topological closure of the open submanifold  $\mathcal{C}$  of timelike momenta. Note that this is indeed a cone: if  $p \in \mathcal{C}_u$  then  $\lambda p \in \mathcal{C}_u$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .  $\mathcal{C}_u$  is the pre-image of an open set  $(0, +\infty)$  by the Randers type function  $F(u, p)$ , which is continuous function on the arguments. Therefore,  $\mathcal{C}_u$  is an open submanifold of  $T_u^*TM$ .

The analogous of the condition (3.14) must hold. We will see that the interpretation of this condition in the case of Hamilton-Randers systems is also valid, but also has some additional non-trivial consequences for the regularity of the theory.

**Notion of Hamilton-Randers space.** Let  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$  be a vector field such that the dual condition to the Randers condition (3.14)

$$(3.16) \quad |\eta^*(\beta, \beta)| < 1, \quad \beta \in \Gamma TTM$$

holds good.

**Definition 3.2.** A Hamilton-Randers space is a generalized Hamilton space whose Hamiltonian function is of the form

$$(3.17) \quad F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad (u, p) \mapsto F(u, p) = \alpha(u, p) + \beta(u, p).$$

with  $\alpha = \sqrt{\eta_{ij}(u)p^i p^j}$  real on  $\mathcal{C}$  and where

$$\beta(u, p) = \sum_{i=1}^{8N} \beta^i(u) p_i,$$

such that  $\beta$  is constrained by the condition (3.16).

The space of Hamilton-Randers structures on  $TM$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$ .

One can consider natural geometric flows in the space of Hamilton-Randers structures  $\mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$ . The geometric flow  $U_t$  responsible for the dynamics in Hamilton-Randers systems, according with assumption A.5 is a map

$$U_t : \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM).$$

This flow induces a geometric flow (also denoted by  $U_t$ ) on the topological closure  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ . For this induced flow it is required that the following general properties hold,

- (1) There is a  $r$ -parameter family of connected submanifolds

$$\{\mathcal{E}_u(r) \hookrightarrow T_u^*TM, u \in TM, r \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$$

which are invariant under the action of  $U_t$ .

- (2) The dynamics of the connected components of the  $r$ -hyperboloid

$$\Sigma_u(r) := \{p \in T^*TM \text{ s.t. } F^2(u, p) = r^2\}$$

by the  $t$ -dynamics has as limit when  $t_b - t_a \rightarrow nT, n \in \mathbb{N}$  the manifold  $\mathcal{E}_u(r)$ .

- (3) There is a proper open domain  $\mathbf{D}_0 \subset T^*TM$  containing the points

$$(3.18) \quad \{t = (2n + 1)T, n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset \mathbf{D}_0.$$

The open domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  will be called the *metastable equilibrium domain*. The existence of the metastable region can be argued from the existence of maximal acceleration and maximal speed of HR-systems, that prevents the system to stay for a long  $t$ -time far from the metastable equilibrium domain<sup>4</sup>. Then a process of expansion in phase space  $T^*TM$  starts until the dynamical system reaches a non-contractive phase. We make therefore the following additional assumption on the dynamics of the fundamental degrees of freedom:

*Assumption A.5+.* The  $U_t$  flow is composed by cycles. Each cycle is composed by an ergodic domain, a contractive domain and an expanding domain. The semi-period of each cycle depends on the system. For stable systems, the period is

---

<sup>4</sup>For instance, in a finite set of harmonic oscillators and the maximal acceleration and speed as universal bounds on such sets.

constant and the properties and characteristics of such domains are related with the size of the system.

The assumed properties of the  $U_t$ -flow contrast with the situation in general relativity, where the geometry is fixed by Einstein's equations without the need of an external time evolution. It is conjectured that such dynamics determined by  $U_t$  exists. We do not present here specific examples, although we provide indications of possible candidates and a particular route to find concrete realizations. Despite of this, we explore the constraints that such dynamical systems must have, constructing the *skeleton* of a theory of dynamical systems for the physics at the fundamental scale.

**3.5. Interpretation of the  $t$ -time parameter and the semi-period  $T$ .** The time scale parameter  $T$ , which is the semi-period of a fundamental cycle, depends on the size of the physical system. The metastable domains  $\mathbf{D}_0$  are reached faster for small systems, since the time that the systems needs to fill the allowed phase space is larger as the dimension increases.

The  $t$ -time parameters do not correspond to observable quantities, since there is no geometric structure on  $TM$  that can be used to define an internal  $t$ -time parameter. Hence the models that we need to construct must be invariant under  $t$ -time re-parameterizations. On the other hand, the  $t$ -parameters cannot be fully arbitrary, because the inverse of the semi-period  $T$  for the  $U_t$  dynamics is related with the size of the system. Thus we need to make precise the relation between the semi-period  $T$  and the size of the system. This relation is postulated to be of the form

$$(3.19) \quad \log\left(\frac{T}{T_{min}}\right) = \alpha \frac{T_{min} m c^2}{\hbar},$$

where  $\alpha$  is a constant  $t$ . It depends upon the choice of the parameter,  $T_{min}$  is the minimal period for any fundamental cycle allowed for any physical system.  $m$  is a coefficient that will be associated with the mass at rest of the quantum system.  $T_{min}$  is a parameter that depends on the choice of the arbitrary  $t$ -parameter but that is the same for all the Hamilton-Randers systems.  $\hbar$  is dimensional constant that makes the quotient on the right hand side invariant under conformal changes of units in the  $t$ -time parameter.  $\hbar$  is identified with the reduced Planck constant.

The relation (3.19) is assumed to be valid at leading order in  $T$ , with corrections that are small when  $T$  is large compared with  $T_{min}$ .

The relation (3.19) is invariant under  $t$ -time re-parameterizations  $t \mapsto \lambda t$  due to change in  $t$ -time units. Under such re-parametrizations the quotient  $T/T_{min}$  remains invariant. This transformation rule is justified if we note that also the right hand side of (3.19) must be invariant under this transformation, if the units of  $\hbar$  changes accordingly. But since  $\hbar$  has dimensions of macroscopic time times energy, the allowed differences is through induced changes in the macroscopic time parameter. But this implies that the microscopic time parameter is only affected by an affine transformation or, if we fix the origin, a linear transformation. Therefore,

we have that

$$\log \alpha \left( \frac{T}{T_{min}} \right) = \log \alpha \left( \frac{\tilde{T}}{\tilde{T}_{min}} \right)$$

for a given quantum system whose size is characterized by  $m$ . Henceforth we take from now on the time parameter  $t$  such that  $\alpha = 1$ . These changes in units corresponds to arbitrary reparameterizations of  $t$ -time.

In the context of the theory developed here in this work, it is more natural to re-cast the relation (3.19) as a definition of the mass parameter  $m$  in terms of the semi-period  $T$  of the fundamental cycle.

**Definition 3.3.** *The inertial mass  $m$  of a quantum elementary particle with fundamental semi-period  $T$  is*

$$(3.20) \quad m = \frac{\hbar}{T_{min} c^2} \log \left( \frac{T}{T_{min}} \right).$$

If the semi-period  $T$  is an attribute of the system, the mass  $m$  is also an attribute of the system that increase with the complexity of the system, that is, it increase with  $T$ . The mass  $m$  is necessarily positive. The relation (3.20) also shows that given a Hamilton-Randers system, there is an unique metastable domain.

Two limit cases are interesting. If  $T = T_{min}$  holds, then  $m = 0$ . This case describes Hamilton-Randers systems corresponding to massless particles. The second limit is when  $T \rightarrow +\infty$ , which corresponds to the limit  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ . This situation corresponds to a Hamilton-Randers systems describing a system with infinite mass, that is, large enough to be considered a *universe* or an unlimited reservoir of energy. In this interpretation, a physical universe as the collection of all physical systems that co-exists with us, is a Hamilton-Randers system in a metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  of the  $U_t$  dynamics.

**3.6. Emergence of the quantum energy-time relation.** The relation (3.19) is not a quantum energy-time uncertainty relation, since the  $t$ -parameter is not an external time parameter and  $m$  is not an energy, but a scalar parameter associated with the size of the system. Moreover, the relation of  $m$  with  $T$  is given by the  $\log T$  instead than linear with  $T^{-1}$ . This is indeed a significant difference with the quantum energy-time uncertainty relation. Furthermore, according with the relation (3.19)  $m$  increases monotonically with  $T$ .

However, if we consider the variation of the parameter  $m$  due to a variation of the period  $2T$  in the relation (3.19) we have that

$$\Delta (m c^2) = \frac{\hbar}{T_{min}} \frac{\Delta T}{T}.$$

The expression  $m c^2$  is the energy of a system measured by an observer co-moving with the inertial system at rest in a relativistic theory (as it is ours) and since  $\Delta T/T_{min} \geq 1$ , then

$$(3.21) \quad \Delta E T \geq \hbar$$



with the *spread of energy* defined as

$$(3.22) \quad \Delta E = \Delta(m c^2) = \Delta(m) c^2.$$

Thus we see that a variation of the rest energy  $E$  of the system is linked with  $T^{-1}$ .  $\Delta E$  can be interpreted as the minimal exchange of energy between the quantum system and the environment, measured in a co-moving instantaneous inertial reference frame before the system changes to another different state or it decays to another different class of quantum particle or quantum state. This exchange of energy can be associated to the uncertainty in the energy of the system. If  $T$  is interpreted as a measure of the life time of the quantum system, then the relation (3.21) can be seen as the energy-time uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics. However, the relation (3.21) admits other interpretations. For instance,  $\Delta m$  can be interpreted as the energy on rest of the particle and  $T$  as the time used in the measurement of it.

**3.7. Properties of the  $U_t$  flow.** Given the generalized Hamilton-Randers space  $(TM, F, \mathcal{C})$ , it is possible to define a Riemannian structure  $h \in \Gamma T^{(2,0)}TM$  by averaging the fundamental tensor components  $g_{ij}(u, p)$  on each  $\Sigma_u(1)$ . The tensor components  $h^{ij}$  are obtained by averaging the metric coefficients  $g^{ij}(u, p)$  on the open cone  $\Sigma_u(1)$  at  $u \in TM$ ,

$$(3.23) \quad h^{ij}(u) := \frac{1}{\int_{\Sigma_u} dvol_{\Sigma_u}(p)} \int_{\Sigma_u} dvol_{\Sigma_u}(p) g^{ij}(u, p), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 8N,$$

where  $dvol_{\Sigma_u}$  is the volume form on the unit hyperboloid  $\Sigma_u$ . The submanifold  $\Sigma_u$  is not compact. This makes non-trivial the problem to find pull-back volume form  $dvol_{\Sigma_u}(p)$  such that the integrals in (3.23) are well defined. If there is homogeneity of the functions  $h^{ij}(u)$  this can be done by regularizing  $\Sigma_u$ , defining a volume form and volume function in the regularized manifold and then taking the limit appropriately. If this procedure or any other analogous procedure is applicable, then the squared norms  $h(u, p)$  and  $g(u, p)$  are defined by the expressions

$$h(u, p) = h^{ij}(u) p_i p_j, \quad g(u, p) = g^{ij}(u, p) p_i p_j = F^2(u, p).$$

**Definition 3.4.** *The  $U_t$  dynamics in the interval  $[0, T] \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a geometric flow of the form*

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} U_t &: \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM), \\ F &\mapsto F_t = \sqrt{\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) h(u, p) + (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g(u, p)}, \end{aligned}$$

such that the function  $\kappa : \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM) \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, T] \subset [0, 1]$  satisfies the boundary conditions

$$(3.25) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} (\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) - 1) = 0.$$

Hence the  $U_t$ -flow determines an homotopy transformation in the space  $\mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$  compatible with the conformal transformation of the form

$$(3.26) \quad g \mapsto (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g.$$

Such interpolation and conformal transformations are compatible with the general properties (1) and (2) of the flow  $U_t$ . Note that in this definition  $t \in [0, T]$ , instead of  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , in concordance with the assumption that the dynamics becomes almost-periodic with period  $2T$ .

Let us consider the convex hull  $C_{hg} \subset \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$  containing  $g$  and  $h$ ,

$$C_{hg} := \{F \in \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM) \text{ s.t. } g_F = t_1 g + t_2 h, t_1 + t_2 = 1, t_1, t_2 \geq 0\},$$

where  $g_F$  is the fundamental tensor of  $F$ . Then we have that

**Proposition 3.5.** *Every Hamilton-Randers structure  $F$  in the convex hull  $C_{hg}$  containing  $g$  and  $h$  evolves towards the averaged structure  $h \in \Gamma T^{(2,0)}TM$  under the action of the flow (3.24),*

$$(3.27) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T} U_t(F) = \sqrt{h(u, p)}, \quad \forall F \in C_{hg}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $F \in C_{hg}$  has the same averaged metric,

$$\langle g_F \rangle = \langle t_1 g + t_2 h \rangle = t_1 h + t_2 h = h.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow T} U_t(F) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \sqrt{\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) h(u, p) + (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g_F(u, p)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \sqrt{\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) h(u, p) + (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g_F(u, p)} \\ &= \sqrt{h(u, p)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Hence the  $U_t$ -flow is *dissipative* in  $\mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$ , since many structures evolve to the same final structure  $h$ , with many metric in  $\mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$  with the same final average limit  $h$ . The collection of metrics  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$  defines the *equivalence class of metrics*  $[h]$ . This motivates the following definition,

**Definition 3.6.** *Two Hamilton-Randers structures  $(TM, F_1, \mathcal{C})$  and  $(TM, F_2, \mathcal{C})$  are equivalent if they have the same metaestable limit  $(TM, F_i) \rightarrow (TM, h)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  under the  $U_t$  flow.*

Therefore, the limit space  $(TM, h)$  defines the equivalence class  $[h]$ .

**3.8. t-time inversion operation.** The parameter  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  is interpreted as the time parameter for an *internal dynamics* of the system. The *time inversion operation*  $\mathcal{T}_t$  is defined in local natural coordinates on  $T^*TM$  by the operator

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_t : T^*TM &\rightarrow T^*TM, \\ (u, p) &= (x, y, p_x, p_y) \mapsto (\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t^*(p)) = (x, -y, -p_x, p_y). \end{aligned}$$

This operation does not depend upon the choice of the coordinate system: if the relation (3.28) holds in a given natural coordinate system, it holds in any other natural coordinate system on  $T^*TM$ .

The induced action of  $\mathcal{T}_t$  on elements  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$  is given by the expression

$$\mathcal{T}_t(F)(u, p) := F(\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t(p)).$$

Note that a Hamilton-Randers metric is non-reversible in the sense that

$$F(u, p) \neq F(\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t(p))$$

except for a subset of measure zero in  $(u, p) \in T_u^*TM$ . From this relation the intrinsic irreversible character of the Randers geometry follows. However, we assume that  $\mathcal{T}_t$  commutes with the  $U_t$  dynamics,

$$(3.29) \quad [U_t, \mathcal{T}_t] = 0, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

This commutation relation guarantees that  $\mathcal{T}_t(F)$  and  $F$  are in the same equivalence class  $[h]$ , if  $h$  is invariant under  $\mathcal{T}_t$ . Indeed, one can prove by a continuity argument on the parameter  $t$  that for  $t = n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is an  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  such that the condition (3.29) holds for each  $\tilde{t} \in (n - \epsilon, n]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We can perform the explicit calculation of  $\mathcal{T}_t h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_t(h) &= \mathcal{T}_t(\lim_{t \rightarrow T} U_t(F)) \\ &= \mathcal{T}_t(\lim_{t \rightarrow T} (\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) h(u, p) + (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g_F(u, p)) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \mathcal{T}_t(\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) h(u, p) + (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g_F(u, p)) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T} (\mathcal{T}_t(\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) \mathcal{T}_t(h)(u, p) + \mathcal{T}_t(1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) \mathcal{T}_t(g_F)(u, p)) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow T} (\mathcal{T}_t(\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) h(u, p) + \mathcal{T}_t(1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) g_F(u, p)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a sufficient condition for the invariance  $\mathcal{T}_t h = h$  is that

$$(3.30) \quad \mathcal{T}_t(\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) = \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}).$$

Furthermore, it is clear that  $\mathcal{T}_t$  is an idempotent operator,

$$(3.31) \quad \mathcal{T}_t^2 = Id, \quad \forall t \in I \subset \mathbb{R},$$

where  $Id$  is the identity operation on  $T^*TM$ .

**3.9. The  $U_t$  flow Hamiltonian function.** Hamilton-Randers structures and linear Hamiltonian functions on momentum variables are related. If  $(TM, F, \mathcal{C})$  is a Hamilton-Randers space that evolves towards the *averaged structure*  $(TM, h)$  under the  $U_t$  flow, for each value of  $t$ -parameter there is an element  $(TM, F_t)$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{HR}(TM)$ . The key point is the implementation of *assumption 3* and *assumption 8* in the following way,

*Assumption 3+8.* On each individual sub-quantum molecule, one of the quantum atoms evolves with a Hamiltonian function  $\frac{1}{2}F_t(u, P)$  and the second sub-quantum atom with a Hamiltonian  $\frac{1}{2}F_t(\mathcal{F}_t(u), \mathcal{F}(p))$ .

Applying the time inversion operation  $\mathcal{T}_t$  to  $F_t$  and taking into account that the function  $\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})$  is invariant under  $\mathcal{T}_t$ , one obtains the corresponding Hamiltonian function of a HR-systems at the instant  $(t, \tilde{\tau})$  to be

$$\begin{aligned}
H_t(u, p) &= \frac{1}{2} F_t(u, p) - \frac{1}{2} F_t(\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t^*(p)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) (g^{ij}(u, p) p_i p_j)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) (\langle g^{ij} \rangle p_i p_j)^{1/2} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) (g^{ij}(\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t^*(p)) p_i p_j)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2} \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}) (\langle g^{ij} \rangle p_i p_j)^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) (g^{ij}(u, p) p_i p_j)^{1/2} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) (g^{ij}(\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t^*(p)) p_i p_j)^{1/2} \\
&= (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(u) p_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the Hamiltonian function associated with a HR-system at  $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  is

$$(3.32) \quad H_t(u, p) = (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tau)) \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(u) p_k.$$

As a consequence of the limit conditions (3.25) it holds the following,

**Proposition 3.7.** *The Hamiltonian (3.32) in the metastable equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$  is the average Hamiltonian of a HR-system, which is identically zero,*

$$(3.33) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} H_t(u, p) = 0.$$

The interpretation of this condition is three-fold. First, it defines the metastable points  $\{t = (2n + 1)T, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Second, it is intrinsically related with the flow of geometric structures  $(TM, F) \rightarrow (TM, h)$ , showing that the  $U_t$  flow is dissipative. Third, it is fully compatible with time reparameterization invariance property of general covariant theories. Note that this consequence of (3.33) is not equivalent to a Hamiltonian constraint as it appears in general relativity, but shows the compatibility of the  $U_t$ -flow with the Hamiltonian constraint.

**3.10. Notion of external time parameter  $\tau$ .** The  $U_t$  flow is *almost cyclic*. By this we mean that the total  $U_t$  evolution is composed by a series of *fundamental cycles*, where the  $n$ -cycle take place during the intervals of internal  $t$ -time

$$t \in [(2n + 1)T, (2n + 3)T], \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

According to our *Assumption A.5+*, each of these fundamental cycles is itself composed by an ergodic regime for the evolution of the sub-quantum molecules defining the system, followed by a contractive regime, followed by an expanding regime. Then a new ergodic regime start, defining the next fundamental cycle. The period of each fundamental cycle, if the quantum particle content of the system does not change, is constant and equal to  $2T$ , if the quantum state does not change.

It is natural to assume that the period  $2T$  depends upon the physical, since it is assumed that the relation (3.19) holds good. Furthermore, following our original *Assumption A.5*, the ergodic-contractive-expansion domains are universal, that is, the fundamental cycles happen for every quantum system. In particular, for each degree of freedom of the Standard Model of particle physics but also for each atomic and some molecular systems and for larger systems.

**Definition 3.8.** *An external time parameter  $\tau$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -multiple function of the number of fundamental cycles of the  $U_t$  flow associated to a given system.*

Different species of elementary particles or quantum systems, for instance the quantum system  $a$  and the quantum system  $b$ , have non-congruent fundamental semi-periods  $T_a$  and  $T_b$ , which correspond to particles with different inertial masses.

Note that the definition 3.8 of  $\tau$ -time parameter assumes the repeatability and stability of the fundamental cycles of the  $U_t$  dynamics. Since physical clocks are based on stable, periodic processes, that can be reduce to the analysis of periodic quantum processes, they are also periodic in the number of fundamental cycles. The existence of ideal repeated cycles is associated with a double periodic dynamics  $(U_t, U_\tau)$  along the two dimensional time  $(t, \tau)$  and corresponds to perfect ideal stable clocks. Thus it is inherent to Hamilton-Randers theory that time is necessarily described by two independent times.

When in classical mechanics we have two independent oscillators of semi-periods  $T_a$  and  $T_b$  which are relative prime to each other, it is natural to define clocks associated with the joint Hamilton-Randers system  $a \sqcup b$  which we can characterized by a total period which is the product. This idea can be implemented in Hamilton-Randers theory as follows [29]. If the sub-quantum molecules that define the quantum system  $a$  are independent or they do not interact with the sub-quantum molecules that define the quantum system  $b$  and the corresponding structures are  $(M_a, (\alpha_a, \beta_a))$  and  $(M_b, (\alpha_b, \beta_b))$  respectively, then the Randers structure for the system  $a \sqcup b$  is

$$(M_a \times M_b, (\alpha_a \otimes \alpha_b, \beta_a \otimes \beta_b)).$$

Moreover, if the systems  $a$  and  $b$  do not interact and the semi-period are relative prime to each other, the semi-period for  $a \sqcup b$  is given by the relation

$$(3.34) \quad T_{a \sqcup b} := T_a T_b.$$

This product rule can be extended to Hamilton-Randers systems whose periods are not relative prime but the systems do not interact between them. For instance, the period of a system composed by two identical non-interacting electrons is the product of periods  $T_e^2$ .

From the relation (3.34) the mass  $M$  and the semi-period  $T$  given by the relation (3.19) the mass of a composed non-interacting system  $a \sqcup b$  is

$$(3.35) \quad M_{a \sqcup b} = M_a + M_b,$$

which shows the additivity of inertial mass parameter  $M$  for non-interacting Hamilton-Randers systems. Also, it shows that semi-periods are larger for larger systems.

If the systems  $a$  and  $b$  interact by the exchange of sub-quantum degrees of freedom, due to the hypothesis of indistinguishability of the degrees of freedom in *Assumption 3*, the semi-period  $T_{a \sqcup b}$  of  $a \sqcup b$  will be shorter than in the case of non-interacting systems. Provisionally, we propose for the semi-period of the whole system the relation

$$(3.36) \quad T_{a \sqcup b} = \{T_a, T_b\},$$

where  $\{T_a, T_b\} < T_a T_b$  is the least common multiple of  $T_a$  and  $T_b$ . This implies that strongly interacting Hamilton-Randers systems, the period of the whole system will be far from saturating the relation (3.34) and  $T_{a \sqcup b}$  will correspond to highly composite numbers. In general we assume a relation of the form

$$i \mapsto T_i = \Theta(i), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

where  $\Theta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a multiplicative function but not necessarily completely multiplicative [4, 37], in order to accomplish with the relation (3.36) in the presence of interactions between the parts.

**3.11. On the relation between fundamental periods and primes.** From the discussion above, it is clear the existence of a relation between the series of prime numbers  $\{p_i, i = 1, 2, \dots\}$  and fundamental semi-periods of Hamilton-Randers systems. Therefore, we postulate the simpler possible relation for fundamental systems,

$$(3.37) \quad i \mapsto T_i = p_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots$$

where  $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots\}$  is the increasing sequence of prime numbers. For composite systems, the product rule (3.36) is adopted. Thus in the case of two interaction identical quantum particles  $a, a'$ , it is very interesting to assume the hypothesis that the differences on the prime numbers due to the periods are small compared with the size of the prime numbers  $p_a, p_{a'}$ . The most obvious way to associate primes to identical particles is to associate the same prime,  $p_a = p_{a'}$ , if  $a$  and  $a'$  are identical particles. Characterizations of meta-stable systems or pseudo-particle systems can be associated to twin primes, for example.

If the collection of fundamental semi-periods is associated with the collection of prime numbers, then by the relation (3.19), the minimal semi-period must be, in convenient units of the  $t$ -parameter,

$$(3.38) \quad T_{min} = 2.$$

This semi-period corresponds to the smallest possible Hamilton-Randers systems, that have inertial mass parameter zero, the relation (3.20). The associated mass spectrum of fundamental particles is related with the series of prime numbers as

$$(3.39) \quad p_i \mapsto \frac{\hbar}{2c^2} \log\left(\frac{p_i}{2}\right), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

By the prime number theorem [37], the number of fundamental states such that the semi-period  $T_a$  is bounded by a number  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  is asymptotically given by

$$(3.40) \quad \sum_{p < x} 1 \sim Li(x),$$

where

$$(3.41) \quad Li(x) = \int_2^x \frac{dt}{\log t}.$$

Since there is a bijection between the number of periods and the number of states, this expression also determines the number of mass  $M_i$  less than a given upper bound.

Then we show that the periods are the prime numbers  $T_i = \frac{1}{2} p_i$ , a common attribute to the quantum mechanical approach to the *Hilbert-Polya conjecture* [11, 12, 20, 55]. There exists further analogies between Hamilton-Randers models and  $xp$ -models, related with specific Hamilton-Randers dynamics.

The above discussion suggests that the rules for combining Hamilton-Randers systems is related with the fundamental laws of arithmetics and in particular, with the theory of congruences and the distribution of the prime numbers.

**3.12. Further remarks on the notion of time in Hamilton-Randers theory.** Defined in this way, the  $\tau$ -time parameters are necessarily discrete. Therefore, the degrees of freedom and dynamics of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom in Hamilton-Randers theory are strictly speaking, discrete, as well as the  $\tau$ -time parameters. However, it is particularly useful to treat the parameter  $\tau$  as continuous. This is the aptitude advocated in the present work, where we describe external time as a real parameter,  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ . The rationale beneath this approximation is that the phenomena associated to quantum or classical clocks involves a large number of fundamental cycle. Thus it is possible to define the notion of infinitesimal time  $\delta\tau$  in the theory, by looking for quantum systems whose fundamental transitions involve very short number of cycles, compare with the number of cycles of standard and physical clocks.

We also made the hypothesis that the  $t$ -parameter is continuous, although there is no doubt that this is also an approximation to a better discrete version of the theory. Such approximation can be make because the large difference between the fundamental scale and the quantum scale, that allows such approximation in the description of time and dynamical evolution.

A direct implication of *Proposition 3.7* is that the spacetime where the sub-quantum mechanical events can be located is a topological space  $M_4 \times \mathbb{Z}$ , where each point is  $(x, t) \in M_4 \times \mathbb{Z}$ . If the continuous approximation is adopted, the topological space  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}$  associated with the parameter time  $(t, \tau)$  is replaced by the *time manifold*  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, the spacetime that emerges in this description is a smooth manifold (indeed, a topological manifold that we assume to be smooth) which is locally a foliation,

$$M_5 \simeq M_3 \times \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Generically, this relation only holds locally, that is, for a small enough neighborhood  $U \in M_5$ . Apart, there is canonical foliation in the theory: there is no notion of privilege time. Each of the slits

$$\{t = (2n + 1)T, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

defines a 4-dimensional submanifold  $M_4 \hookrightarrow M_5$ , the 4-dimensional spacetime manifold where physical processes are described by physical observers.

An alternative interpretation of the pair  $(t, \tau)$  as fast/slow time parameters is not totally adequate. It implies to identify the  $\tau$ -time parameter in a bijective correspondence with values of the  $t$ -time parameter. However, this is not possible, since each  $\tau$ -time parameter is defined as an integer multiple of a number of fundamental cycles, while the  $t$ -time parameterizes the dynamics on each  $U_t$  fundamental cycle. Moreover, the identification the parameter  $\tau$  with the parameter  $t$  by a diffeomorphism implies to use a large scale (quantum or classical scale) for describing a sub-quantum scale, which is a logical contradiction. From this reasoning we conclude the strictly two-dimensional character of any time parameter and the emergence character of external time  $\tau$  in Hamilton-Randers theory.

The notion of two-dimensional time is not new in physics. It was introduced and it is being investigated in the contest of string theory and super-symmetry by I. Bars and collaborations [8]. However, we believe that this notion is radically different from our notion of two dimensional time.

**3.13. Generalities on the bare  $U_\tau$  flow.** Let us consider the trajectories of the sub-quantum molecules under the  $U_t$ -flow. The *word lines predecessors* are the maps

$$\xi_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M_4^k, t \mapsto \xi_k(t) \in M_4^k, \quad k = 1, \dots, N$$

solutions of the  $U_t$ -flow. Equivalently, by the definition of the  $\tau$ -time parameter, we can consider instead

$$\xi_{tk}(\tau) := \xi_k(t + 2T\tau), \quad t \in [0, 2T], \quad \tau \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

By the embeddings  $\varphi_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4$ , each manifold  $M_4^k$  is diffeomorphic to the manifold of observable events or spacetime manifold  $M_4$ . Then for each fixed  $t \in [0, 2T]$  one can consider the embeddings of the predecessor world lines  $\{\xi_{tk}, k = 1, \dots, N\}$  of the *sub-quantum molecules*  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  in the model spacetime manifold  $M_4$  given by  $\varphi_k(\xi_{tk}) = \hat{\xi}_{tk} \hookrightarrow M_4$ ,

$$(3.42) \quad \hat{\xi}_{tk} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M_4, \quad \tau \mapsto (\varphi_k \circ \xi_{tk})(\tau).$$

Since each value of a  $\tau$ -time parameter is associated with a particular fundamental cycle in a series of consecutive cycles, changing  $\tau$  but fixing  $t$  is equivalent to consider the position of the sub-quantum molecule at different cycles at a fixed internal time  $t \pmod{2T}$ . This succession of locations defines a world line of each  $k$  sub-quantum particle in the spacetime manifold  $M_4$ .

The kinematics and dynamics of the sub-quantum molecules respect to the external time parameter  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$  is described as follows. First, the speed components



$\beta_x$  and the acceleration components  $\beta_y$  of the vector field  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$  are defined in terms of the time inversion operator  $\mathcal{T}_t$  by the expressions

$$(3.43) \quad \beta_x := \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \mathcal{T}_t(\beta)), \quad \beta_y := \frac{1}{2}(\beta + \mathcal{T}_t(\beta)).$$

The components  $(\beta_{kx}^\mu, \beta_{ky}^\mu)$  determine the loci of the  $k$  sub-quantum molecule at the given frozen  $t$  in terms of the  $\tau$ -time parameter. That is, for each of the fundamental cycles, we consider the loci of each  $k$ -molecule at  $\{\dots, t - 2T, t, 2T + t, 4T + t, \dots\}$ . At this point  $\tau$  is discrete, but we will consider in the following considerations, the approximation that  $\tau$  is indeed continuous from a macroscopic point of view.

For each HR-system, the non-degeneracy of the fundamental tensor  $g$  of the underlying Hamilton-Randers space is ensured when the vector field  $\beta$  is constrained by the condition (3.16). Such condition implies that

- (1) The velocity vector of the sub-quantum atoms is normalized by the condition  $\eta_4^k(\dot{\xi}_{tk}, \dot{\xi}_{tk}) \leq v_{\max}^2 = c^2$ . This implies that the world lines of sub-quantum molecules on the time  $\tau$  are sub-luminal or luminal.
- (2) If the *on-shell* conditions

$$\{\dot{x}^k = y^k, k = 1, \dots, 4N\}$$

hold good, then there is a maximal bound for the proper acceleration  $\eta_4^k(\ddot{\xi}_{tk}, \ddot{\xi}_{tk}) \leq A_{\max}^2$ .

Hence the speed vector and accelerations of the sub-quantum molecules respect to the  $U_\tau$  evolution are bounded,

$$(3.44) \quad \eta_4(\beta_{kx}, \beta_{kx}) \leq c, \quad \eta_4(\beta_{ky}, \beta_{ky}) \leq A_{\max}^2, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

The conditions (3.44) are 4-dimensional covariant.

A direct consequence of the conditions (3.44) is that the velocity of each of the sub-quantum molecules respect to the  $U_t$  evolution, must also be bounded by the speed of light, in the coordinate systems associated to free falling coordinate systems on  $M_4$ . If this condition of finiteness does not hold, it could happen that the difference in the coordinates at two consecutive instant of  $\tau$ -time, for a fixed  $t$ -time and for some specific molecules, is outside of the causal cone defined by (3.44), implying a contradiction with the Randers conditions.

The classical Hamiltonian function (3.32) of a HR-system can also be defined by the *partially averaged Hamiltonian function*

$$H_t(u, p) := \left( \frac{1}{2} F(u, p) - \frac{1}{2} F(\mathcal{T}_t(u), \mathcal{T}_t^*(p)) \right).$$

Thus we observe that the Hamiltonian is associated to the evolution operator associated to the center of mass of a two sub-quantum atoms, one evolving on one direction of  $t$ -time and the other on the opposite direction of the  $t$ -time,

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &\equiv I - \imath F_t(u, p) \delta\tau, & U_{-t} &\equiv I + \imath F_{-t}(u, p) \delta\tau \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{2}(U_t + U_{-t}) &= 1 - \imath H_t(u, p) \delta\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line applies to the evolution of some initial conditions in an appropriate way, for instance, in the Koopman-von Neumann formalism that we will

introduce in the next *section*. Under such condition the Hamiltonian is the difference of two individual Hamiltonian functions: one that corresponds to sub-quantum atoms evolving towards the future  $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$  and second one that corresponds to sub-quantum atoms evolving back-wards  $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$ . This physical interpretation justifies the need of the condition (3.16), in order to have non-degenerate Hamilton-Randers structures and to provide a Hamiltonian interpretation for each of them. It is then natural to read the Hamiltonian function (3.32) as corresponding to a *time orientation average* of the Hamilton-Randers function associated with a particular form of classical Hamiltonian. The non-degeneracy for the Hamilton-Randers structure is required to have the following interpretation for the Hamiltonian (3.32).

The Hamilton equations for  $H(u, p)$  are

$$\begin{aligned} u^i &= \frac{\partial H(u, p)}{\partial p_i} = 2(1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tau)) \beta^i(u) - \frac{\partial \kappa(u, p, t, \tau)}{\partial p_i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(u) p_k \right) \\ p^i &= -\frac{\partial H(u, p)}{\partial u^i} = -2(1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tau)) \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial \beta^k(u)}{\partial u^i} p_k \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial \kappa(u, p, t, \tau)}{\partial u^i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(u) p_k \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have written the equations of evolution of the world lines precursors in terms of the external time parameter  $\tau$ , since it will be normalized conveniently as we show below.

**3.14. Redefinition of the  $\tau$ -time parameter and  $U_t$  flow.** The  $U_t$  flow has been parameterized by the conformal factor  $\kappa(u, p, t, \tau)$ . However, in order to obtain dynamical equations of motion (3.12) it is necessary to conveniently normalize the  $\tau$ -time parameter. Indeed, the Hamilton equations of the Hamiltonian function (3.32) are not in general the equations (3.12). Let us call the *old* time parameter (that is, the one that appears in the  $U_\tau$  evolution until now) by  $\tilde{\tau}$  and the new parameter by  $\tau$ . In order to make them compatible, we re-define

$$(3.45) \quad \tilde{\tau} \mapsto \tau = \tilde{\tau} (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau}))^{-1}.$$

As it stands, the relation (3.45) is ill-defined, since  $\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})$  depends on  $u \in TM$  (there is not such a problem with the  $p$ -dependence, since it is a dummy variable, that it is completely fixed in function of  $\tilde{\tau}$ , once the equations of motion for the  $u$ -coordinates are solved). Hence we are constrained to postulate that the factor  $\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})$  is of the form  $\kappa(p, t, \tilde{\tau})$ ,

$$(3.46) \quad \frac{\partial \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})}{\partial u^i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8N.$$

On the other hand, one has the differential expression

$$d\tau = (1 - \kappa(p, t, \tilde{\tau})) d\tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\tau} d \left( \frac{1}{1 - \kappa(p, t, \tilde{\tau})} \right).$$

It is reasonable that respect to the external time can further impose

$$\frac{d\kappa}{d\tilde{\tau}} = 0,$$

indicating homogeneity respect to  $\tilde{\tau}$ -time translation. Then we have

$$d\tau = (1 - \kappa(p, t, \tilde{\tau}))d\tilde{\tau}$$

or in terms of derivative operators

$$(3.47) \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} = (1 - \kappa(p, t, \tilde{\tau}))\frac{d}{d\tilde{\tau}}$$

In the metastable equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$ , the  $\tilde{\tau}$ -parameter is a slow time, since the limit condition  $\lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} (1 - \kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})) = 0$ . Respect to this external  $\tau$ -time parameter and in the metastable domain, the Hamilton equations of (3.32) are

$$(3.48) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{u}^i &= \frac{\partial H(u, p)}{\partial p_i} = 2\beta^i(u), \\ \dot{p}_i &= -\frac{\partial H(u, p)}{\partial u^i} = -2 \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial \beta^k(u)}{\partial u^i} p_k, \quad i, k = 1, \dots, 8N, \end{aligned}$$

where the time derivatives are taken respect to the non-compact time parameter  $\tau$ . Since this is the domain of definition for the observable  $U_\tau$  dynamics, we adopt this slow time for the description of the  $U_\tau$  dynamics. Also note that the equations for  $u^i$  determine an autonomous dynamical system independent of the time  $\tau$ , not the slow time  $\tilde{\tau}$

### 3.15. A fundamental result in Hamilton-Randers theory.

**Theorem 3.9.** *For each dynamical system as given by the equations (3.48), there exists a Hamilton-Randers system whose Hamiltonian function is (3.32).*

It is remarkable that the  $U_\tau$  dynamics defined in this way does not depend on the particular value of  $t \in ((2n+1)T, (2n+3)T)$ . This is of relevance for the definition of the evolution of densities and observables used in quantum mechanics. Moreover, for the dynamical systems that we are considering there is not a relation as in classical mechanics of the standard form  $\dot{x}^k = 1/m p^k$ , since the Hamiltonian function (3.32) that we are considering is linear on the canonical momentum variables.

**3.16. Macroscopic observers and metric structures.** Since  $M_4$  is endowed with a Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$  with signature  $(1, -1, -1, -1)$ , there is a natural definition of ideal macroscopic observer, namely,

**Definition 3.10.** *Given the Lorentzian spacetime  $(M_4, \eta_4)$  an ideal macroscopic observer is a timelike vector field  $W \in \Gamma TM_4$ .*

This is the standard definition of observer in general relativity, based upon the notions of coincidence and congruence. Since we are adopting the point that the

reference spacetime  $M_4$  is a Lorentzian manifold, we are forced to adopt this definition. Given an observer  $W$  there is associated to the Lorentzian metric  $\eta_4$  a Riemannian metric on  $M_4$  given by the expression

$$(3.49) \quad \bar{\eta}_4(u, v) = \eta_4(u, v) - 2 \frac{\eta_4(u, W(x))\eta_4(v, W(x))}{\eta_4(W(x), W(x))}, \quad u, v \in T_x M_4, x \in M_4.$$

$d_W : M_4 \times M_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the distance function associated with the norm of the Riemannian metric  $\bar{\eta}_4$ .

We can apply these elementary metric notions of Lorentzian geometry to the geometry configuration of the embeddings of the world lines (3.42) of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom on  $M_4$ . Given an ideal macroscopic observer  $W$ , for a fixed point  $x \in M_4$  and the world line  $\hat{\xi}_{tk}$ , the *distance function* between  $x$  and  $\hat{\xi}_{tk}$  is given by the expression

$$d_W(x, \hat{\xi}_{tk}) := \inf \{d_W(x, \tilde{x}), \tilde{x} \in \hat{\xi}_{tk}\}.$$

It is clear that  $\inf\{d_W(x, \hat{\xi}_{tk}), k = 1, \dots, N\}$  depends on  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , which is unobservable for the macroscopic observer  $W$ . However, there is a definition of distance which is independent of  $t$ , namely,

$$(3.50) \quad d_W(x, \hat{\xi}_k) = \inf\{d_W(x, \hat{\xi}_{tk}), t \in [0, 2T]\}.$$

This distance function will be used when we define the quantum description of the system in *section 5*, specifically we define the density of probability in terms of the relative geometry of the define properties of the system at the point  $x \in M_4$ . The distance function  $d_W$  depends on the observer  $W$ . It also depends on the specification of the family of diffeomorphisms  $\{\varphi_k, k = 1, \dots, M\}$ . Therefore, it does not define an observable, even if it is linked with the observer  $W$ . This distance function will be used in the construction of quantum states and in its interpretation.

## 4. HILBERT SPACE FORMULATION OF HAMILTON-RANDERS SYSTEMS

In order to show how quantum mechanics emerges from Hamilton-Randers theory, it is natural to formulate the dynamics of Hamilton-Randers models using the theory of Hilbert spaces and operators acting on Hilbert space theory. This idea was first applied in the context of emergent approaches to quantum mechanics in the work of G. 't Hooft [38], while in the theory of dynamical systems one has the original ideas in the work of Koopman and von Neumann [47, 61]. Indeed, the theory developed in this work is a direct application of Koopman-von Neumann theory to Hamilton-Randers systems.

**4.1. Hilbert space formulation of classical systems applied to Hamilton-Randers systems.** Each HR-system has associated a Hilbert space and there is a Hilbert space formulation of the dynamics. To show this correspondence, let us start considering the algebra of diagonal functions  $\mathcal{F}_D(T^*TM)$  and the canonical quantization of this algebra. We assume the existence of a vector space  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun}$  and a set of operators

$$\{\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\mu : \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\}$$

such that the values of the position coordinates  $\{x_k^\mu, k = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and the velocity coordinates  $\{y_k^\mu, k = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  of the sub-quantum molecules are the eigenvalues of certain self-adjoint linear operators. Elements of  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun}$  will be called *sub-quantum states*. The operators commute between each other when applied to equal values of  $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad [x_k^\mu, x_l^\nu] = [y_k^\mu, y_l^\nu] = [x_k^\mu, y_l^\nu] = 0, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k, l = 1, \dots, N.$$

Note that since in Hamilton-Randers theory the time parameter  $(t, \tau)$  is 2-dimensional, the specification of the commutation relations of the algebra is done at each fixed value of the pair  $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . We further assume the existence of a *generator set*  $\{|x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu\rangle\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N, 4}$  of the vector space  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun}$  of common eigenvectors of the operators  $\{\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\mu, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\}$  characterized by the relations

$$(4.2) \quad \hat{x}_k^\mu |x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu\rangle = \sum_l \delta_{kl} x_l^\mu |x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu\rangle, \quad \hat{y}_k^\nu |x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu\rangle = \sum_l \delta_{kl} y_l^\nu |x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu\rangle,$$

where  $\delta_{kl}$  is the Kronecker delta function. This construction implies an equivalence between the spectra of the family  $\{\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\mu, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\}$  and the points of the configuration manifold  $TM$  of a Hamilton-Randers space,

$$(4.3) \quad Spec(\{\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\mu\}_{\mu=1}^4) \rightarrow TM_4^k, \quad \{|x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu\rangle\}_{\mu=1}^4 \mapsto (x, y).$$

The commutation relations (4.1) are only a piece of the full canonical quantization conditions of the system. The completion of the canonical quantization conditions is made by assuming the following:

- There is a set of self-adjoint linear operators

$$\{\hat{p}_{\mu x_k}, \hat{p}_{\mu y_k}, k = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$$

that generates local diffeomorphism on  $TM$  along the integral curves of the local vector fields

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k^\mu}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_k^\nu} \in \Gamma T^*TM \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N \right\},$$

with  $U \subset M$  an open subset.

- The following commutation relations at each fixed 2-time  $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  hold good,

$$(4.4) \quad [\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{p}_{\nu x_l}] = i \hbar \delta_\nu^\mu \delta_{kl}, \quad [\hat{y}_k^\mu, \hat{p}_{\nu y_l}] = i \hbar \delta_\nu^\mu \delta_{kl}, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3, 4, k = 1, \dots, N.$$

- The phase space  $T^*TM$  is commutative<sup>5</sup>,

$$(4.5) \quad [\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{x}_l^\nu] = 0, [y_k^\mu, y_l^\nu] = 0, [x_k^\mu, y_l^\nu] = 0, [\hat{p}_{\mu k}, \hat{p}_{\nu l}] = 0, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3, 4, k = 1, \dots, N.$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun}$  can be promoted to a complex pre-Hilbert space by defining the following scalar product,

$$(4.6) \quad \langle x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu | x_k^\rho, y_k^\lambda \rangle = \delta_l^k \delta(x^\mu - x^\rho) \delta(y^\nu - y^\lambda)$$

and extended by assuming bilinear property of the product for arbitrary linear combinations. Note the symmetric property of this product rule,

$$\langle x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu | x_k^\rho, y_k^\lambda \rangle = \langle x_k^\rho, y_k^\lambda | x_l^\mu, y_l^\nu \rangle.$$

Let us consider combinations of the form

$$\Psi = \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k (\varphi_k^{-1}(x_k), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle.$$

This is a generic sub-quantum state. In the most simple case one expects that, due to the existence of fundamental cycles, the vector  $\Psi$  must be  $2T$ -modular invariant. The natural way to satisfy this condition is by imposing complex modularity of the coefficients  $\alpha(\varphi_k^{-1}(x_k), z_k)$  and invariance in the product rule (4.6) respect to the external time  $\tau$ , in accordance with the congruence  $2T$ -module invariance property described in *subsection 3.10*. In order to accomplish with this second property, we adopt the Heisenberg image of the dynamics, where the ontological states  $|x_k^\mu, y_k^\nu\rangle$  do not change with time but the operators  $\{\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\nu\}_{\mu, k=1,1}^{4,N}$  change with the  $\tau$ -time. Such combinations of fundamental states  $|\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle$  that we shall consider are complex combinations, defining the vector space  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{Fun}$ .

The norm of a vector  $\Psi$  is obtained by assuming a bilinear extension of the relation (4.6). The norm in  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  is defined by

$$(4.7) \quad \|\cdot\|_{Fun} : \mathcal{H}_{Fun} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Psi \mapsto \|\Psi\|_{Fun}^2 = \langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{TM_4^k} dvol_{\eta_4^k} |\alpha_k|^2.$$

<sup>5</sup>Since the dynamics in a Hamilton-Randers theory is discrete and the continuous version is only an approximation, the commutativity condition can be seen as an approximation as well. Indeed, it would be more natural to consider a non-commutative space, for instance, Snyder spacetime.

The linear closure of the states with finite norms is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  and with the scalar product associated to this norm,  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  is a complex pre-Hilbert space.

**4.2. Quantum Hamiltonian associated to a Hamilton-Randers system and the associated Heisenberg dynamics.** The Hamiltonian operator of a HR-system is obtained by application of quantization procedure to the classical Hamiltonian (3.32) using the canonical quantization rules (4.4) and (4.5). Note that at this level it is not necessary to prescribe the Hamiltonian to be an Hermitian operator. The reason for this is that we are adopting the Heisenberg picture of dynamics in order to reproduce the deterministic differential equations (3.48). For this it is only enough to consider the Hamiltonian operator

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_t(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) &: \mathcal{H}_{Fun} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Fun} \\ \widehat{H}_t(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) &:= (1 - \kappa(t)) \sum_{k=1}^N \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}) \hat{p}_k, \end{aligned}$$

with  $(t, \tau) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 8N$ .

Let us consider the Heisenberg representation for the  $U_\tau$  dynamics, where the Hermitian operators evolve in the  $U_\tau$  time by the Heisenberg equations determined by the Hamiltonian (4.8),

$$(4.9) \quad \imath \hbar \frac{d\hat{O}}{d\tau} = [\widehat{H}_t, \hat{O}].$$

Then we have

**Theorem 4.1.** *The Heisenberg's equations associated with  $\hat{x}_k^\mu$  and  $\hat{y}_k^\mu$  reproduces the first set of Hamiltonian equations (3.48) for the slow  $\tau$ -time parameter.*

*Proof.* This result is direct if we take into account the definition of slow time (3.45). In terms of such parameter the Hamiltonian can be written simply as

$$(4.10) \quad \widehat{H}_t(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) := \sum_{k=1}^N \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}) \hat{p}_k.$$

Then the canonical theory developed in this section (the commutations relations (4.4) and (4.5)) and the structure of the Hamiltonian (4.8) in the evaluation of the Heisenberg equations implies

$$\imath \hbar \frac{d\hat{u}^i}{d\tau} = [\widehat{H}_t, \hat{u}^i] = \imath \hbar \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}) \hat{p}_k, \hat{u}^i \right] = \imath \hbar \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}).$$

That is,

$$(4.11) \quad \imath \hbar \frac{d\hat{u}^i}{d\tau} = \imath \hbar \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}).$$

Applying this operational equation on each of the fundamental states  $|u_l^\mu\rangle = |x_l^\mu, y_l^\mu\rangle$ , one obtains the first set of Hamiltonian equations (3.48) for the slow time  $\tau$ -time parameter.  $\square$

Similarly, the momentum operators follow the dynamical equation

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{d\hat{p}_{ui}}{d\tau} = [\hat{H}_t, \hat{u}] = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}) \hat{p}_k, \hat{u} \right] = - \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\partial \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u})}{\partial \hat{p}_{ui}} \hat{p}_{uk}.$$

There is a substantial difference between the operational equation the fundamental states  $|u_l^\mu\rangle$  (4.11) and the equation of motion of the momenta (4.12), which is that the system (4.11) is autonomous system, while the system (4.12) is not autonomous. At least this property makes natural that the generators of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  should be chosen as eigenvectors of the operators  $\hat{u}^\mu$  as in (4.2), while they will not be eigenvectors of the momenta operators  $\hat{p}_{k\mu}$ . Hence the second half of the equations (3.48) are not recover. This does not constitute a severe problem, since the  $p$ -coordinates are determined by the  $u$ -coordinates in Hamilton-Randers theory.

Given the Hamiltonian function (3.32), the Hamiltonian operator  $\hat{H}_t(\tau, u, p)$  is not Hermitian and it is not uniquely defined. One can construct equivalent Hamiltonian operators of the form

$$\hat{H}_{\alpha t}(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) := \frac{1}{2}(1 - \kappa(t)) \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \left( (1 + \alpha)\beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}) \hat{p}_k - \alpha \hat{p}_k \beta^k(\tau, \hat{u}) \right)$$

with  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\hat{H}_{\alpha t}(\hat{u}, \hat{p})$  determines the same equations than  $\hat{H}_t(\hat{u}, \hat{p})$ , all of them reproducing the Hamiltonian equations (3.48). However, if we want to relate this Hamiltonian with a quantum Hamiltonian, it is useful to adopt  $\hat{H}_{\alpha t}(\hat{u}, \hat{p})$  as an Hermitian Hamiltonian. Moreover, we require that the quantum Hamiltonian is preserved. A way to ensure this condition is adopting the Born-Jordan quantization prescription [16, 17, 33].

The constraints

$$(4.13) \quad \hat{y}_k^\mu = \frac{d\hat{x}_k^\mu}{d\tau}, \quad \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; \quad k = 1, \dots, N$$

are imposed. These constraints define in the Koopman-von Neumann formalism the *on-shell evolution* of the sub-quantum molecules as curves on  $TM$ . However, the constraints (4.13) are not strictly necessary from the point of view of the Hamiltonian dynamics.

We need to emphasize that adopting (4.1) the dynamical picture the Heisenberg picture of dynamics is adopted in this theory as the natural one to describe the dynamics of the ontological degrees of freedom. In these picture, the ket space of sub-quantum states  $\{|x_l^\mu, y_l^\mu\rangle\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N, 4}$  do not change on  $\tau$ -time, but the operators associated to the quantized generalized position and canonical momenta change. Therefore, a generic state  $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  does not change with  $\tau$ -time in this picture, while operators that are functional dependent of the canonical operators  $\{\hat{u}_k^\mu, \hat{p}_k^\mu\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N, 4}$  change on  $\tau$ -time as the Heisenberg equation determines. Note that in the Heisenberg dynamics the eigenvalues of the Hermitian operators changes with  $\tau$ -time. Instead, the ket vectors do not change with time [22].



Finally, let us note that the meta-stability condition (3.33) is translated in the quantum formulation of  $HR$ -systems to

$$(4.14) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \widehat{H}_t(\hat{u}, \hat{p})|\Psi\rangle = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

This is the pre-quantum formulation of  $\tau$ -parameter time diffeomorphism invariance. Note that only holds on the equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .

**4.3. Sub-quantum operators and quantum mechanical operators.** The commutation relations (4.4) are mathematically and physically consistent, despite the fact that in quantum mechanics, the canonical coordinate operators

$$\{\widehat{X}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}$$

do not commute in general with the velocity operators

$$\{\dot{\widehat{X}}^a = \frac{d\widehat{X}^a}{d\tau}, a = 2, 3, 4\},$$

while they do not commute with the position operators,

$$[\widehat{X}^a, \dot{\widehat{X}}^a] \neq 0.$$

If the constraint (4.13) holds good, in general there are no pair of operators  $(\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\mu)$  in the collection  $\{(\hat{x}_k^a, \hat{y}_k^a)\}_{k=1, a=2}^{N,4}$  that can coincide with any of the quantum operators  $\{\widehat{X}^a, \dot{\widehat{X}}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}$ . This is because, if  $\dot{\widehat{X}}^a$  is determined by means of the corresponding Heisenberg equations, then the quantum Hamiltonian should not contain the momentum operator in a form which contains higher order terms than linear terms. Thus for instance, a Hamiltonian of the form

$$(4.15) \quad \widehat{H} = f^{ab} \widehat{P}_a \widehat{P}_b + \tilde{f}^{ab} \widehat{X}_a^\mu \widehat{P}_{\mu b} + f^{\mu a} \tilde{P}_{\mu a} + K(\widehat{X}), \quad a, b = 2, 3, 4, \quad \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

where  $K(\widehat{X})$  is a scalar function of the position operators, will define a non-trivial commutator  $[\widehat{X}^a, \dot{\widehat{X}}^a]$ , contrary to the hypothesis that  $[\hat{x}_k^\mu, \hat{y}_k^\mu] = 0$ .

The exception to this argument is the case when the quantum Hamiltonian  $\widehat{H}$  is at most linear on the  $\widehat{P}$  operators. This determines fermions. Thus it is not a surprise the result found by G. 't Hooft that massless Dirac fermions can be described as deterministic systems [38, 41]. By by this argument, it also shows the difference between Hamilton-Randers models advocated in this work and general CA models advocated by Hooft theory.

By definition, the operators  $\{\widehat{X}^a, \dot{\widehat{X}}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}$  have as spectrum the possible outcomes of measurements on a quantum system for the cartesian position coordinates and the corresponding speeds. In a more complete version of the theory, the operators  $\{\widehat{X}^a, \dot{\widehat{X}}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}$  shall emerge in HR-systems together with the wave function for the quantum state from the mathematical elements of the underlying dynamical system. The quantum states constitute a phenomenological description of the ergodic dynamics of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom, when the projection  $(t, \tau) \mapsto \tau$  is considered. The exact relation between the emergent operators  $\{\widehat{X}^a, \dot{\widehat{X}}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}$  and the entire family of operators  $\{(\hat{x}_k^a, \hat{y}_k^a, \hat{p}_{kx_k}^a, \hat{p}_{ky_k}^a)\}_{k=1, a=2}^{N,4}$  is still missing in our version of the theory, but it is

expected not to be a symplectic transformation, among other things because there is no conservation on the number of degrees of freedom. In particular, we have that

$$\# \{(\hat{x}_k^a, \hat{y}_k^a, \hat{p}_{kx_k}^a, \hat{p}_{ky_k}^a), k = 1, \dots, N, a = 2, 3, 4\} \gg \# \{\hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}.$$

**4.4. Non-commutativity of the spacetime suggested by Hamilton-Randers Theory.** The quantum states obtained from HR-systems should be non-local in both position and speed (or canonical momentum) variables and the operators  $\hat{X}^a$  and  $\hat{X}^a$  have generically non-zero dispersion when applied to physical states. In general, the operators

$$\{\hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^a, a = 2, 3, 4\}$$

are non-linear and non-trivial combinations of operators in the collection

$$\left\{(\hat{x}_k^a, \hat{y}_k^a, \hat{p}_{kx_k}^a, \hat{p}_{ky_k}^a)\right\}_{k=1, a=2}^{N, 4},$$

and mix configurations of coordinate operators  $\hat{x}, \hat{y}$  and momentum operators  $\hat{p}$  can appear in the combinations  $\hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^a$ , for example. Thus in general, the quantum states must hold a representation of a non-commutative algebra,

$$(4.16) \quad [\hat{X}^\mu, \hat{X}^\nu] = A^{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{X}^\mu, \hat{X}^\nu] = B^{\mu\nu}, \quad [\hat{X}^\mu, \hat{X}^\nu] = C^{\mu\nu},$$

with  $\mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . This algebra contrasts with the related commutative algebra (4.5). From this argument follows that Hamilton-Randers theory suggests non-commutative spacetime geometry with where  $A^{\mu\nu} \neq 0$ . The commutativity of spacetime  $M_4$  should be considered an approximation to a deeper non-commutative spacetime, linked with the fundamental fact of discreteness. An interesting realization of these conditions is Snyder non-commutative spacetime [58]. It is a fully Lorentz invariant algebra and the spacetime is discrete, with coordinate differences of the order of the Planck length.

**4.5. On the operator interpretation of coordinate time.** The 4-dimensional covariant formalism adopted, that treats on equal footing the four dimensions on each manifold  $M_4^k$ , is consistent with the principle of relativity, in particular, with the absence of geometric structures as *absolute time structures*. While this point of view is natural at the classical level as it was considered in *section 3*, at the quantum level it requires further attention. In particular, the requirement that  $\{\hat{x}_k^0\}_{k=1}^N$  and  $\hat{X}^0$  are operators is in sharp contrast with non-relativistic quantum mechanics, where coordinate time is a parameter and does not correspond to an observable. This ambiguity is resolved naturally starting by considering the situation in quantum field theory, where all coordinates  $X^\mu$  are parameter or labels for the quantum fields. This interpretation is also applicable to the variables  $\{x_k^\mu\}_{k=1}^N$ , since they are used in Hamilton-Randers models not as a observables but rather as a parameter or labels for the sub-quantum degrees of freedom. Therefore, it is reasonable that the same happens for  $X^\mu$ . The use of Koopman- von Neumann theory does not imply that the time coordinates  $\{x_k^\mu\}_{k=1}^N$  or  $X^\mu$  become observable, but it is only a formal description of the theory. The fact that the coordinates are considered

operators and that a maximal speed of propagation must hold for the sub-quantum degrees of freedom have an interesting relation with Snyder quantum spacetime, that provides a framework consistent with relativity and discreteness character of the coordinates  $\{x_k^\mu\}$ .

The fact that we are using an operator approach to the description of the coordinates  $\{x_k^\mu\}_{k=1}^N$  does not imply that they are observables. It is a technical construction. Indeed, our approach is in consonance with the interpretation of coordinates  $X^\mu$  as labels, as it is usual in quantum field theory.

5. RUDIMENTS OF THE QUANTUM MECHANICS FORMALISM FROM  
HAMILTON-RANDERS SYSTEMS

We have introduced in *section 3* the elements of Hamilton-Randers dynamical systems and in *section 4* the Koopman-von Neumann formulation of the theory. In this *section* we construct the quantum mechanical Hilbert space from the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  and we show that the mathematical framework of quantum mechanics can be recovered from our theory by a process of averaging, following ergodic arguments applied to the  $U_t$  dynamics.

**5.1. Quantum Hilbert space from Hamilton-Randers systems.** It is the purpose of this sub-section to show how a generic quantum mechanical wave function can be expressed in terms of the ontological states  $\{|x_k^\mu, y_k^\mu\rangle\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N,4}$ . Let us consider a sub-quantum state  $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  that in terms of Dirac notation is of the form

$$(5.1) \quad |\Psi(u)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N e^{i\vartheta_{k\Psi}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} n_{k\Psi}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle,$$

such that it has finite  $\|\cdot\|_{Fun}$  norm as defined by the relation (4.7). This is a generic state of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$ . We call these specific combinations of ontological states *predecessor states*. The fundamental assumption beneath our construction developed below is that every quantum state  $\psi$  is obtained from a predecessor state  $\Psi$  by averaging over the speed coordinates. In Dirac notation, it is the bracket

$$(5.2) \quad |\psi(x)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_k^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k e^{i\vartheta_{k\Psi}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} n_{k\Psi}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle,$$

where the measure  $d^4 z_k$  has support on a sub-set of the causal region

$$\alpha(z_k, z_k) \leq 0$$

where also the proper maximal accelerations of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom are bounded. The speed defined by coordinate systems identified with inertial systems or free falling coordinate systems must be smaller than the speed of light. Therefore, the measure is such that, if  $\tilde{y}_k$  lays out the causal cone, one has formally

$$d^4 z_k(x, \tilde{y}_k) \equiv 0.$$

In the state (5.2) the integration along the speed coordinates is fundamental and differentiates  $\psi$  from the pre-quantum state  $\Psi$ . In Hamilton-Randers theory the average operation over the speed coordinates is partially justified by the ergodic property of the  $U_t$  flow in the ergodic regime. If we consider a particular point  $x \in M_4$ , it is assumed that a form of the ergodic theorem could be applied and as a result, the average along the  $t$ -time parameter in a period  $[0, 2T]$  is identified with the average along the speed coordinates. On the other hand, the positions are not integrated: they constitute labels for the states to be used by macroscopic observers in the comparison of results.

It was assumed that each fundamental cycle have three dynamical regimes: an ergodic regime, which is the longest one on the  $t$ -time parameter, a short contractive regime and a short expanding regime. If the  $U_t$  flow is completely ergodic, it will be more natural to apply a stronger form of the ergodic theorem [6] and assume that time average during the ergodic phase of the  $U_t$  is equivalent to velocity integration (phase space integration or fiber average).

A quantum state  $\psi(x)$  as defined by the expression (5.2) can be re-cast in the following way. Two elements of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$   $\Psi_1$  and  $\Psi_2$  are said to be equivalent if they have the same average given by the operation (5.2). Such relation is an equivalence relation  $\sim_{\langle \rangle}$ . Then a quantum state is an element of the coset space  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}/\sim_{\langle \rangle}$ . An element of the coset space containing  $\Psi$  is  $\psi = [\Psi] := \{\tilde{\Psi}\}$ , with  $\tilde{\Psi}$  determined by having the same average state  $\psi$  respect to averaging along speed coordinates operation. The canonical projection is

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{H}_{Fun} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Fun}/\sim_{\langle \rangle} \quad \Psi \mapsto [\Psi] \equiv \psi.$$

The sum operation in the coset space  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}/\sim_{\langle \rangle}$  is defined as follows. If  $\psi_1 = [\Psi_1]$ ,  $\psi_2 = [\Psi_2]$ , then

$$\psi_1 + \psi_2 = [\Psi_1] + [\Psi_2] := [\Psi_1 + \Psi_2].$$

The product by a scalar  $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$  is defined by

$$\lambda \psi = [\lambda \Psi] := \lambda[\Psi].$$

Since the operation of averaging that defines the equivalence class is linear, these operations are well defined and do not depend upon the representative of the equivalence classes.

Hamilton-Randers theory makes extensive use of properties of Fourier transform on complex field. Thus the number field  $\mathbb{K}$  is fixed to be the field of complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$ . Then the complex, linear bulk generated by finite combinations of fundamental states  $\psi$  is the space  $\mathcal{H}$ , that is indeed a complex vector space. Furthermore, the projection (5.3) can be extended to all the elements of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\sum_a \beta_a \Psi_a \mapsto \sum_a \beta_a [\Psi_a], \quad \Psi_a \in \mathcal{H}_{Fun}, \beta_a \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Let us consider two possible states  $A$  and  $B$  that can be associated to the same physical system, in principle with different energy and different environmental conditions. Since  $A$  and  $B$  are associated to the same quantum system, the associated sub-quantum degrees of freedom are indicated by a sub-index  $k = 1, \dots, N$ , with the only difference between  $A$  and  $B$  being on the configurations of each  $k$  sub-quantum molecule. Then we make the assumption that the collection of product of local phases

$$\left\{ e^{i \vartheta_{kA}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} e^{-i \vartheta_{kB}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)}, \quad x \in M_4, z_k \in T_{\varphi_k^{-1}(x)} M_4^k \right\}$$

are highly oscillating compared to an universal characteristic frequency  $1/T_{min}$ . Formally this highly oscillating property is equivalent to the condition

$$(5.4) \quad \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k e^{i \vartheta_{kA}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} e^{-i \vartheta_{kB}(\varphi_{k'}^{-1}(x'), z'_{k'})} \equiv C_\psi \delta_{AB} \delta_{kk'} \delta(x_k - x'_{k'}) \delta(z_k - z'_{k'}),$$

where  $C_\psi$  is a normalization factor depending on the state  $\psi$ . The measure  $d^4 z_k$  must be such that on any normalized test function  $\chi \in T_{\varphi_k^{-1}(x)} M_4$ , the relation

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \int_{M_4} dvol_{\eta_4} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k |\chi(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)|^2 = N$$

must hold good.

At this point, a second justification for applying averaging makes emphasis in the analogy with the application averaging method in classical mechanics [5]. In our case, the integration over the speed coordinates could be justified by the highly oscillatory character of the phases  $\vartheta$ , which can be viewed as a definition of the velocity vector of  $k$ . Since the average is a measure of the  $t$ -time the particle is with a definite speed and for a large number of passings and if the ergodic regime is dominant on time, the average value operation along speeds introduce a measure representative of the value of the physical fields and functions.

From a physical point of view, condition (5.4) is a strong form of locality for the quantum states as elements of the space  $\mathcal{H}$ . It is a consistent condition for the identification of the projection (5.3), since it is used to define a *separability* property of the space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In terms of the ontological states  $\{|x_k^\mu, y_k^\mu\rangle\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N, 4}$  and using the product rule (4.6), one finds the following expression for the isometrically induced scalar product from  $(\mathcal{H}_{Fun}, \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle)$ ,

$$(5.5) \quad \langle \psi_A | \psi_B \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{M_4} \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} dvol_{\eta_4} \wedge d^4 z_k \sum_{k'=1}^N \int_{M_4} \int_{\varphi_{k'^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} dvol_{\eta_4} \wedge d^4 z'_{k'} e^{i \vartheta_{kA}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} e^{-i \vartheta_{kB}(\varphi_{k'}^{-1}(x), z_k)} \cdot n_{Ak}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) n_{Bk'}(\varphi_{k'}^{-1}(x), z_{k'}).$$

After a short calculation and using the product orthogonality condition for the ontological states (4.6), the following orthogonality condition for the wave functions (5.2) is obtained,

$$(5.6) \quad \langle \psi_A | \psi_B \rangle = 0, \quad \text{if } A \neq B.$$

The same procedure implies the normalization rule

$$(5.7) \quad \int_{M_4} dvol_{\eta_4} \langle \psi | \psi \rangle = \int_{M_4} dvol_{\eta_4} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_k^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) = 1.$$

Thus the collection of fundamental  $\psi$  of the form (5.2) determines a set of orthogonal elements, that it is obviously generator set of  $\mathcal{H}$  and hence a basis. Note that

because the elements of  $\mathcal{H}$  have finite norm, they are normalizable. Thus the condition (5.7) is re-cast as

$$\|\psi\|_{L_2} = 1.$$

**Proposition 5.1.** *The linear space  $\mathcal{H}$  with the  $L_2$ -norm is a complex Hilbert space.*

*Proof.* The set  $\mathcal{H}$  with the product

$$\langle \psi | \chi \rangle := \int_{M_4} d\text{vol}_{\eta_4} \psi^* \chi$$

is a pre-Hilbert space. Moreover, since the elements of  $\mathcal{H}$  are finite combinations of ontological states, that define a Hilbert space, any Cauchy sequence of  $\psi$  can be decompose in a finite sum of Cauchy sequences of ontological states, hence it is a convergent sequence.  $\square$

**5.2. Representations of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom.** Applying linearity of the product  $\langle, \rangle$ , one obtains the relation

$$(5.8) \quad \langle x_k, z_k | \Psi \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} e^{i \vartheta_{\Psi k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} n_{\Psi k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k).$$

This expression is analogous to the quantum mechanical relation between the space representation and the momentum representation in quantum mechanics,

$$(5.9) \quad \langle \vec{x} | \vec{p} \rangle = e^{i \vec{x} \cdot \vec{p}} \frac{1}{(2\pi \hbar)^{3/2}}.$$

This representation is obtained in quantum mechanics from the coordinate representation of the translation operator, by solving a simple differential equation and determines an unitary transformation [22].

The expression (5.8) defines a natural phase  $\vartheta(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)$  and a natural module  $n_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)$  of the bra state  $\langle x_k, z_k | \in \mathcal{H}_{Fun}^*$  respect to the sub-quantum state  $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  as representation on  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  of the  $U_t$  flow. If we follow this analogy, the role of  $\langle x |$  in (5.8) is played by  $\langle x_k, z_k |$ , while the role of  $|p\rangle$  is played by the sub-quantum state  $\Psi$ . If we pursue further this analogy, as for the expression (5.9), the relation (5.8) should be the solution of a partial differential equation directly related with the  $U_t$ -flow.

**5.3. Emergence of the Born rule in the Heisenberg representation of the dynamics.** Since we are considering the Heisenberg's picture of dynamics for the sub-quantum degrees of freedom, the fundamental quantum states  $|x_k, z_k\rangle$  do not change with the time parameter  $\tau$ . The density squared of the fundamental wave function  $n^2(x)$  is given by the expression

$$(5.10) \quad n^2(x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_k^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k).$$

Since  $n_k^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)$  is the number of world lines passing at  $\varphi_k^{-1}(x) \in M_4^k$  with velocity speed vector  $z_k$ , then  $n^2(x)$  can be read as the *total density* of world-lines of sub-quantum molecules close to the point  $x$ . This is in accordance with our definition of density of lines, showing that the ansatz (5.2) provides a statistical

interpretation of a quantum state in terms of the presence of sub-quantum degrees of freedom at a given spacetime point.

**Theorem 5.2.** *The density of lines  $n^2(x)$  coincides with the square of the wave function,*

$$(5.11) \quad \frac{1}{N} n^2(x) = |\psi|^2(x),$$

*Proof.* This is direct consequence of the relations (5.7) and (5.10).  $\square$

Remember that for a fixed spacetime point  $x \in M_4$ , the density  $n_k(x)$  is necessarily 1 or 0, depending on whether the  $k$ -subquantum degree of freedom *pass close* to  $x$  or not. If we associate  $n^2(x)$ , that is a probability of presence of world lines of sub-quantum particles at  $x \in M_4$ , with the probability density to find the particle at  $x \in M_4$ , then the relation (5.11) is identified with the Born rule. Following this interpretation, the Born rule is obtained in Hamilton-Randers theory after an argument involving dynamical and statistical considerations, a locality property (5.4) and the assumption of in the Heisenberg picture of the dynamics for the sub-quantum molecules. In other pictures of the dynamics, the interpretation is adopted, in consistence with unitary equivalence of different pictures in quantum mechanics.

It is remarkable that the interpretation of  $n^2(x)$  advocated above applies to quantum pure states  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$  describing individual quantum systems and therefore, this interpretation is not a statistical interpretation of the quantum state.

The density of lines  $n^2(x)$  is normalized by the condition

$$(5.12) \quad \int_{M_4} n^2(x) dvol_{\eta_4} = N$$

and since in our models the number of degrees of freedom  $N$  is preserved, we have the conservation law

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \left( \int_{M_4} n^2(x) dvol_{\eta_4} \right) = 0.$$

The derivative can pass inside the integration,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau} \left( \int_{M_4} n^2(x) dvol_{\eta_4} \right) &= \int_{M_4} \frac{d}{d\tau} (n^2(x) dvol_{\eta_4}) \\ &= \int_{M_4} \frac{d}{d\tau} (n^2(x)) dvol_{\eta_4} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us assume the product structure of  $M_4 = \mathbb{R} \times M_3$  and that the invariant volume form is  $dvol_{\eta_4} = d\tau \wedge d\mu_3$ , where  $d\mu_3(\tau, \vec{x})$  is an invariant volume form on each leave  $\{\tau\} \times M_3$ . Then the above constraint is expressed as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times M_3} d\tau \wedge \frac{d}{d\tau} \left( d\mu_3 \sum_{k=1}^N n_k^2 \right) = 0.$$



This is equivalent to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tau \int_{M_3} \frac{d}{d\tau} \left( d\mu_3 \sum_{k=1}^N n_k^2 \right) = 0.$$

Let us apply a *bump* diffeomorphism  $\theta : M_3 \rightarrow M'_3$  such that it is the identity, except for a small region around a point  $x_0 \in M_3$ , but such that it produces an arbitrary *bump* around  $x_0$ . Then by the invariance under diffeomorphism property of the integrals, at the point  $x_0$  we have

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \left( d\mu_3 \sum_{k=1}^N n_k^2 \right) = 0.$$

If  $\frac{d}{d\tau}(d\mu_3) = 0$ , this expression can be rewritten as a continuity equation,

$$(5.13) \quad \frac{\partial n^2}{\partial \tau} + \vec{v} \vec{\nabla} n^2 = 0.$$

In this expression the vector field  $\vec{v}$  stands for the field of an hypothetical fluid that makes the above equation self-consistent. Hence it has a different interpretation than in quantum mechanics [14]. The existence of the vector field  $\vec{V}$  must be imposed in Hamilton-Randers theory, in contraposition with quantum mechanics, where it is fixed by demanding compatibility with Schrödinger equation. However, a natural candidate for  $\vec{v}$  is given by

$$(5.14) \quad \vec{v} \propto \sum_{k=1}^N \vec{\nabla}_k \vartheta_k,$$

in analogy with quantum mechanics.

**5.4. Physical interpretation of the density  $n^2(x)$ .** Given a macroscopic observer  $W$ , there is defined the distance structure  $d_W$  as in (3.50). Let us consider an arbitrary point  $x \in M_4$ . We say that a world line  $\varphi_k(\xi_{t_k}) : I \rightarrow M_4$  pass close to  $x \in M_4$  if its image in  $M_4$  by the isometry  $\varphi_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4$  is in the interior of an open set  $\mathcal{U}(x, L_{min}, \tilde{L})$  whose points are at a distance  $d_W$  between  $L_{min}$  and  $\tilde{L}$  from the point  $x \in M_4$ . Then by application of the ergodic theorem, the density of lines  $n^2(x)$  is the number of world lines  $\varphi_k(\xi_{t_k}) : I \rightarrow M_4$  that pass close to  $x$  for a fixed internal time  $t(l)$  for the  $l$ -fundamental cycle  $t(l) \in [(2l+1)T, (2l+3)T]$ .  $\tilde{L}$  is large compared with  $L_{min}$  but small compared with any macroscopic observable variation of local coordinates. We assume that there is independence in the definition of  $n^2(x)$  respect to  $\tilde{L}$ .

At first sight, this interpretation of the density  $n^2(x)$  is not  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ -invariant for generic models, a fact which is consistent with usual models in quantum mechanics. However, the existence of measures that are  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ -invariant allows to construct invariant theories.

$n^2(x)$  measures the relative presence of a quantum system at a given point. It can be interpreted as the probability to find a particle at  $x$  if a spacetime position measurement is done. It refers to one particle and not to a statistical ensemble

of quantum particles. Therefore,  $n^2(x)$  has the same interpretation than Born's interpretation for  $|\psi^2$  in the quantum theory.

### 5.5. Emergence of the classical $\tau$ -time diffeomorphism invariant constraint.

The relation (4.14) is a constraint on  $\mathcal{H}_{Fun}$ . Since  $\mathcal{H} \equiv \mathcal{H}_{Fun}/\sim_{\langle \rangle}$ , the analogous constraint can be applied to a subset of elements in  $\mathcal{H}$ , which corresponds to physically admissible quantum states. Such constraint on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is a quantum version of the  $\tau$ -time diffeomorphism invariant condition (3.33),

**Proposition 5.3.** *For any physical state  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  the constraint*

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \widehat{H}_t(u, p) |\psi\rangle = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

*holds good.*

This constraint holds periodically in the parameter  $t$ , with a periodicity  $2T$ . Thus  $\tau$ -time re-parametrization invariance only holds in the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ . This is in agreement with the diagonal  $\text{Diff}(M_4)$ -invariance symmetry of the Hamilton-Randers systems formulated in *section 3*.

One could be tempted to think that the constraint (5.15) can be interpreted as the Wheeler-de Witt equation. However, there are two main differences between them. The first one is that we did not state a particular model for the Hamiltonian  $\widehat{H}_t$ . Thus the relation (5.15) with Wheeler-DeWitt equation is purely formal. Second, the constraint (5.15) only holds in the metastable regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$  and not during the whole  $U_t$  flow evolution.

**5.6. Heuristic proof that a free quantum state is a Hamilton-Randers system.** As an example of the models that can be associated to Hamilton-Randers systems, let us consider a quantum state of a physical system described by a free state  $|P^\mu\rangle$ . In terms of the basis of spacetime position operators  $|X^\mu\rangle$ , the state is decomposed as

$$|P^\mu\rangle = \int_{M_4} d^4x \langle X^\mu | P^\mu \rangle |X^\mu\rangle,$$

where the coefficient  $\langle X^\mu | P^\mu \rangle$  is a scalar. If the state  $|P^\mu\rangle$  is of the type described by Hamilton-Randers models, then it is necessary that

$$\langle X^\mu | P^\mu \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_k^{-1}(T_x M)} d^4z_k \exp(i \vartheta_{kP}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) n_{kP}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \langle X^\mu | \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k \rangle.$$

In order to compare with a free solution

$$(5.16) \quad \langle X^\mu | P^\mu \rangle = \frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^{4/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{iX^\mu P_\mu}{\hbar}\right)$$

we make the following ansatz,

$$(5.17) \quad \exp(i \vartheta_{kP}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) = \exp\left(-\frac{i x^\mu P_\mu}{\hbar}\right),$$

$$(5.18) \quad n_{kP}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \delta(z_k - P).$$

Then we have the expression

$$\langle X^\mu | P^\mu \rangle \propto \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \exp\left(-\frac{i x^\mu P_\mu}{\hbar}\right) \langle X^\mu | \varphi_k^{-1}(x), P \rangle.$$

Thus to recover (5.16) it is necessary that

$$(5.19) \quad \sum_{k=1}^N \langle X^\mu | \varphi_k^{-1}(x), P \rangle \equiv \int_{\varphi_k^{-1}(T_x M)} d^4 z_k \delta(X - x).$$

These equivalence in the operations can be argued if we notice that the number of degrees of freedom  $N$  is large and if we notice that for a state  $|P\rangle$ , there is homogeneity in the spacetime probability density distribution.

Note that in this derivation a four-dimensional covariant formulation has been adopted. This is in concordance with the notion developed in *section 4* and also with the underlying relativistic speed limit. In addition, free spinor fields are easily described in a similar way. Indeed, this constitutes a generalization of the famous example from Hooft of four dimensional fermions to general spinor representations of Dirac type. It is worthily to remark the importance of this case, since one can extend this construction to waves packets by Fourier analysis theory.

**5.7. An example of interaction in Hamilton-Randers models.** The following example is taken literally from [29] and describes a method or example to introduce non-trivial interactions in Hamilton-Randers theory. Suppose a system composed by two identical elementary system, being their dynamics described by a deterministic Hamiltonian of the form (4.10), so their Hamiltonian are determined by  $(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$  and  $(\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ . The 1-forms  $\beta_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . have norm less than one by the corresponding Riemannian norms  $\alpha_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . There are at least two ways to produce a bigger Randers space using just the above geometric data:

- (1) The first way is valid for complete general structures

$$\alpha = \alpha_1 \oplus \alpha_2; \quad \beta = \beta_1 \oplus \beta_2.$$

This construction does not produce interaction terms in the total Hamiltonian. There is a priori not relation  $\alpha_1 \alpha_2$ .

- (2) The second form recovers the impossibility for a external observer to differentiate between identical particles:

$$\vec{p} = \vec{p}_1 \times \vec{0} + \vec{0} \times \vec{p}_2; \quad \vec{\beta} = \vec{\beta}_1 \times \vec{0} + \vec{0} \times \vec{\beta}_2,$$

$$\alpha = \alpha_1 \oplus \alpha_2; \quad \alpha_1 = \alpha_2.$$

The quantum total Hamiltonian is given by:

$$\vec{\beta}(\vec{p}) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \vec{\beta}_1(\vec{p}_1) + \vec{\beta}_1(\vec{p}_2) + \vec{\beta}_2(\vec{p}_1) + \vec{\beta}_2(\vec{p}_2)\right).$$

The mixed terms produce the interaction. The condition  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$  is to ensure that the above construction is a Randers space.

It is direct that this method can be developed further to introduce more complex interactions.

## 6. CONCENTRATION OF MEASURE AND MEASUREMENT PROCESSES IN HAMILTON-RANDERS SYSTEMS

We introduce an application of a general theory of concentration of measure in emergent quantum mechanics. This mathematical theory provides a mechanism to explain the collapse of quantum states. This is because the concentration domain of the fundamental cycles is assumed to correspond to a  $U_t$  flow dynamics which is 1-Lipschitz, a context where the concentration can be applied.

**6.1. Concentration of measure.** In this *section* we discuss the relation between *concentration of measure* [35, 48, 59] and Hamilton-Randers theory. The concentration of measure is a general property of regular enough functions defined in high dimensional topological spaces  $\mathbf{T}$  endowed with a metric function  $d : \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and measure structure  $\mu_P$ . In a nut-shell, the phenomena of concentration of measure for the category of topological spaces admitting a notion of dimension can be stated as follows [59],

*In a measure metric space of large dimension, every real 1-Lipschitz function of many variables is almost constant almost everywhere.*

In the formalization of the concept of concentration one makes use of the metric properties and the measure properties of the space to provide a precise meaning for the notions of *almost constant* and *almost everywhere*. Remarkably, in the phenomenon of concentration, the notions of concepts the measure structure and metric structure are independent from each other. Hence the concentration of measure is naturally formulated in the category of Gromov mm-spaces [35] and for 1-Lipschitz functions.

In a general measure metric space  $(\mathbf{T}, \mu_P, d)$ , the *concentration function*

$$\alpha(\mu_P) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \rho \mapsto \alpha(\mu_P, \rho),$$

is defined by the condition that  $\alpha(\mu_P, \rho)$  is the minimal real number such that

$$(6.1) \quad \mu_P(|f - M_f| > \rho) \leq 2\alpha(\mu_P, \rho),$$

for any real function  $f : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Thus  $\alpha(\mu_P, \rho)$  does not depend on the function  $f$ .  $M_f$  is the median or Levy's mean of  $f$ , which is defined as the value attained by  $f : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\mu_P(f > M_f) = 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_P(f < M_f) = 1/2.$$

Therefore, the probability that the function  $f$  differs from the median  $M_f$  in the sense of the given measure  $\mu_p$  by more than the given value  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  is bounded by the concentration function  $\alpha(P, \rho)$ .

**Example 6.1.** *A typical example of concentration of measure is provided by the concentration of measure in spheres  $\mathbb{S}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ . Let  $(\mathbb{S}^N, \mu_S, d_S)$  be the  $N$ -dimensional sphere with the standard measure and the round metric distance function. As a consequence of the isoperimetric inequality [48] it holds that for each*

$A \in \mathbb{S}^N$  with  $\mu(A) \geq 1/2$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , the set

$$A_\epsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{S}^N \text{ s.t. } d_S(x, A) \leq \epsilon\}$$

is such that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{S}}(A_\epsilon) \leq 1 - \sqrt{\pi/8} \exp(-\epsilon^2 (N-1)/2).$$

More generically, given Then a smooth function  $f : \mathbb{S}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the set

$$A_\epsilon := \{x \in \mathbb{S}^N \text{ s.t. } f(x) = M_f\} \geq 1/2$$

the concentration inequality

$$(6.2) \quad \mu_{\mathbb{S}}(A_\epsilon) \leq 1 - \sqrt{\pi/2} \exp(-\epsilon^2 (N-1)/2).$$

holds good.

The fundamental implication of the relation (6.2) is that for high dimensional spheres  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  and for each  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  (note that the radius of the sphere is normalized, such that  $\epsilon = 1$  is the maximal distance between points in the sphere), for almost all the points on the sphere (that is, module a set of measure zero with  $\mu_S$ ) the limit

$$(6.3) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_\epsilon) = 1$$

holds good. That is, the function  $f$  must be almost constant on  $\mathbb{S}^N$ , concentrating its value at the median  $M_f$ . In particular, for the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^N$  the concentration of 1-Lipschitz functions is of the form

$$(6.4) \quad \alpha(P_M, \rho) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{(N-1)}{2} \rho^2\right),$$

with  $C$  a constant of order 1.

**Example 6.2.** A second example of concentration that we consider here is for 1-Lipschitz real functions on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  (compare with [59], pg. 8). Then there is concentration, determined by the concentration inequality

$$(6.5) \quad \mu_P \left( \left| f - M_f \right| \frac{1}{\sigma_f} > \frac{\rho}{\rho_P} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2}{2\rho_P^2}\right),$$

where we have adapted the example from [59] to a Gaussian measure  $\mu_P$  with median  $M_f$  and standard deviation  $\rho_P$ .  $\sigma_f$  is associated to the minimal physical resolution of any measurement of the quantum observable associated to the 1-Lipschitz function  $f$ .

For 1-Lipschitz functions on a measure metric space  $\mathbf{T}$  of dimension  $N$  there are similar *exponential bounds* as for  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and other manifolds locally homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^N$  [59]. This suggests that concentration of measure is a general phenomenon consequence of the Lipschitz regularity condition of the function  $f : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the higher dimensionality of the space  $\mathbf{T}$ .

For  $\dim(\mathbf{T})$  large, the concentration of 1-Lipschitz functions implies that the values of the function are very picked around a certain constant value. Heuristically, one can think the concentration of measure as partially originated by the constraint

that the 1-Lipschitz regularity condition imposes on  $f$  globally on  $\mathbf{T}$ . Let  $f : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a 1-Lipschitz function on a normed topological space  $(\mathbf{T}, \|\cdot\|, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{T}})$  locally homeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . The Lipschitz condition is a form of *equipartition* of the variations of  $f$  caused by arbitrary variation on the point on the topological space  $\mathbf{T}$  where the function  $f$  is evaluated. Hence if the dimension of the space  $\mathbf{T}$  is very large compared with 1, the significance of the 1-Lipschitz condition is that  $f$  cannot admit large *standard variations* caused by the corresponding standard variations on the evaluation point of  $\mathbf{T}$ . Otherwise, a violation of the Lipschitz condition can happen, since the large dimension provides long contributions to the variation of  $f$ . Note that to speak of large and small variations, one needs to have a reference scale.

**6.2. Natural spontanenous collapse as concentration of measure phenomena.** We should applied first the theory of concentration to Hamilton-Randers theory by considering the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^q$  with  $q \gg 1$ ,  $\mu_P$  the standard product measure in  $\mathbb{R}^q$  and  $f : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a real 1-Lipschitz function. Then there is concentration of measure determined by the inequality (6.5). By applying this concentration inequality to a generic function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_D(T^*TM)$  in the domain where the flow  $U_t$  is 1-Lipschitz, one obtains

$$U_t : \mathcal{F}_D(T^*TM) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_D(T^*TM), \quad f(t=0) \mapsto f(t).$$

Note that the flow  $U_t$  generically depends on the  $\tau$ -time parameter. In the 1-Lipschitz dynamical regimes corresponding to each fundamental cycle of the dynamics operator  $U_t$  the function  $f$  must be constant almost everywhere, if the function  $f$  is 1-Lipschitz in  $(u, p)$  and  $(t, \tau)$ . Moreover, for macroscopic observations associated to any measurement of a quantum system, one expects the existence of scales such that the relation

$$(6.6) \quad |f - M_f| \frac{1}{\sigma_f} \gg N, \quad 1 \ll N,$$

holds good, where  $N$  is the number of quantum degrees of freedom. This relation, when applied to the concentration relation (6.5) implies that one should consider

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{\rho^2}{\rho_P^2} = N^2.$$

This condition provides a criteria for introducing quantum scales relative to the fundamental scale.

If the quantum system corresponds to a Hamilton-Randers system of  $N$  sub-quantum molecules, then the configuration space  $TM$  is such that locally  $TM \simeq \mathbb{R}^{8N}$ .  $\sigma_f$  is the minimal theoretical resolution for an observable associated to the function  $f : T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .  $\sigma_f$  is associated to the variation of  $f$  produce by a minimal variation of the configuration state of one sub-quantum particle. Therefore, for a quantum state composed of  $N$  sub-quantum degrees of freedom, the variation on  $f$  that we should consider is of order  $8N\sigma_f$ , which is the typical measurable minimal value for a quantum system under some additive rule. By the relation (6.6), if

the concentration of measure relation (6.5) is applied to a 1-Lipschitz function  $f$  respect to all its arguments in the 1-Lipschitz dominated regime of  $U_t$  one obtains

$$(6.8) \quad \mu_P(|f - M_f| > 8N\sigma_f) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-32N^2).$$

Note that although the quotient  $|f - M_f|/\sigma_f$ , the value  $(8N)^2$  is larger for  $N$  large compared to 1. Hence the concentration relation (6.8) is a strong condition on the function  $f$ . For functions associated with measurements of the properties of quantum systems and since  $N \gg 1$  there must be concentration of measure around the median  $M_f$  with probability very close to 1. Thus if a measurement of an observable associated with  $f$  is performed the value  $M_f$  is to be found with probability very close to 1 and in practice, equal to 1 in the regime where the  $U_t$  evolution is Lipschitz.

The relation

$$|f - M_f| \sim 8N\sigma_f$$

provides us with the limit where the inequality starts to imply not concentration meaning in terms of  $N$ . Thus for dispersions on  $f$  around  $M_f$  larger than  $8N\sigma_f$  the concentration of  $f$  will not be effective. This threshold is associated with a weak additivity of  $f$  respect to the values of individual sub-quantum degrees of freedom.

**6.3. Fundamental and highest quantum scale.** In our theory, there are two natural scales: the fundamental scale and the highest scale where the systems are conveniently described by quantum models and/or macroscopic fields. At the present stage of the theory we cannot fix the ration of that scales, but only adopt the assumption that such ratio is large enough to apply concentration. However, this assumption leads to observable consequences in different scenarios. Leaving this discussion for *section 7*, for the sake of concreteness let us make the assumption that the GUT scale is the highest energy scale where the dynamics is well described by a quantum gauge field theory, while the fundamental scale is of the order of the Planck energy. Under this hypothesis,  $N^2$  is large for all practical purposes of the application of the concentration phenomena. We assume that the model could be applied elementary particles whose quantum fields appear in the standard model of particles.

We see from (6.7) that the integer  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  provides a *measure* of the *complexity* of the quantum system compared with the complexity of the associated HR-system. For instance, if the degree of complexity of the quantum system is of order 1, since there is one quantum particle involved. This order of complexity 1 is of the same order than the dimension of the model spacetime manifold  $M_4$ , the number of spin degrees of freedom and other quantum numbers associated with the quantum mechanical description of the elementary quantum particle. In contrast, the degree of complexity of the associated HR-system is of order  $N$ , which is at least of the order of the energy of the Fundamental scale relative to GUT.



**6.4. Notion of classical and quantum interaction.** Depending on the domain of the fundamental cycles where an interaction is dominant, one can make a clear distinction between *classical* and *quantum interactions* as follows,

**Definition 6.3.** *A classical interaction in Hamilton-Randers theory is an interaction which is dominant only on the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  containing the metastable points  $\{t = (2n + 1)T, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  of each fundamental cycles. In contrast, a quantum interaction in Hamilton-Randers theory is dominant at least in the interior of the fundamental cycles*

$$\{\cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} [(2n + 1)T, (2n + 3)T]\} \setminus \mathbf{D}_0.$$

Since a quantum interaction is not localized on the domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  through the whole fundamental cycles, after the projection  $(t, \tau) \mapsto \tau$ , such class of interactions characterized by density probability functions associated to states and transition probability amplitudes associated to transitions between quantum states under changes in  $\tau$ -time. Furthermore, the non-local variables describing a quantum interaction have a non-local character. Examples of quantum interactions are gauge theories, whose exact quantum mechanical description is through holonomy variables. The Aharonov-Bohm effect is an example of non-local effect due to the intrinsic non-local behaviour of the holonomy variables.

In contrast, a classical interaction as defined above is local, since it is dominant only on the domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  where all the observable properties of the system, described by weak additive functions  $f : T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are well defined locally. A relevant example of a classical interaction of this type is gravity (see *section 7*).

**6.5. Notion of natural spontaneous quantum state reduction.** The concentration of measure for functions defined in the Lipschitz regime of the  $U_t$  flow provides a natural mechanism for the reduction of the quantum state. However, such reduction processes not only happen when the quantum system is being *measured* by a standard observer. On the contrary, they are *spontaneous processes* that happen after the ergodic regime in each fundamental cycle of the  $U_t$ -evolution. This is the reason of the name *natural reduction processes*, in contrast with induced reduction of the quantum state by an interaction with a quantum measurement device [21, 32, 50]. A natural reduction process does not necessarily changes the quantum state of the system, neither it is necessarily associated with quantum measurement processes. In contrast, in a measurement process the measurement device can change the original quantum state, since there exists an interaction between the system being measured and the apparatus measurement. This is described, for instance by von Neumann models describing the interaction between the quantum system with the measurement device.

Note that the interaction responsible for the natural spontaneous collapse of the state is classical, since it is dominant only in the metastable equilibrium domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ , when all the observable properties of the system are localized by the effect to the same interaction driving  $U_t$ . As a consequence of this phenomena the properties

of the system appear as macroscopically well defined when the system is measured by means of a macroscopic measurement device.

If the initial conditions of the Hamilton-Randers system are fixed, then the evolution of  $M_f$  is fixed as well. However, it is difficult to determine the initial conditions of a given HR-system for a macroscopic observer. It is also difficult to fix operationally  $\tau_0$  and hence, the long time dynamics of the average value  $M_f$ . Thus although the dynamics is deterministic, if we adopt assumption A.9. of *section 2*, the system is chaotic and hence unstable and sensitive to initial conditions. Therefore, the natural way to describe the long term dynamics of the system is by using probabilistic methods, with the probability distribution function determined by the fundamental dynamics  $U_t$  of the system during the ergodic regime. In particular, the probability distribution function is associated with the density of world lines of sub-quantum molecules.

**6.6. Emergence of the classical domain.** We identify the metastable equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$  with the observable domain, that is, the domain of the fundamental dynamics where the observable properties of the system, capable to be observed by the macroscopic observer  $W$ , are defined. In the metastable domain, the dynamics is dominated by 1-Lipschitz operators and each observable associated with a 1-Lipschitz function of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom have well defined values at each instant  $\tau_n = (2n + 1)T$ . Under the assumptions that are discussed in the next *section*, the average position and speed observable quantities are 1-Lipschitz functions.

**Quantum fluctuation and prepared states** A natural notion of quantum fluctuation arises in connection with the emergence character of observable quantities. Thus the ergodic property of the  $U_t$  flow implies that the sequence on  $\tau$ -time of generic physical observables and functions can be discontinuous in the spacetime evolution.

There is at least an exception to this rule, which is the case of prepared states. In a prepared state, a given macroscopic observable is well defined: repeated consecutive measurements of the observable will give the same value. How is this compatible with the emergent origin of quantum fluctuations? There is a natural characterization of prepared state, which is to be a state where the mean  $M_f$  for a given observable is constant on time. For example, to prepare an state of a given energy, the system is manipulated such that  $M_E$  is fixed. If we select another observable, for instance an spin component, the state could change. In the situation when the prepared state has constant means  $M_E$  and  $M_S$ , the state is prepared with defined energy and spin. Thus the characteristics of prepared states can be reduced to the study of compatible constant means  $M_f$ .

7. HAMILTONIAN BOUND MECHANISM, THE EMERGENCE OF THE WEAK EQUIVALENCE PRINCIPLE AND CLASSICAL GRAVITATIONAL INTERACTION

This *section* investigates further consequences of the application of concentration of measure phenomena to Hamilton-Randers theory and some other related issues. First we provide a mechanism to bound from below the spectrum of the matter Hamiltonian. Second, we use concentration of measure to show that gravity is what we called a 1-Lipschitz, classical interaction. Third, we discuss the dynamics of matter, showing that it is naturally associated to the Heisenberg dynamics.

**7.1. Bound of the matter Hamiltonian.** We show that in Hamilton-Randers theory and under certain regularity conditions, there is a natural mechanism ensuring the existence of lower bounds for the energy levels of the Hamiltonian (4.8). Let us consider the decomposition of the Hamiltonian operator  $\hat{H}_t$  in a 1-Lipschitz component  $\hat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}$  and a non-Lipschitz component  $\hat{H}_{matter,t}$ ,

$$(7.1) \quad \hat{H}_t(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) = \hat{H}_{matter,t}(\hat{u}, \hat{p}) + \hat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}(\hat{u}, \hat{p}).$$

We have defined in this expression the matter Hamiltonian as the piece which is not 1-Lipschitz. This is according with the general idea that matter (including gauge interactions) is quantum matter, in the sense that it is conveniently described by quantum models and their interactions by quantum interactions in the sense of *Definition* (6.3).

In general the decomposition (7.1) is not unique and it also is not evident that it exists. However, one can obtain a characterization that allows for such type of decompositions, if we adopt additional assumptions about the regularity of the Hamiltonian (7.1) are adopted. In particular, let us assume that the classical Hamiltonian function (3.32) is  $\mathcal{C}^2$ -smooth in the variables  $(x, y, p_x, p_y)$ . Then we can prove the following

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $H_t : T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\mathcal{C}^2$ -smooth Randers Hamiltonian function (3.32). Then there exists a compact domain  $K \subset T^*TM$  such that the restriction  $H|_K$  is 1-Lipschitz continuous.*

*Proof.* By Taylor's expansion at the point  $(\xi, \chi) \in T^*TM$  up to second order one obtains the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(u, p) &= H_{t_0} + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial u^k} \Big|_{(\xi, \chi)} (u^k - \xi^k) + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial p^k} \Big|_{(\xi, \chi)} (p_k - \chi_k) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k (u^k - \xi^k)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q_k (p_k - \chi_k)^2 \\ &= H_{t_0} + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial u^k} \Big|_{(\xi, \chi)} (u^k - \xi^k) + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(\chi) (p_k - \chi_k) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k (u^k - \xi^k)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q_k (p_k - \chi_k)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the term

$$\sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k (u^k - \xi^k)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q_k (p_k - \chi_k)^2$$

is the remaind term of the second order Taylor's expansion. The difference for the values of the Hamiltonian  $H_t$  at two different points is given by the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} |H_t(u(1), p(1)) - H_t(u(2), p(2))| &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial u^k} |_{(\xi, \chi)} (u^k(1) - \xi^k) \right. \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(\chi) (p_k(1) - \chi_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k(1) (u^k(1) - \xi^k)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q^k(1) (p_k(1) - \xi_k)^2 \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial u^k} |_{(\xi, \chi)} (u^k(2) - \xi^k) - \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(\chi) (p_k(2) - \chi_k) \\ &\left. - \sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k(2) (u^k(2) - \xi^k)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q^k(2) (p_k(2) - \chi_k)^2 \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial u^k} |_{(\xi, \chi)} (u^k(1) - u^k(2)) \right| + \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \beta^k(\chi) (p_k(1) - p_k(2)) \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k(1) (u^k(1) - \xi^k)^2 - R_k(2) (u^k(2) - \xi^k)^2 \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q^k(1) (p_k(1) - \chi_k)^2 - Q^k(2) (p_k(2) - \chi_k)^2 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the continuity of the second derivatives of  $H_t$ , for each compact set  $K \subset T^*TM$  containing the points 1 and 2, there are two constants  $C_R(K) > 0$  and  $C_Q(K) > 0$  such that  $|R_k(1)|, |R_k(2)| < C_R(K)$  and  $|Q_k(1)|, |Q_k(2)| < C_Q(K)$ , for each  $k = 1, \dots, 8N$ . Moreover, as a consequence of Taylor's theorem it holds that

$$\lim_{1 \rightarrow 2} C_Q(K) = 0, \quad \lim_{1 \rightarrow 2} C_R(K) = 0,$$

Since  $K$  is compact the last two lines in the difference  $|H(u(1), p(1)) - H(u(2), p(2))|$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} R_k(1) (u^k(1) - \xi^k)^2 - R_k(2) (u^k(2) - \xi^k)^2 \right| &\leq C_R(\tilde{K}) \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} (u^k(1) - u^k(2))^2 \right| \\ \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} Q^k(1) (p_k(1) - \chi_k)^2 - Q^k(2) (p_k(2) - \chi_k)^2 \right| &\leq C_Q(\tilde{K}) \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} (p_k(1) - p_k(2))^2 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The constants  $C_Q(K)$  and  $C_R(K)$  can be taken finite on  $K$ . Furthermore, by further restricting the domain where the points 1 and 2 are to be included in a smaller compact set  $\tilde{K}$ , one can write the following relations,

$$(7.2) \quad C_R(\tilde{K}) |u^k(1) - u^k(2)| \leq 1/2, \quad C_Q(\tilde{K}) |p_k(1) - p_k(2)| \leq 1/2.$$

Let us consider further restriction on the compact set  $K' \subset T^*TM$  such that for each  $(\xi, \chi) \in K'$

$$(7.3) \quad \left| \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial u^k} \Big|_{(\xi, \chi)} \right| \leq C_U, \quad k = 1, \dots, 4N$$

holds good for some constant  $C_U$ . Also, on  $K'$  it must hold that

$$\begin{aligned} C_R(K) \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} (u^k(1) - u^k(2))^2 \right| + C_Q(K) \left| \sum_{k=1}^{8N} (p_k(1) - p_k(2))^2 \right| \\ \leq 1/2 \sum_{k=1}^{8N} |(u^k(1) - u^k(2))| + 1/2 \sum_{k=1}^{8N} |(p_k(1) - p_k(2))|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the factors  $|\beta^i|$  are bounded as a consequence of Randers condition (3.14). Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |H(u(1), p(1)) - H(u(2), p(2))|_{K'} \leq \tilde{C}_U \left( \sum_{k=1}^{8N} |(u^k(1) - u^k(2))| \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} |(p_k(1) - p_k(2))| \right) + 1/2 \sum_{k=1}^{8N} |(u^k(1) - u^k(2))| + 1/2 \sum_{k=1}^{8N} |(p_k(1) - p_k(2))| \end{aligned}$$

with  $\tilde{C}_U = \max\{C_U, 1\}$ . This proves that  $H|_{K'}$  is a Lipschitz function, with Lipschitz constant  $M = \max\{\frac{1}{2}, \tilde{C}_U\}$ , which is necessarily finite. Now we can redefine the Hamiltonian dividing by  $M$ , which is a constant larger than 1. This operation is equivalent to redefine the vector field  $\beta \in \Gamma TTM$ . Such operation does not change the equations of motion and the Randers condition (3.14). Then we obtain a 1-Lipschitz Hamiltonian on  $K'$ , restriction of the original Hamiltonian  $H_t$ .  $\square$

**Remark 7.2.** *Note that since it is assumed that the Hamiltonian  $H_t$  is  $\mathcal{C}^2$  smooth, it is not necessary for the proof of Lemma 7.1 that the Randers condition (3.14) holds. However, the Randers condition is fundamental to have causal structures associated to the underlying non-reversible Randers metric structure compatible with a macroscopic Lorentzian or causal structure.*

The compact domain  $K'$  is not empty. However, it is not unique. Extensions from  $K$  to the whole phase space can be constructed as follows. Consider the lift to  $T^*TM$  of the asymmetric distance function  $\varrho : TM \times TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  associated with the underlying Hamilton-Randers structure of Definition (3.2) on  $T^*TM$ ,

$$\varrho_S : T^*TM \times T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Let us assume for technical purposes that  $K'$  is a star domain and let us consider the projection on  $K'$

$$(7.4) \quad \pi_{K'} : T^*TM \rightarrow K', \quad (u, p) \mapsto (\bar{u}, \bar{p}),$$

where  $(\bar{u}, \bar{p})$  is defined by the condition that the distance from  $(u, p)$  to  $K'$  is achieved at  $(\bar{u}, \bar{p})$ . Then one defines the *radial decomposition* of  $H_t$  by the expression

$$(7.5) \quad H_t(u, p) = R(\varrho_S((u, p), (\bar{u}, \bar{p}))) H_t(\bar{u}, \bar{p}) + \delta H_t(u, p).$$

The positive function  $R(\varrho_S((u, p), (\bar{u}, \bar{p})))$  is such that decreases with the distance function  $\varrho_S((u, p), (\bar{u}, \bar{p}))$  and it is bounded in a way that the first piece of the Hamiltonian is 1-Lipschitz. The second contribution is not 1-Lipschitz. By definition, it is associated with the matter Hamiltonian  $H_{matter}$ ,

$$(7.6) \quad H_{matter,t}(u, p) := \delta H_t(u, p).$$

With these redefinitions we obtain the following

**Theorem 7.3.** *Every Hamiltonian (4.8) admits a normalization such that the decomposition (7.1) holds globally on  $T^*TM$ .*

*Proof.* One can perform the normalization

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(u, p) &\rightarrow \frac{1}{R(\varrho_S((u, p), (\bar{u}, \bar{p})))} H_t(u, p) \\ &= H_t(\bar{u}(u), \bar{p}(u)) + \frac{1}{R(\varrho_S((u, p), (\bar{u}(u), \bar{p}(u))))} \delta H_t(u, p). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is 1-Lipschitz in  $T^*TM$ , since  $H_t(\bar{u}(u), \bar{p}(u))$  is 1-Lipschitz on  $K'$ , while the second term is not 1-Lipschitz continuous.  $\square$

We can read the Hamiltonian constraint (5.15) in the following way. From the properties of the  $U_t$  flow it follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} (\widehat{H}_{matter,t} + \widehat{H}_{Lipschitz,t})|\psi\rangle = 0$$

for each  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{Fun}$ . However, each of the individual terms in this relation can be different from zero in the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \widehat{H}_{matter,t}|\psi\rangle \neq 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \widehat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}|\psi\rangle \neq 0.$$

This implies that in order to have a the metastable equilibrium point at the instant  $t = (2n + 1)T$ , in addition with the matter Hamiltonian (7.6), an additional piece of dynamical variables described by the Hamiltonian  $\widehat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}$  is needed. If we assume that the matter Hamiltonian (7.6) must be positive definite when acting on physical states, then the 1-Lipschitz Hamiltonian should have negative eigenvalues only. Moreover, the function  $\kappa(u, p, t, \tilde{\tau})$  in the quantum Hamiltonian (3.32) takes values in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Hence for Hamilton-Randers models the positiveness of the matter Hamiltonian is extended to all  $t \in [0, (2n + 1)T]$ . This implies the consistency of the positiveness of the energy level for the quantum Hamiltonian for matter (7.6) in the whole process of the  $U_t$ -evolution.

We can turn this argument and say that if  $\widehat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}$  is negative definite, then  $\widehat{H}_{matter,t}$  must be positive definite. Then we could provide an argument why  $\widehat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}$  must be negative definite. This argument is related with gravity, as we discuss below, where  $\widehat{H}_{Lipschitz,t}$  is related with the classical gravitational interaction.

**7.2. Emergence of a weak equivalence principle in Hamilton-Randers theory.** We organize this subsection in two parts.

**A. Preliminary considerations.** Let us consider a physical system  $\mathcal{S}$  that can be thought as composed by two sub-systems  $A$  and  $B$ . We denote by  $X^\mu(\mathcal{S}_i)$ ,  $i \equiv \mathcal{S}, A, B$  the *macroscopic observable* coordinates associated to the system  $\mathcal{S}_i$ , that is, the value of the coordinates that could be associated when local coordinates are assigned by a classical observer to each system  $\mathcal{S}, A, B$  by means of a measurements or by means of theoretical models. Then we adopt the following

**Assumption I.** The functions

$$\begin{aligned} X^\mu(\mathcal{S}_i) : T^*TM \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow M_4, \\ (u^{k_1}, \dots, u^{k_N}, p^{k_1}, \dots, p^{k_N}, t) &\mapsto X^\mu(u^{k_1}, \dots, u^{k_N}, p^{k_1}, \dots, p^{k_N}, t) \end{aligned}$$

are smooth.

This is a minimal required to link the microscopic degrees of freedom with macroscopic degrees of freedom. It is not required that the functions are smooth respect to the external time parameter  $\tau$ . Therefore, *assumption I* applies to both, classical dynamics applied to a classical system but also to quantum dynamics and the results of measurements of position operators.

Under the additional constraint of universal bounded acceleration and speed for the sub-quantum molecules, in the metastable equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$  containing the metastable points  $\{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , the functions  $X^\mu((2n+1)T, \tau) = X^\mu(\tau)$  are 1-Lipschitz in  $t$ -time parameter. In order to show this, let us first remark that the relations

$$(7.7) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \frac{\partial X^\mu(u, p, t)}{\partial t} = 0,$$

holds good, since in the metastable equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$  physical observables do not have  $t$ -time dependence (they are almost fixed points of the  $U_t$  flow). This expression can be re-written as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \frac{\partial X^\mu(u, p, t)}{\partial t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial u_k^\rho} \frac{\partial u_k^\rho}{\partial t} + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial p_{\rho k}} \frac{\partial p_{\rho k}}{\partial t} \right) = 0.$$

It follows as a consequence of this relation and since the number of degrees of freedom  $8N$  is finite, the collection of partial derivatives

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial u_k^\rho}, \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial p_{\rho k}}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N \right\}$$

can be uniformly bounded in a closed and small enough domain in the region  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .

Secondly, let us also consider the differential expressions

$$\frac{dX^\mu(u, p, t)}{d\tau} = \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial u_k^\rho} \frac{du_k^\rho}{d\tau} + \sum_{k=1}^{8N} \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial p_{\rho k}} \frac{dp_{\rho k}}{d\tau}.$$

The derivatives  $\left\{\frac{du_k^\rho}{d\tau}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\right\}$  are uniformly bounded as a consequence of the Randers condition (3.14). Since the system of equations for the configuration coordinates  $\{u^i\}_{k=1}^{8N}$  (3.48) is autonomous for  $u$ , the derivatives

$$\left\{\frac{dp_{\rho k}}{d\tau}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\right\}$$

are fully determined by

$$\left\{u_k^\mu(\tau), \frac{du_k^\rho}{d\tau}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\right\}.$$

It follows that

**Proposition 7.4.** *If the functions  $\left\{u_k^\mu(\tau), \frac{du_k^\rho}{d\tau}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\right\}$  are  $\mathcal{C}^1$ -functions, then the coordinate functions  $\{X^\mu(\tau)\}_{\mu=0}^3$  are  $\mathcal{C}^1$ -functions with uniformly bounded derivatives.*

Since the system of equations for the configuration coordinates  $\{u^i\}_{k=1}^{8N}$  (3.48) is autonomous for  $u$ , the functions  $\left\{u_k^\mu(\tau), \frac{du_k^\rho}{d\tau}\right\}_{\mu,k=1,1}^{4,N}$  are also 1-Lipschitz continuous, then  $\{X^\mu(\tau)\}_{\mu=0}^3$  are 1-Lipschitz functions. Note that we have required to consider also the bound of the derivatives of  $X^\mu$  to be able to establish 1-Lipschitz continuity.

From the above reasoning it is natural to consider the following

**Assumption II.** In the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  the functions

$$\left\{u_k^\mu(\tau), \frac{du_k^\rho}{d\tau}, \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4; k = 1, \dots, N\right\}$$

are  $\mathcal{C}^1$ -regular functions.

Let us consider two subsystems  $A$  and  $B$  of the full system under consideration  $\mathcal{S}$ . The sub-systems  $A, B$  are embedded in  $\mathcal{S}$  such that

$$(7.8) \quad \mathcal{S} = A \sqcup B,$$

for a well defined union operation  $\sqcup$  for systems composed by sub-quantum molecules.

Let us consider local coordinate systems such that the identification

$$(7.9) \quad A \equiv (u_1(\tau), \dots, u_{N_A}(\tau), 0, \dots, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad B \equiv (0, \dots, 0, v_1(\tau), \dots, v_{N_B}(\tau)),$$

with  $N = N_A + N_B, N_A, N_B \gg 1$  holds good. The whole system  $\mathcal{S}$  can be represented in local coordinates as

$$\mathcal{S} \equiv (u_1(\tau), \dots, u_{N_A}(\tau), v_1(\tau), \dots, v_{N_B}(\tau)).$$

By the action of the diffeomorphisms  $\varphi_k : M_4^k \rightarrow M_4$ , one can consider the world lines of the sub-quantum molecules on  $M_4$  at each constant value of  $t$  modulo  $2T$ . In the particular case of metaestable equilibrium points  $\{t = (2n + 1)T, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  we have a set of (discrete) world lines in  $M_4$ , showing that the functions  $\{X^\mu\}_{\mu=1}^4$  characterize the average presence of sub-quantum world lines at a given point of



$M_4$ . Therefore, it is reasonable to define the *observable coordinates of the system* by the expression

$$(7.10) \quad \tilde{X}_i^\mu(\tau(n)) = \frac{1}{N} \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \sum_{k_i=1}^{N_i} \varphi_{k_i}^\mu(x_{k_i}(t)), \quad i = A, B, \mathcal{S}, \mu = 0, 1, 2, 3,$$

where here  $\varphi_{k_i}^\mu$  are local coordinates on  $M_4$ , defined after the action of the diffeomorphism  $\varphi_{k_i}$ . Note that the normalization factor  $1/N$  is the same for all the systems  $i = A, B, \mathcal{S}$ . This means that we are considering systems that eventually are sub-systems (proper or improper) of a larger sub-system  $\mathcal{S}$ . This formal constraint is however harmless for general purposes. Actually, we can suppress the factor  $N$ , as long as we keep track in all the expressions below of the equivalent normalization criteria.

The expression (7.10) is not general covariant. The notion of additivity of coordinates is foreign, if additional constraints on the coordinates are assumed. This is not a fatal problem. A way to deal with covariant formulation is through the notion of center of mass associated to a metric space (see for instance [10], pg 233-235). In the case of Hamilton-Randers theory we have at our disposal of a Lorentzian metric. This happens if we further constraint to domains where the spacetime is a product of the form  $\mathcal{I} \times M_3$ , with a warped metric

$$(7.11) \quad \eta_4 = -f(\tau, \vec{x})d\tau^2 + \eta_{ij}^3(\vec{x}, \tau) dx^i dx^j,$$

where  $\tau$  is the time parameter coordinate and  $\vec{x}$  local coordinates on each leave  $\{\tau\} \times M_3$ . The distances are measure along each slit  $\tau = \text{constant}$ . Conversely, the requirement of a local spatial metric, not associated to any particular macroscopic observer  $W$  together with the existence of a local time structure together with the condition that the theory should be general covariant implies the existence of a spacetime metric, the simplest form to be (7.11).

We identify  $\tau(n)$  with the  $\tau$ -time parameter and consider it continuous, in relation with macroscopic or quantum time scales. Then by the embedding (7.9),

$$(7.12) \quad X^\mu(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \sum_{k=1}^N \varphi_{k_i}^\mu(x_{k_i}(t)), \quad i = A, B, \mathcal{S}.$$

This function is 1-Lipschitz, by applying the arguments given above, specifically *Proposition 7.4* and *assumption II*.

The *mean*  $M^\mu(\tau)$  is assumed to be equal to the mean of the probability distribution  $\mu_P$ ,

$$(7.13) \quad M^\mu(\mathcal{S}(\tau)) = \frac{1}{N} \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \sum_{k=1}^N \mu_P(k)(t) \varphi_{k_i}^\mu(x_{k_i}(t))$$

The mean  $M^\mu$  does not depend on the system  $i = A, B, \mathcal{S}$  and only depends upon the distribution of probability  $\mu_P$ . This probability distribution of sub-quantum degrees of freedom depends only upon the macroscopic preparation of the system and not of the system itself: by definition, the probability distribution of the  $N$

sub-quantum molecules does not depend of the particular configurations that they can have. Therefore, we make a third assumption,

**Assumption III.** The mean  $M^\mu$  only depends on the preparatory macroscopic conditions.

It is under *assumption III* together with the fact that the configuration spacetime is large dimensional enough to apply effectively concentration of measure and with the required regularity conditions of the  $U_t$ -interaction that implies the existence of a classical weak equivalence principle by application of concentration of measure. The mean  $M^\mu(\tau)$  serves as a *guide* to the motion of macroscopic variables. However, it does not fix the evolution by application of concentration of measure if the other two conditions also meet. And still, it is not yet enough.

### B. Emergence of a weak equivalence principle.

**Definition 7.5.** Given a Hamilton-Randers system, we say that is in free quantum evolution if the condition on the probability distribution

$$(7.14) \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} \mu_P(k)(t, \tau) = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, N$$

holds good.

Thus a quantum interaction in Hamilton-Randers theory is associated with the exchange of sub-quantum degrees of freedom with the environment or with other classical or quantum fields. Although there is still a long way, this notion suggest the possibility to describe interactions by using quantum field theory. This conjecture is also supported by the fact that the theory is relativistic by construction.

By the concentration property (6.5) of the  $U_t$  dynamics in the Lipschitz dynamical regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$ , the  $\tau$ -evolution of the coordinates  $\tilde{X}^\mu(\mathcal{S}(\tau))$ ,  $\tilde{X}^\mu(A(\tau))$  and  $\tilde{X}^\mu(B(\tau))$  that have the same initial conditions differ between each after the dynamics at  $\tau$ -time such that

$$(7.15) \quad \mu_P \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_{\tilde{X}^\mu}} |\tilde{X}^\mu(\mathcal{S}_i(\tau)) - M^\mu(\mathcal{S}(\tau))| > \rho \right)_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \sim C_1 \exp \left( -C_2 \frac{\rho^2}{2\rho_p^2} \right),$$

$\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ,  $i = A, B, \mathcal{S}$  holds. The constants  $C_1, C_2$  are of order 1, where  $C_2$  depends on the dimension of the spacetime  $M_4$ .  $\rho_p$  is independent of the system  $i = A, B, \mathcal{S}$  (see *Section 6*). Note that there is no dependence on the  $t$ -parameter, since we are considering these expressions in the limit  $t \rightarrow (2n + 1)T$ .

An exchange of sub-quantum molecules between the system and the environment can happen. This can affect the motion of the center of mass  $M^\mu(\mathcal{S}(\tau))$  in a rather intricate way, because the derivatives  $\left\{ \frac{d}{d\tau} \mu_P(k)(t, \tau) \right\}_{k=1}^N$  depend upon the details of the system  $\mathcal{S}_i(\tau)$ . In the metastable equilibrium regime  $\mathbf{D}_0$  and if there is absence of interaction with the ambient, then there is no exchange of degrees of freedom with the ambient. Hence the condition (7.14) holds. In this case, the center of mass coordinates  $M^\mu(\mathcal{S}_i(\tau))$  are solutions of an ordinary differential equation,

$$(7.16) \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} M^\mu(\tau) = h^\mu(\tau), \quad \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

where the functions  $h^\mu : T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are fixed by the dynamics of the  $N$  sub-quantum molecules (as consequence of equation (7.13)) and by the properties of the measure  $\mu(k)$ ,

$$(7.17) \quad h^\mu : T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (x, y, p_x, p_y) \mapsto \lim_{t \rightarrow (2n+1)T} \sum_{k=1}^N 2 \mu_p(k) \beta_x^\mu(x, p).$$

The local solutions of the equation (7.16) only depend upon the initial conditions for  $M^\mu(\tau = 0)$ .

**Definition 7.6.** *A test particle system is describe by a Hamilton-Randers system such that the  $\tau$ -evolution of the center of mass coordinates  $\tilde{X}^\mu$  are determined by the initial conditions  $\left(\tilde{X}^\mu(\tau = 0), \frac{d\tilde{X}^\mu(\tau=0)}{d\tau}\right)$  and the external field.*

**Proposition 7.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$  HR-systems with  $N \gg 1$  associated to test particles. Let the system be in free evolution. Then the observable macroscopic coordinates  $\tilde{X}^\mu(\tau)$  do not depend on the system  $\mathcal{S}_i$  at each  $\tau$ .*

*Proof.* The coordinate functions  $\tilde{X}^\mu(\tau)$  are 1-Lipschitz in the metastable equilibrium regime  $t \rightarrow (2n + 1)T$ . Then we can apply the concentration of measure (7.15). Moreover, we assume that the condition (6.7) holds for HR-systems. Hence the observable coordinates  $\{\tilde{X}^\mu\}_{\mu=1}^4$  moves following the common  $M^\mu(\tau)$  coordinates with an error bounded by  $\exp(-C_2N^2)$ . Since the system is in free evolution, the condition (7.14) holds, the median coordinates  $M\mu(\tau)$  follow an ordinary differential equation, integrable at every  $\tau \in [0, +\infty]$ .  $\square$

Therefore, in the metastable equilibrium regime  $t = (2n + 1)T$  there is a strong concentration for the value the functions  $\{\tilde{X}^\mu(\tau)\}_{\mu=1}^4$  around the mean  $\{M^\mu(\tau)\}_{\mu=1}^4$ . Note that this universality is up to fixing the initial conditions of the mean  $M^\mu$ , which is equivalent to fixing the initial conditions for  $\{u_k^\mu\}_{k=1}^N$ . This fact does not rest relevance to the main idea that we are discussing, that for the dynamics  $U_t$  in the metastable equilibrium regime  $t \rightarrow (2n + 1)T$ , for the same initial conditions, the center of mass coordinates  $\{\tilde{X}^\mu(\tau)\}_{\mu=1}^4$  evolve in the same way (in the sense that the bound in the dispersion is given by the concentration relation (7.15)), independently of the nature and composition of the system. This result can be interpreted as a form of weak equivalence principle.

Despite being applied to classical trajectories only, the explanation of the equivalence principle offered along these lines implies that theoretically the weak equivalence principle should be an almost exact law of Nature, only broken at scales  $1/N^2$  compared with the fundamental scale. This is because the weak equivalence principle just derived is valid up to an error of  $\exp(-C_2N^2)$ . It breaks down abruptly in the transition from quantum to classical description that corresponds to the transition ergodic to contractive regime in the  $U_t$  flow.

**Proposition 7.8.** *If a classical trajectories can be constructed for quantum systems, the equivalence principle will hold up to scales  $1/N^2$  compared with the fundamental scale.*

The value of the constant  $C_2$  cannot be fixed by the theory, but does not compensate the abrupt concentration caused by the difference of sub-quantum scale and quantum scale.

**7.3. On the fundamental scale and its relation with the validity of the weak equivalence principle.** As we discussed before, in Hamilton-Randers systems  $N$  is large enough to apply concentration of measure in such a way that smooth, additive functions  $f : T^*TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are almost constant almost everywhere. According to the relation (6.7), the effectiveness of this concentration depends on the ratio of the fundamental energy and the ratio of the largest quantum scale. This implies a large landscape, but there are three situations which are

- The fundamental scale  $m_F$  is identified with the Planck scale  $m_P$ . Then there are two possibilities. 1. The first is that the largest quantum scale  $m_Q$  is much larger than the any Standard Model scale  $m_H$ . In this case, the weak equivalence principle due to concentration of measure will be *exact* up to the energy much larger than the Higgs's mass  $m_H$ . At energies comparable to  $m_Q$  the equivalence principle fails, with an increasing Gaussian deviation from  $M_f$ , until reaching the  $m_H$ , where the deviation from universal free motion is maximal. 2. The second possible scenario is that  $m_Q \sim m_H$ . In this case, we should expect exponential deviations from WEP at energies reachable with current particle physics acceleration.
- The fundamental scale  $m_F$  is much smaller than the Planck scale. There are two possibilities. 1. The differences between the scales  $m_Q$  and  $m_H$  is still large, in which case we have a similar behaviour than in the first previous possibility. The second is that  $m_Q \sim m_H$ , in which case the observable evidence of the violation of wep must be even more evident than in the previous case.
- The fundamental scale  $m_F$  is larger than the Planck scale. 1. In this case, if  $m_Q$  is much larger than  $m_H$ , then the WEP will be exact up to  $m_H$ . 2. If  $m_Q \sim m_H$ , then the situation is similar to the preceding cases, but with a slighter deviation from the exactness than in previous cases.

In contemporary physical investigations the fundamental scale is fixed to be of order of Planck mass. The reasoning for it is that at such scale, the Schwarzschild radius and the Compton length of a non-rotating mini black-hole coincide. The argument follows in the way that at such level, virtual black-holes could be produced and that it is required a quantum theory to understand the dynamics of such virtual particles. However, we observe that the qualitative behavior is the same in the above three cases and that the difference is only on where to fix the fundamental scale. Moreover, the standard argument does not apply to Hamilton-Randers theory, where Einstein's type of gravity has only validity up to  $m_Q$ . Henceforth, the Planck scale does not play such distinguished role. This leaves the problem of how to fix the fundamental scale open, except for the constraint  $m_F \gg m_Q$  by construction.

**7.4. On the emergent origin of the gravitational interaction.** Bringing together the previous characteristics for the 1-Lipschitz interaction induced by the  $U_t$  flow in the domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  we find the following general features:

- Since the constraint (3.33) holds good, the dynamical  $U_t$  flow in the domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  is compatible with the Hamiltonian constraint of general relativity.
- A weak equivalence principle for the observable coordinates  $X^\mu(S(\tau))$  holds good in the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .
- The dynamical  $U_t$  flow in the domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$  determines a classical interaction, since it is relevant only when the wave function happens, that is, in the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .
- There is a local maximal speed for the sub-quantum molecules of a HR-systems and invariance under a local relativity group invariance holds. This local relativity group is by construction the Lorentz group.

Furthermore, we have found the following two additional restrictions

- The interaction is compatible with the existence of a maximal and universal proper acceleration,

In view of the formal similarity of these properties with the analogous properties of the current mathematical description of the gravitational interaction, one is naturally lead to the following conclusion,

*In the metastable equilibrium regime the 1-Lipschitz dynamics associated with  $H_{Lipshitz,t=(2n+1)T}$  is the gravitational interaction.*

That gravity could be intrinsically involved in the collapse of the wave functions is a common of several modern approaches to the description of measurement problem [21, 32, 50]. However, as we discuss explicitly before, there are fundamental differences between the models described here and spontaneous collapse models or collapse models induced by large mass measurement devices. There is also differences with semi-classical gravity, since in our case, gravity only appears in the classical domain, while in semi-classical gravity it is also generated by quantum states.

Thus according to our theory, gravity appears as classical, instead of semi-classical or quantum. Furthermore, there must exists essential differences with Einstein's gravity, since our theory includes a maximal proper universal acceleration. It is very interesting that a generalization of Einstein gravity with a maximal acceleration and where the weak equivalence principle holds could lead to a *classical resolution of curvature singularities*.

Regarding the incorporation of gravity in the standard description of quantum systems we will discuss in *section 8* gravitational induced quantum interference and see how this procedure is compatible with our version of emergent gravity.

Related with our discussion on the mechanism to stabilize the matter Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{matter,t}$ , we introduce the idea that  $\hat{H}_{Lipshitz,t}$  could be negative defined. If  $\hat{H}_{Lipshitz,t}$  is the Hamiltonian of gravitational degrees of freedom (at the classical level), this must be the case.

**7.5. Existence of a domain where gravity is 1-Lipschitz continuous.** That there is a domain where the gravitational interaction is 1-Lipschitz can be easily argued within the framework of newtonian gravity. Let us consider a newtonian gravitational force between a massive point particle with mass  $m$  by a massive point particle with mass  $M$  located in the origin of coordinates,

$$(7.18) \quad F(\vec{x}) = -G \frac{mM}{r^2}, \quad \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

and  $r = |\vec{x}|$  the distance to the origin in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  of the point  $\vec{x}$ . The newtonian gravitational potential  $V(\vec{x})$  lives on the collection of Euclidean spheres

$$\hat{S}^2 := \{S^2(r), r \in (0, +\infty)\},$$

where the expression  $|r_1 - r_2|$  defines a norm function. Moreover, to compare different lengths or different mechanical forces, it is useful to consider dimensionless expressions, for which we need fundamental scales. In doing this comparison we adopt as length scale the Planck length and for the force scale the Planck force and use homogenous quantities for length and force. The Planck force provides a natural unit, respect to it we can compare any other.

Let us consider the expression

$$\frac{|F(\vec{x}_2) - F(\vec{x}_1)|}{F_P} = \alpha \frac{|r_2 - r_1|}{l_P},$$

where  $F_P$  is the Planck force and  $l_P$  is the Planck length. After a bit of algebraic manipulations, one finds an expression for the coefficient  $\alpha$ . In the case of Newton law of universal gravitation (7.18),  $\alpha$  is given by the expression

$$\alpha = l_P \frac{1}{c^4} G^2 m M \frac{1}{r_2^2 r_1^2} |r_2 + r_1|.$$

In order to simplify the argument, let us consider  $m = M$ . Furthermore, although the case  $r_2 = r_1$  is singular, in order to work in a fixed scale, we consider a relation  $r_1 = \lambda r_2$  with  $\lambda \sim 1$  constant. After some algebra, one obtains a compact expression for  $\alpha$ ,

$$(7.19) \quad \alpha = \frac{1 + \lambda}{\lambda^3} \frac{D}{D_p} \frac{E}{E_P},$$

where  $D = m/r^3$  is a characteristic density of the system,  $E = mc^2$ ,  $D_P$  is the Planck density and  $E_P$  is the Planck energy. It follows from the expression (7.19) that for scales of the standard model, atomic physics, or macroscopic systems,  $\alpha \ll 1$ . Moreover,  $\alpha$  is bounded by 1. The bound is saturated at the Planck scale. This shows that at such scales, gravity is 1-Lipschitz. This is because the relative weakness of the gravitational interaction compared with the interactions of the Standard Model of particles.

Although based on a Newtonian limit and in several approximations and assumptions, the conclusion that we can extract of the above argument is the existence of a regime where classical gravity is a 1-Lipschitz interaction. This is in accordance with our interpretation of gravity as an emergent phenomenon.

As mathematical models, newtonian gravity or Einstein gravity can be extrapolated to domains where the evolution is not 1-Lipschitz, specially in domains close to the singularities of fields. However, such extrapolations, by the arguments given in this *section*, should be considered un-physical. A possible way out of this dichotomy is to consider classical theories of gravity with a maximal acceleration. Consistently with the weak equivalence principle, such classical theories could be free of curvature singularities.

**The case of electrodynamics.** If we repeat this argument for the static electromagnetic field, formally an analogous result is obtained. However, if we take into account the relative intensity of the classical Coulomb field with the Newtonian field, for instance for the electron, the corresponding  $\alpha$  is a factor of order  $10^{42}$  larger than for gravity. This suggests that at such scales the electromagnetic field cannot be 1-Lipschitz. Another argument in favour of this conclusion is that the electromagnetic field is quantized, which is a very different regime than a 1-Lipschitz regular dynamic. Instead, we find that it is the full Q.E.D theory that should be required for calculations at the atomic and sub-atomic scale. Hence we should not extend the argument directly from the Newtonian gravitational field to the Coulomb field. Furthermore, we showed that one of the assumptions in our derivation of the weak equivalence principle was the absence of exchange of sub-quantum molecules with the ambient or the source of the field. This assumption seems not to hold in the case of the electrodynamic and in general, gauge interactions, which is based on the exchange of virtual photons or bosons.

**Absence of gravitons.** The immediate consequence of the above reasoning is that a gravitational wave is not composed of gravitons, in the same way as a classical electromagnetic wave could be thought. Instead, in the framework of Hamilton-Randers theory and its extension to gravity as developed in this *section*, a gravitational wave is a classical and emergent effect, not reducible to quantum. This negative result can be turned a falsifiable prediction of our theory.

**7.6. Heisenberg dynamics of quantum observables.** Let us fix the value of the  $t$ -time parameter modulo an integer multiple of  $2T$  and let consider the corresponding slow times to be  $\tau(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  for each value of  $t, t + 2T, \dots$  defined by the relation (3.45) for each fundamental cycle of the  $U_t$  flow. While in the contractive regime the 1-Lipschitz component is dominant, in the ergodic regime of the  $U_t$  flow it is expected to be dominated by the matter Hamiltonian. This is the evolution induced by the generator  $\hat{H}_{matter}$ . Since fundamental cycles are labeled by the parameter  $\tau$ , the sequences of fundamental cycles defines a dynamics along  $\tau$ -time for the physical observables. In this context we can make the following,

**Assumption IV.** The dynamics just defined is the same for each  $t$ , except on metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .

From a point of view of the ergodic property, there is a kind of homogeneity in the sense that all the instants  $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{\mathbf{D}_0\}$  are natural, from a coarse grain description. Therefore, *assumption IV* is natural. Adopting this assumption we

assure the existence of a quantum  $U_\tau$ -dynamics which is independent of the  $t$ -time parameter, except when the system is suffering a natural spontaneous collapse or it has collapsed already, which happens only in the *small* metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ . It is a quantum mechanics evolution because the objects evolved do not correspond to definite macroscopic observable quantities, since in the ergodic regime and for a generic quantum state, macroscopic observables are not well defined.

Let  $\hat{U}_\tau$  be the quantum evolution operator along the  $\tau$ -time. Then any operator acting on the Hilbert space of matter, a space which is determined by the linear closure of the eigenvectors of the non-Lipschitz piece of the Hamiltonian, changes from one cycle to another cycle. If the change is generated by the quantized matter Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{matter}$ , then the infinitesimal change in  $\hat{A}$  is determined imposing unitarity by Stone's theorem [57],

$$(7.20) \quad \hat{A}(\tau) := (I - \imath \delta\tau \hat{H}_{matter})^\dagger \hat{A}(\tau_0) (I - \imath \delta\tau \hat{H}_{matter}), \quad \delta\tau = \tau - \tau_0.$$

It follows that at first order in  $\delta\tau$  the following expression,

$$\frac{\hat{A}(\tau) - \hat{A}(\tau_0)}{\tau - \tau_0} = -\imath \left[ \hat{H}_{matter}, \hat{A} \right],$$

which leads in the continuous limit to the Heisenberg equation of motion,

$$(7.21) \quad \imath \hbar \frac{d}{d\tau} \hat{A} = - \left[ \hat{H}_{matter}, \hat{A} \right].$$

Thus except for the still problematic issue of relating the sub-quantum observables with the quantum observables, Heisenberg's equations applies un-ambiguously to quantum observables, except in the domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .

**On the equivalence between Heisenberg and Schrödinger pictures.** Since we have assumed the Born-Jordan quantization of  $\hat{H}_t$ , such quantization prescription is applied to the matter Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{matter}$ . Then by a well known result [16, 17, 33], the equivalence between the Heisenberg picture and the Schrödinger picture can be established.



## 8. SOME CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS IN QUANTUM MECHANICS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF HAMILTON-RANDERS THEORY

There are several fundamental issues on the foundations of quantum theory which are a continuous source of theoretical problems since the advent of the theory. Four conceptual problems and the way that they are addressed in Hamilton-Randers theory are the following,

- (1) **The meaning of probability.** We have considered this problem in *section 5* and *section 6*, pointing out that in Hamilton-Randers theory the origin of the probability description in the quantum theory is on an ergodic behaviour of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom.
- (2) **The role of measurement.** In *section 6* we have drawn a theory of the measurement, showing how it is related with the notion of natural instantaneous collapse of the quantum state. In Hamilton-Randers theory, the observables are well defined prior measurement in the sense that every measurement is performed in the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .
- (3) **The collapse of the quantum state.** In Hamilton-Randers theory this is associated to the natural instantaneous collapse of the quantum state that happens in each fundamental cycle, as described in *section 6*. The mechanism does not require of an interaction between the quantum system and a macroscopic device and it is a fundamental property of the fundamental  $U_t$  flow.
- (4) **Quantum entanglement.** We think that a potential explanation of quantum entanglement could be based on the ergodic property of the  $U_t$  flow for sub-quantum dynamics. The main idea is to connect spacelike separated points in the spacetime by means of interactions of the fundamental  $U_t$  dynamics.

As an attempt to understand the last of these fundamental issues, in this *section* we describe a heuristic mechanism to explain quantum non-local correlations in the frame work of Hamilton-Randers theory. Moreover, we describe within our framework the mechanism explaining quantum interference phenomena and provide a mechanism for contextuality, avoiding in this way the constraints imposed by the Kochen-Specker theorem [45, 42].

### 8.1. The two slit quantum experiment and its interpretation in Hamilton-Randers Theory.

Let us consider the quantum two slit interference experiment as prototype of quantum interference phenomena. In a simplified version of the experiment, the experimental setting is two-dimensional, with the  $x$ -direction being the direction of propagation of the quantum particles and the  $z$ -axis the vertical direction of orientation for the slits and the detector screen. We assume that the intensity of the beam can be regulated to allow only for one quantum particle on flight each time that the experiment is repeated. The states are pure quantum states, describing individual quantum particles. The experiment is repeated many times with different quantum particles, under the constraint that the macroscopic initial momenta before reaching the slits is the same for all the particles. We assume

that other conditions on the experiment, as the value of the external gravitational field, interactions with the ambient, spin dynamical degrees of freedom and other dynamical properties are either the same for each of the particles or that the variance of these factors do not affect the outcomes of the experiment. Furthermore, each of the particles used in the experiment are quantum mechanically identical.

The quantum mechanical description of the experiment can be summarized as follows. We say that the quantum system is associated to the slit  $A$  (resp. for the slit  $B$ ) if, closing the slit  $B$ , the particle is detected on the detection screen after some time has pass since the particle was generated. Therefore, one can say that the particle has pass through the slit  $A$  (resp. the slit  $B$ ). Let us consider the state associated to the slit  $A$ . The quantum state associated to the slit  $A$  is described by means of a wave function  $\psi_A$  such that, if we close the slit  $B$ ,  $|\psi_A|^2$  reproduces the statistical patron observed in the detection screen, after the experiment has been done many times with identical particles. The slit  $B$  determines another state denoted by  $\psi_B$  in a similar way. Indeed, the evolution is characterized by which slits are open. Assuming that the experimental setting is stationary, if the two slits are open, then the quantum mechanical state at the instant  $\tau_0$  just after the system goes through the slits is described by a vector  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$  of the form

$$(8.1) \quad \psi(x, z, \tau_0) = C (\psi_A(x, z, \tau_0) + \psi_B(x, z, \tau_0)),$$

with  $C$  a normalization real constant such that  $\|\psi\|_{L_2} = 1$ . The evolution after passing the slits is linear and determined by a Schrödinger's equation and prescribed boundary or initial conditions,

$$(8.2) \quad \psi(x, z, \tau) = C (U_\tau(\tau, \tau_0)\psi_A(x, z, \tau_0) + U_\tau(\tau, \tau_0)\psi_B(x, z, \tau_0)),$$

Since the slits  $A$  and  $B$  are different, the states  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  describe different screen patters after a long time exposition and when the experiment is repeated many times with prepared individual identical particle states. However, there are some constraints on the states imposed by the geometry of the experiment. Symmetry considerations imply that  $\psi_A \simeq \psi_B$  in the central region of the screen. Outside of the central axis one expects that either  $|\psi_A| \neq |\psi_B|$  or  $arg(\psi_A) \neq arg(\psi_B)$  or that both conditions hold. In the case where there is a relative phase between  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$ , an interference pattern depending on the geometric arrangement of the experiment must appear and as we move out from the axis  $z = 0$ , a relative phase between  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  will initially increase. Moreover, one also expects to find that  $|\psi_A| \neq |\psi_B|$  holds along the  $z$ -axis.

From the point of view of standard interpretations of quantum mechanics, there is no further direct interpretation of the two slit experiment: if  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  are constructed in the form above described and if the two slits are open, there is now way to know by which one the particle passed without measuring the system. Furthermore, the appearance of interference patterns, inexplicable from the classical point of view, indicates that it is not correct to say that the particle passed by the

slit  $A$  or by the slit  $B$ <sup>6</sup>. Therefore, although the states  $\psi_A$  and  $\psi_B$  are constructed using classical terminology and classical language, it is not possible to associate with them a classical dynamical behaviour.

The physical description and interpretation of the two slit experiment from the point of view of Hamilton-Randers theory is the following. First, let us consider a generic predecessor state (5.1),

$$\Psi(u) = \sum_{k=1}^N e^{i\vartheta_k \Psi(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} n_k \Psi(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle.$$

In the case of the double slit, the predecessor state can be written in this generic form before and after the particle passes the slits. Let us consider first the case when both slits  $A$  and  $B$  are open. A sub-quantum molecule is associated to  $A$  (resp. to  $B$ ) if during the fundamental cycle marked by  $\tau_0$ , it expends more  $t$ -time close to the slit  $A$  (resp. for  $B$ ). In this case, some of the sub-quantum molecules will be associated with  $A$  and some will be associated with  $B$  and very few with both. Thus the generic form of a predecessor state is in this case

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(u) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} e^{i\vartheta_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} n_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{l=1+N_A}^{N_A+N_B} e^{i\vartheta_l(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} n_l(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding quantum state is

(8.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k e^{i\vartheta_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} n_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \\ &+ \sum_{l=1+N_A}^{N_A+N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l e^{i\vartheta_l(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} n_l(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We realize that since the degrees of freedom referred by the indices  $k$  and  $l$  are different, the locality condition (5.4) cannot be applied. The consequence of this fact is bold, since it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(x)|^2 &\neq \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_k^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \\ &+ \sum_{l=1+N_B}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l n_l^2(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l). \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $|\psi(x)|^2$  is not a sum of squares, the difference attributed to the appearance of interference terms between  $k$  and  $l$  terms. In the particular case of the doubly slit experiment, the symmetries of the setting implies the existence

<sup>6</sup>This is clearly not true within the Bohm's interpretation and de Broglie-Bohm interpretation. However, we do not consider Bohm theory here. It is also not applicable in the case of weak measurements, according to [3].

of nodes, or regions where  $|\psi(x)|^2 = 0$ , that are regularly distributed. Thus the picture for the interference that we propose is quite natural: in the case of the double slit, the system pass through both slits at the same time parameter  $\tau_0$ : part of it pass through  $A$  and part of it through  $B$ . However, just before it pass and just after it pass, if the particle is observed or some of its properties measured, it appears as localized, since the system interacts with the measurement device only when the system is in domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ .

Our description of the two slit quantum experiment is not yet strictly expressed in a form directly related with the quantum mechanics description. In order to clarify this point, let us note that in the symmetric situation described above the relations

$$N_A = N/2, \quad N_B = N/2$$

hold good. Thus we have a quantum state of the form

(8.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_A}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k e^{i \vartheta_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} n_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_B}} \sum_{l=1+N_A}^{N_A+N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l e^{i \vartheta_l(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)} n_l(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

that can be casted formally as

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\psi_A(x) + \psi_B(x)),$$

(8.5)

$$\psi_A(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_A}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k e^{i \vartheta_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)} n_k(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle$$

and similarly for  $\psi_B$ . Therefore, the quantum mechanical rule of addition of states associated to two slits is obtained. The rule can be generalized to different situations where interference happen.

The above interpretation is based on the fact that both  $N_A$  and  $N_B$  are large numbers and that the statistical behavior of the sub-system  $N_A$  is equivalent as if the slit  $B$  was closed. However, this interpretation raises the problem of understanding how it is possible that the particles are always detected in localized form and why there is no loss of unitarity, that is, if we close one of the slits  $B$  and half of the sub-quantum degrees is associated to  $B$ , is it not natural that we lost the sub-quantum particles that were associated to  $B$ ? At this point, our theory of natural spontaneous concentration can be applied. It follows that the properties of a quantum particle are only measurable when it is in the metastable domain  $\mathbf{D}_0$ . Thus the particle could be measured either close to  $A$  or close to  $B$ , although the exact location is impossible to predict because the complexity of the dynamical system and with an intensity according to  $N$ , not to  $N_A$  or  $N_B$ .

When we close one of the slits, the configuration space for the sub-quantum degrees of freedom changes. Now only  $k$ -type or  $l$ -type terms enters in the above decomposition (8.4). In this case, the locality condition (5.4) can be applied and  $|\psi(x)|^2$  is expressed as a sum of  $N$  independent square integrals,

$$|\psi(x)|^2 = n^2(x) = \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_k^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k), \quad k = 1, \dots, N.$$

These integrals are independent to each other, in the sense that their values are not a priori related, except by the normalization condition (5.12). In particular, there is no reason for the appearance of nodes, except asymptotically far from the central origin, in order to preserve the convergence in the spacetime integral of  $n^2(x)$ .

In our picture, although each of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom explores the full available phase space during the  $U_t$  flow, some of them could be confined in a domain  $A$  most of the time, while others in another domain  $B$ . When the concentration happens, then all the system is eventually attracted to a sub-region. In the case of study, if one of the slits it is close, then the phase space is automatically reduced, all the sub-quantum degrees of freedom in some sense equivalent, and there is no separation between associated to  $A$  and associated to  $B$ . When the two slits are open, there an intrinsic separation between degrees of freedom, that define the corresponding quantum states. This mechanism shows a short of contextuality, dependence of the behavior of the  $U_t$  flow on what are the prepared macroscopic conditions. We will see later when considering that the same mechanism implies contextuality in non-local situations.

**8.2. Quantum interferometry in presence of an external gravitational field.** We discuss now how a classical external gravitational field enters in the description of the interaction of quantum systems with an external gravitational field from the point of view of Hamilton-Randers theory. We would like to show that an external gravitational interaction is modelled in an analogous way as any other external potential. This could be surprising if we think that in Hamilton-Randers theory gravity corresponds to the dominant interaction in the 1-Lipschitz domain of the  $U_t$  flow. Therefore, gravity emerges when the system is naturally spontaneously collapsed and localized.

Is this description of gravity consistent with quantum interferometry experiments and with the quantum theory? Let us consider a typical gravitational interferometer setting composed by two classical paths  $ABD$  and  $ACD$  situated at different potentials of the Earth's surface gravitational field. The details can be found in [18, 19] or the exposition in [53], from where we adopt the notation. In particular, the phase difference along the paths is

$$(8.6) \quad \Phi_{ABD} - \Phi_{ACD} = \frac{m^2}{\hbar^2} g_0 \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} (l_1 l_2 \delta).$$

In the derivation of this expression it is applied the path integral approach to quantum amplitudes, the local expression for the gravitational potential of the Earth and de Broglie relation between the momenta and wave vectors.

The quantum particle has two possible classical paths where it can spontaneously concentrate. If the neutron concentrates at a point along the classical path  $ABD$ , then the local classical gravitational potential that the quantum particle feels is  $V(x_{ABD})$  and similarly if it concentrates along the second path  $ACD$ . If no measurement is carry on the system, the possible concentration region is  $ABD \cup ACD$ . Therefore, there are two possibilities for the  $U_t$  evolution of each sub-quantum degree of freedom, associated to each of the classical paths. Furthermore, the localization of the quantum particle can switch between the paths  $ABD$  to  $ACD$  and viceversa. Since the quantum particle is not always localized during the  $U_t$  flow and therefore, jumps could happen between the two classical paths connecting different fundamental cycles. However, since the gravitational potential  $V$  is local in the spacetime manifold, it is implemented in the standard way in the quantum evolution. Following this interpretation, although the system is collapsed at any instant that interacts gravitationally with  $V$ , there is no smooth classical trajectory defined by the system.

It is worth good to remark that since the dependence of the phase difference  $\Phi_{ABC} - \Phi_{ADB}$  on the mass of the system enters as a factor  $\frac{m^2}{\hbar^2}$ , there is an universal validity of the equality between inertial and gravitational mass. This is because inertial mass of the system and passive gravitational mass does not appear in the form  $m_{grav}m_i$ , but just as the product  $m^2$ . Therefore, if one could define classical world lines for a neutron or any other neutral nuclei, the world line will be the same. This is in accordance with our concentration of measure interpretation of the weak equivalence principle, that applies exactly to quantum systems.

**8.3. On the non-local quantum correlations.** The existence of *long distance quantum correlations* is an astonishing realization of quantum phenomenology that claims for a geometric explanation. In the framework of Hamilton-Randers theory there exists a is mechanisms originating the quantum correlations. Let us consider a entangled state with two parties  $a$  and  $b$ . During the  $U_t$  evolution, the sub-quantum degrees of freedom of  $a$  and  $b$  are mixing in the phase space  $T^*TM$ . During such mixing, they can interact and hence, they can correlate their motion. After the projection  $(t, \tau) \mapsto \tau$  is done in the mathematical formalism, this information is completely unaccessible. This mixing mechanism combined with the formal projection is the origin of the quantum correlations, according to Hamilton-Randers theory.

There are two main consequences of this mechanism. The first is that the correlations appear as instantaneous in the time  $\tau$  measured by a macroscopic observer, despite that the ergodic motion of the sub-quantum molecules is constrained by hypothesis to the sub-luminal speed condition  $\vec{v} < c$  in a very specific coordinate stems of  $TM$ . The second consequence is that, due to the sub-luminal kinematics in the sense of  $v < c$  of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom, the maximal distance achievable for the instantaneous quantum correlations is bounded by the relation

$$(8.7) \quad d_{cor} \leq T c.$$

By the relation (3.19), this bound  $d_{cor}$  depends on the mass of the quantum system in question,

$$(8.8) \quad d_{cor} \leq c T_{min} \exp \left[ \frac{T_{min} m c^2}{\hbar} \right].$$

In this expression  $m$  is the mass of the quantum system. The generalization for photons of the expression (8.8) should be written as

$$(8.9) \quad d_{cor} \leq c T_{min}.$$

Both expressions (8.8) and (8.8) are in principle falsifiable. If a particular value of  $T_{min}$  is determined by experiments, for instance in terms of the time  $T_{Planck}$ , then also the relation (8.8) could be tested in systems with very small differences in mass compared with the Planck mass. However, without knowledge of the ratio  $T_{min}/T_{Planck}$  few things can be say consistently, except that current experiments on quantum correlation could provide lower bounds for that quotient.

#### 8.4. On the emergence and ontological nature of the $\tau$ -time parameters.

Although the  $\tau$ -time class of parameters has been considered to be real parameter, the general observation that the  $U_t$  flow is almost periodic in  $t$  and that every quantum measurement is performed in the metastable equilibrium regime given by (5.15) implies indeed the discreteness of any  $\tau$ -time parameter. There are several consequences of this interpretation. The first one is that the continuous time parameters of classical physics and quantum mechanics must be regarded as an idealization or approximation. However, it is a very useful one, due to the extreme smallness of the Fundamental scale, related with the scale where the dynamics of the individual sub-quantum degrees of freedom lives, compared with quantum and macroscopic scales.

The second consequence is the emergent origin of the notion of external  $\tau$ -time parameter. The time parameters  $\tau$  appear as determined by the  $U_t$  flow at the Fundamental scale, and given by the number of fundamental cycles of the  $U_t$  flow during associated to a quantum system. It is this an emergent notion of time, that arises from physics of sub-quantum processes.

On the other hand, this emergent character of the  $\tau$ -time is not in contradiction with the requirement of *time diffeomorphism invariance* of general relativity, since our interpretation of the  $\tau$ -time parameters applies to any parameter associated to a physical clock as specified in *sub-section* 3.10. Hence there is no a privileged notion of  $\tau$ -time in our theory.

The representation of a clock as we did in *section* 3, as counting periods of the  $U_t$  dynamics requires a mechanism to stabilize the notion of macroscopic  $\tau$ -time. If we use two different dynamical systems with different semi-periods  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  as clocks, why they must determine the same fundamental lapses of  $\tau$ -time? Let us consider the inversion of the relation (3.20),

$$\frac{T}{T_{min}} = \exp \left( \frac{m c^2 T_{min}}{\hbar} \right)$$

and note the existence of a *fundamental mass scale* given by  $m_{min} = c^2 T_{min}/\hbar$ . Thus comparing two different clocks is given by the relation

$$(8.10) \quad \frac{T_2}{T_1} = \exp\left(\frac{(m_2 - m_1)}{m_{min}}\right).$$

For these clocks, that we can call *quantum clocks*, the semi-periods  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are the same provided that  $m_1, m_2 \ll m_{min}$ . Thus the rate of any two quantum clocks is universal<sup>7</sup>, as long as the mass scale of the clocks are far from  $m_{min}$ .

Even if the rate of all quantum clocks is effectively universal, there is no apparent reason to *work synchronized*, that is, that the metastable domains of two quantum systems to appear as *correlated* to each other. This apparent correlation is only needed from a macroscopic perspective and a different mechanism based in usual quantum mechanics and its relation with the macroscopic limit is need to explain it.

Our theory suggests that the underlying dynamics beneath quantum mechanics is fundamentally irreversible and unrepeatable. The irreversible nature of the dynamical evolution is based on the emergent character of time and the physical impossibility by means of quantum or classical means of repeat the initial conditions for the fundamental sub-quantum dynamics using physical systems at the quantum or classical level. That means that, since the  $\tau$  evolution corresponds to a larger scale than the  $U_t$  flow, it is not possible to control the fundamental  $U_t$  flow by means of systems described by the  $U_\tau$  dynamics, due to the complexity of the dynamics of sub-quantum degrees of freedom and the impossibility to control the  $U_t$  flow using quantum interactions. This implies the existence of an irreversible time evolution for any particular physical systems but also for the whole universe.

The uniqueness of the initial conditions for the Universe as a Hamilton-Randers system can be argued from a probabilistic point of view. Since the universe as a system must be described by a set containing a very large number of atomic and sub-atomic degrees of freedom, each of which is described in Hamilton-Randers theory by a complex system of sub-atomic molecules, it is reasonable to think as rather unlikely the repetition of the same initial conditions.

Our theory also suggests the impossibility of *travel back* in the  $\tau$ -time for any quantum or classical degree of freedom, as a standard model elementary particles or for any larger quantum and classical system. This is because the way  $U_t$  flow defines emergent time. This assertion is substantiated as a consequence of the emergent character of  $\tau$ -time. Thus any consistent theory with Hamilton-Randers theory should be consistent with the emergent character of time. Thus this is a form of *chronological protection* [36], that when applied to macroscopic spacetimes should impose the absence of closed timelike curves. The concrete realization of the conjecture in Hamilton-Randers theory needs to be fleshed out in the form of a maximal acceleration relativistic generalization of general relativity.

---

<sup>7</sup>This notion should not be confuse with the different frequencies associated with different quantum systems.



**8.5. Entangle states and correlations between sub-quantum degrees of freedom.** Let us consider a predecessor state of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{AB}(u_A, u_B) = & \left( \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \left( n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) \right) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \right) \otimes \\ & \left( \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \left( n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

In these expressions the indices  $k$  and  $l$  run over different sets of sub-quantum particles, referred by  $A$  and  $B$ . Thus the particle  $A$  is here represented by the predecessor state

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_A = & \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \left( n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) \right. \\ & \left. + n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) \right) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

while particle  $B$  is describe by the predecessor state

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_B = & \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \left( n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right. \\ & \left. + n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(8.11) \quad \Psi_{AB} = \Psi_A \otimes \Psi_B.$$

The associated quantum product state is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{A \otimes B}(x) = & \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_k^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k \int_{\varphi_l^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \\ & \left( n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) + n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) \right) \\ & \left( n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) + n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right) \\ & \cdot |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \otimes |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle \end{aligned}$$

We are interested to obtain conditions under which from the general predecessor state (8.11) a quantum state  $\psi_{AB}$  of the form

$$(8.12) \quad \psi_{AB}(x) = \psi_{1A}(x) \otimes \psi_{2B}(x) + \psi_{2A}(x) \otimes \psi_{1B}(x)$$

is obtained. Thus although the predecessor state is a product, the quantum effective state is an entangled state. In view of the structure of the state  $\psi_{AB}$ , a natural

way to arrive to this entangled structure (8.12) for  $\psi_{AB}$  is to demand that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \left( n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right. \\ & + n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \Big) \\ & \cdot |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \otimes |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\{|\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \otimes |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle, x \in M_4, k = 1, \dots, N_A, l = 1, \dots, N_B\}$  is a basis for the Hilbert space containing the vector  $\psi_{AB}$ , it follows that the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} (8.13) \quad & n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \\ & + n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) = 0, \\ & x \in M_4, k = 1, \dots, N_A, l = 1, \dots, N_B \end{aligned}$$

must hold good. This condition can be considered our definition of entanglement of two predecessor states. It can be re-written as a determinant equation,

$$(8.14) \quad 0 = \begin{vmatrix} n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) & -n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \\ n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) & n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \end{vmatrix}.$$

Thus the entanglement condition (8.13) can be read as that each of pairs of 2-vectors

$$\begin{aligned} (8.15) \quad & \left\{ \left( n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i\vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)), n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i(\vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) + \pi)) \right) \right. \\ & \left. \left( n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)), n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i\vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) \right) \right\}, \\ & x \in T_x M_4, k = 1, \dots, N_A, l = 1, \dots, N_B \end{aligned}$$

are orthogonal. Although this is different to say that  $\Psi_A$  and  $\Psi_B$  are orthogonal, the condition imposes a strong correlations on the sub-quantum degrees of freedom.

If we consider that the particle  $A$  and the particle  $B$  are originated from another quantum system  $C$ , we can also think the condition (8.13) in another way. Thus  $k$ -sub-quantum degrees of freedom and the  $l$ -sub-quantum degrees of freedom can be seen as *parts* of the collection of degrees of freedom defining  $C$ . In this case, the constraints (8.13) correspond to non-local correlations at 1 and 2 between different  $k$  and  $l$  types of sub-quantum degrees of freedom at

If the condition (8.13) holds, then  $\psi_{AB}$  is of the form (8.12),

$$(8.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{AB}(x) = & \left( \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i \vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \right) \\ & \otimes \left( \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \cdot n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i \vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle \right) \\ & + \left( \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i \vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \right) \\ & \otimes \left( \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \cdot n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i \vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(8.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{1A}(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i \vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle, \\ \psi_{2A}(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i \vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle, \\ \psi_{1B}(x) &= \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \cdot n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i \vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle, \\ \psi_{2B}(x) &= \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \cdot n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i \vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The predecessor states  $\Psi_A$  and  $\Psi_B$  can originate the entangled state (8.12) by two possible mechanism. In the first one, it is settle down from the beginning, in a form of determinism that to be consistent implies superdeterminism *à la* Hooft [40, 41]. The second way is by a dynamical mechanism in the  $U_t$  flow during the postulated ergodic evolution. This does not requires of superdeterminism, although all the systems will be deterministic and contextual.

If this second mechanism is the one truly responsible for the quantum correlations, then following processes will happen:

$$(8.18) \quad \psi_{AB} \rightarrow \psi_{A \otimes B}.$$

Thus the quantum correlations are not there for ever. This mechanism is caused by the subluminal constraint of the sub-quantum molecules. The constraint is different from [40, 41], since the setting where the conditions (8.13) are derived is an applies to general entangled states, even if macroscopically they never where in contact.

Finally, let us mention that entanglement mechanism described before can be generalized to systems with several particles and observers.

**8.6. Measurement of observable using an entangled state.** Given the entangled state  $\psi_{AB}$ , one can distinguish two terms of the form

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i \vartheta_{1k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \right) \\ \otimes \left( \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \cdot n_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i \vartheta_{2l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle \right)$$

and

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k n_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) \exp(i \vartheta_{2k}(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k)) |\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k\rangle \right) \\ \otimes \left( \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{l^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \cdot n_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \exp(i \vartheta_{1l}(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)) |\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l\rangle \right).$$

We consider the expectation value of product operators  $O_A \otimes O_B$ , and taking into account the assumption of highly oscillation phase (5.4), the expectation value is obtained by terms of the form

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k \int_{\varphi_{l^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l n_{1k}^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) n_{2l}^2(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \\ \langle \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k | O_A | \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k \rangle \langle \varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l | O_B | \varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l \rangle$$

and similarly for the second term.

As a particular case of this general formalism, let us consider the expectation value of the product of two components  $\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a}$ ,  $\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b}$  in Hamilton-Randers theory is of the form

$$\langle \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a} \otimes \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b} \rangle_{\psi_{AB}} = \int_{M_4} d^4 x \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k \int_{\varphi_{l^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \\ \left( n_{1k}^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) n_{2l}^2(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) + n_{2k}^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) n_{1l}^2(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) \right) \cdot \\ (8.19) \quad \cdot \langle \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k | \vec{a} \cdot \vec{\sigma} | \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k \rangle \langle \varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l | \vec{b} \cdot \vec{\sigma} | \varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l \rangle.$$

Not all the variables are independent in (8.19), since they are subjected to the entanglement conditions (8.13). This implies a generic expression for the expectation values of the form

$$(8.20) \quad \langle \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a} \otimes \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b} \rangle_{\psi_{AB}} = \int_{M_4} d^4 x \sum_{k=1}^{N_A} \sum_{l=1}^{N_B} \int_{\varphi_{k^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_k \int_{\varphi_{l^*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4 z_l \\ f(n_{1k}, n_{2k}, n_{1l}, \vartheta_{1k}, \vartheta_{1l}, \vartheta_{2k}, \vartheta_{2l}) \cdot \\ \cdot \langle \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k | \vec{a} \cdot \vec{\sigma} | \varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k \rangle \langle \varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l | \vec{b} \cdot \vec{\sigma} | \varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l \rangle.$$

The expression (8.20) illustrates the impossibility to separate the measure of the properties of the particle  $A$  observed at 1 from the properties of the partible  $B$  at 2 in the description that emerges in Hamilton-Randers theory. Indeed, the

formal structure (8.20) of the expectation value of observables in Hamilton-Randers theory (8.19) is different in several ways from the expression for the expectation value used as a fundamental equation in the derivation of Bell's inequalities [9] in quantum mechanics. To compare these two expressions let us recall that the theory analyzed in [9] is such that the expectation value of the product of the product  $\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a} \otimes \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b}$  is of the form

$$(8.21) \quad P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A_1(\vec{a}, \lambda) B_2(\vec{b}, \lambda).$$

In this expression,  $\lambda$  stands for the set of hidden variables,  $A$  and  $B$  are the possible values of the respective observables and  $\rho$  is the density distribution of the hidden variables.

Let us apply Bell's theory to a Hamilton-Randers model describing a quantum system composed of two entangled particles at 1 and 2, is done in the following lines. First, it is natural to assume that there are  $N = N_A + N_B$  sub-quantum degrees of freedom. Second, the result of the values of the observables is only determined by the  $U_t$ -evolution of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom accordingly with the ergodic theorem (according to the theory developed in *Section 5*). Then according to Bell's theory and in particular expression (8.21), if Hamilton-Randers theory is to be interpreted as a hidden variable theory, the expectation value must be of the form

$$(8.22) \quad \langle \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b} \rangle = \int_{M_4} d^4x \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{\varphi_{k*}^{-1}(T_x M_4)} d^4z_k n_k^2(\varphi^{-1}(x), z_k) A(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a}, (\varphi^{-1}(x), z_k)) \times \\ \times B(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{b}, (\varphi^{-1}(x), z_k)).$$

Comparing the expressions (8.20) and (8.22) we conclude that Hamilton-Randers theory is not a hidden variable theory as the ones considered by Bell's theory. Therefore, it is indeed possible that Hamilton-Randers models avoid Bell's inequalities since a fundamental assumption in Bell's theorem does not hold.

An intriguing aspect of the expression (8.19) is the appearance of fourth degree factors on  $n_k$ , when one should expect quadratic terms. This indicates that there is a different term to  $\rho(\lambda)$  in the expression for the probability (8.22). Specifically, the term

$$n_{1k}^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) n_{2l}^2(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l) + n_{2k}^2(\varphi_k^{-1}(x), z_k) n_{1l}^2(\varphi_l^{-1}(x), z_l)$$

does not correspond to a density, which is typically a quadratic term in  $n$ .

## 9. SEVERAL FURTHER DISCUSSION. OPEN PROBLEMS OF THE HAMILTON-RANDERS THEORY

In this final *section* we discuss several aspects of Hamilton-Randers theory in relation with other theories of emergent quantum mechanics and emergent gravity. We briefly resume some of the, although qualitative, falsifiable predictions of the theory and indicate problems for further development of the theory, linked with internal and general open problems.

**9.1. Comparing Hamilton-Randers theory with others deterministic theories of quantum mechanics.** The theory presented in this work has several remarkable similarities with other approaches to emergent quantum mechanics. Let us consider several aspects of the approach developed in Cellular Automaton models, extensively by G. 't Hooft and others (see for instance [13, 24, 38, 41]). Among the analogous properties between Cellular automaton as developed in the work of Hooft and Hamilton-Randers theory, there are the systematic use of Hilbert spaces theory for the description of quantum mechanics, the introduction of a dissipative dynamics in order to recover the notion of quantum state as an equivalence class of sub-quantum states [38] and the fact that the wave function is  $\psi$ -epistemic. Another point in common, is the discreteness of the evolution (although we have taken in this work a pragmatic approach to it, and considered continuous models).

However, there are important differences between our approach and cellular automaton approaches to emergent quantum mechanics. The mathematical formalism are different and also the notion of deterministic system attached to a quantum particle is different. Another significant difference between our approach and cellular automaton is on the notion of time. In Hamilton-Randers theory it is described by two-dimensional parameters  $(t, \tau)$ , instead that the usual one parameters, with values in the product of partial ordered field  $\mathbb{K}$  (usually assumed to be the real field  $\mathbb{R}$ ) and the set of integer numbers  $\mathbb{Z}$ . In the continuous limit the domain of the time parameters  $(t, \tau)$  are open subsets  $I \times \tilde{I}$  of the cartesian product  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . The further identification of the space of the time parameters with the field of complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$  imposes further constraints on the theory that we have not consider in this work. Also, note that  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  cannot be made an ordered field. Thus strictly speaking, there is no notion of global causation for Hamilton-Randers systems. The causal structure appears after the projection  $(t, \tau) \mapsto \tau$ .

The  $\tau$ -time parameter corresponds to the usual notion of *macroscopic time* as it appears in quantum mechanics and quantum field theory. The internal  $t$ -time parameter in HR-systems is used to describe the  $U_t$  internal dynamics of the Hamiltonian  $H_t(u, p)$  and appears in our theory as the parameter of the evolution (3.24) of the Hamilton-Randers geometric structure. It is also direct that when the projections  $(t, \tau) \mapsto t$  and  $(t, \tau) \mapsto \tau$  are considered, two independent time ordered relations appear, although they are independent from each other.

The parameters  $t$  and  $\tau$  are qualitatively different and irreducible to each other, which implies the two-dimensional character of time and that the associated two dynamical evolution  $(U_t, U_\tau)$  are irreducible to each other. Moreover, in the cellular

automaton of Hooft's approach, unitarity is recovered at the level of equivalence classes. In contrast, in our description, where there is a dissipative dynamics in the form of an internal  $U_t$  flow which is assumed of a rather intricate structure, there is no preservation of the volume phase element for the  $U_t$  flow, since the dynamics is driven by a time dependent Hamiltonian, but the  $U_\tau$  evolution associated with the quantum mechanical evolution is unitary.

Is it necessary to introduce this radically new notion of 2-dimensional time in our theory? From one side, the notion of 2-dimensional time as introduced in Hamilton-Randers theory is a natural abstraction of several mathematical elements found in the development of the theory. The two time parameters  $\tau$  and  $t$  appear in the theory naturally as parameter describing certain dynamics. Thus our notion of 2-dimensional time is not introduced in an ad hoc manner in the theory. But then it turns out that the notion of time that we propose is of fundamental for our interpretation of quantum non-locality, emergence of quantum states from complex dynamics and other emergent properties.

The problem to consider this notion comes from the fact that the usual notion of time that we perception is 1-dimensional. This is a rather persistent perception in diary live and experience, including in all natural sciences. Thus the introduction of a 2-dimensional time appears very unfamiliar to all us. However, there has been in the literature ideas and theories where time is two dimensional. Let us mention, in order to convince the reader that it could be interesting to consider a 2-dimensional time, the two-time physics developed by I. Bars, where the new dimension of time has accompanied a compact space extra-dimension [8]. In order to remark the differences between Bars's notion and our notion of 2-dimensional time, let us make specific here that while in Bars the metric structure is defined in a newer 6-dimensional manifold and has signature  $(-1, -1, 1, 1, 1)$ , our case the metric structure is defined in the 4-manifold  $M_4$  and has Lorentzian signature: there is no extension of the spacetime structure to incorporate the  $t$ -time direction in the form of an extended metric structure. Until that point  $t$ -time and  $\tau$ -time are different in our approach.

One could be inclined to think that the 2-time theory as it appears in Hamilton-Randers theory is indeed familiar from dynamical systems in connections with averaging methods in classical mechanics. In particular, it is notable the formal resemblance between the dynamical system  $(U_t, U_\tau)$  along  $(t, \tau)$  and fast/slow dynamical systems [5]. In such dynamical systems there are two time scales for the variation of the dynamical degrees of freedom: there are slow degrees of motion and fast degrees of motion. One is tented to identify in Hamilton-Randers models the fast degrees of motion with the sub-quantum molecules and the slow degrees of motions with the densities and wave functions described by elements of  $\mathcal{H}$ , which are determined by  $t$ -time averages (and by using an assumed extension of the ergodic theorem, velocity averages) of the fast dynamical degrees of freedom. However, a closer inspection refrains us to make such identification between Hamilton-Randers systems and fast/slow dynamical systems. First, in fast/slow dynamics, there is a one to one map between the values of the fast  $t$ -time and the values of the slow

$\tau$ -time. In the case of Hamilton-Randers systems, such bijection fails, since the values of  $\tau$  correspond to a discrete set of values of  $t$ -time parameter, namely

$$(9.1) \quad \tau \leftrightarrow 2nT, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where  $T$  is the semi-period of the fundamental cycles of the  $U_t$  dynamics. Second, by construction of the dynamics, the  $\tau$ -parameter is independent of the  $t$ -parameter, in the mathematical description of each Hamilton-Randers system. Finally, the theory per se of the fast/slow dynamical systems is significantly different from the systems that we consider in Hamilton-Randers theory.

## 9.2. Comparison of Hamilton-Randers theory and de Broglie-Bohm theory.

There is certain similarity between some properties present in Hamilton-Randers theory and in de Broglie-Bohm theory [15]. In Hamilton-Randers theory, the value of the observables of the system are well-defined before any measurement is done and are independent of the possible decisions that a particular observer makes. Indeed, in Hamilton-Randers theory, the existence of the natural spontaneous collapse solves the measurement problem and provides a deterministic and local picture of the dynamics in the extended configuration space and under the evolution determined by the double dynamics  $(U_t, U_\tau)$ . The quantum system is in a localized state prior to any measurement performed by a standard macroscopic observer, but it does not necessarily follows a smooth world line in the spacetime. In such localized state, all the possible classical observables have a well definite value. Interestingly, that classical observables have definite values does not necessarily implies the existence of a classical smooth trajectory. As our discussion of the double slit experiment reveals, transitions between separate paths can happens, as long as there is compatibility with conservation laws. Therefore, there are not Bohmian trajectories in Hamilton-Randers theory, in the sense that the succession of concentration domains does not necessarily defines a smooth curve in spacetime, although Bohmian trajectories could be associated to statistical averages regarding experiments with ensembles of identical quantum particles.

In Hamilton-Randers theory is natural to interpret the wave function as a *presence of matter* during the non-contractive phase of the  $U_t$  dynamics. However, the matter refers to the sub-quantum degrees of freedom and the only extrapolation to the Standard Models degrees of freedom comes from the use of a form of ergodicity. Therefore, in Hamilton-Randers theory the wave function has an epistemic interpretation, in sharp contrast with de Broglie-Bohm theory (at least in some interpretations, that includes the original formulation due to D. Bohm [15]), where the wave function is a real ontological field.

A possible test of the ontological character of the wave function arises if the wave function is associated to the source of the gravitational interaction. In the de Broglie-Bohm theory, since the wave function  $\psi$  is a physical field, it must carry energy and momentum and henceforth, must affect the surrounding gravitational field. In contrast, in Hamilton-Randers theory such modification of the gravitational field due to the wave function should not be expected.



**9.3. Comparison of the gravitational theory in Hamilton-Randers theory with other theories of classical emergent gravity.** The general idea of emergent gravity is not new to our work. Probably, a relevant example for us is Verlinde's theory of entropic gravity, where it was also argued that gravity is a classical non-fundamental interaction [60]. We aim to clarify the relation and differences between our description of emergent gravity and Verlinde's theory of gravity and show that, in fact, are rather different theories.

Apart from being based in very different principles and assumptions, a qualitative difference is on the universality of the corresponding interaction. While the theory of gravity as entropic force requires that the system is described necessarily by many macroscopic or quantum degrees of freedom, in order to define the temperature and entropy of the system, it seems that this inevitably leads to abandoned universality of gravity, since a simple system as an electron is not such a complex system where macroscopic entropy and temperature can be defined. However, it is well known that gravity affects also quantum systems. For instance, neutron interferometry is usually used to test how a classical gravitational potential interacts with a quantum particle [19]. In contrast, this problem does not appear in our version of emergent gravity, since it can be applied to a single electron.

Another important difference between both theories of gravity is on the use of the holographic principle, which is fundamental in Verlinde's approach but that it is apparently absent in Hamilton-Randers theory. Nevertheless, this point of view and the relation of thermodynamics and gravity is an interesting point to develop from the point of view of Hamilton-Randers theory.

In resume, despite that in both theories gravity appears as an emergent classical interaction, the inspection of the above differences between Verlinde's theory and the proposal suggested by Hamilton-Rander theory appears as very different concepts and not only different formalisms of the same underlying theory.

**9.4. Formal predictions of the Hamilton-Randers theory.** Despite the primitive state of Hamilton-Randers theory, we can make several predictions which are independent of model. Let us resume them here.

- (1) **Existence of a maximal acceleration.** This is a general consequence of the assumptions in *section 2*. The search for experimental signals of maximal acceleration is currently an active research line, developed by several groups. To us, one of the most interesting possibilities to detect effects due to maximal acceleration is on the spectrum and properties of ultra-high cosmic rays, allowing a larger number of ultra-high events compared with the predictions of a special relativistic theory [30].
- (2) **Exactness of the weak equivalence principle.** If our interpretation of emergent quantum mechanics is correct, there will not be an experimental observation of violation of WEP until the energy scales of the probe particles is close to the fundamental scale energy. The prediction can be cast as follows: the WEP will hold exactly up to a given scale (close to the fundamental scale) and after this energy scale is reached or it is close enough,

the principle will be totally violated. The scale where this happens is associated with the fundamental scale where the deterministic sub-quantum degrees of freedom live.

This prediction contrast with standard phenomenological models associated to quantum gravity, where violation of the weak equivalence happens (DSR, rainbow metrics and also some Finsler spacetimes, to give some examples), that predict smooth violations of the principle, even occurring at relatively low scales.

- (3) **Absence of graviton.** According to Hamilton-Randers theory, there is no graviton (massless particle of spin 2, that is associated to the formal quantization of the gravitational field). Hence if a graviton is discovered, our theory has to be withdraw. This can be either falsified by the study of primordial gravitational waves in cosmology or in high energy experiments.
- (4) **The quantum correlations are bounded in distance and instantaneous.** If limits are found in future experiments for the apparent speed of the correlations, our theory has to be deeply modified. Moreover, the expressions (8.8) and the expression (8.9) must hold.
- (5) **Impossibility of time travel.** By the way that  $\tau$ -time is defined as emergent concept in Hamilton-Randers theory, it is not possible to time travel back to the past for a macroscopic or quantum matter system. The reason underlies in the emergent character of  $\tau$ -time from the point of view of the  $U_t$  flow. Although rather qualitative, it is enough to confirm that in Hamilton-Randers theory the chronological protection conjecture holds [36]. This can be interpreted as a theoretical prediction of our theory.

The above are general predictions of Hamilton-Randers theory. We did not discussed the implications on quantum computing that our emergent quantum theory should have. Further consequences are to expected once the theory is developed in more detail.

**9.5. Open problems in Hamilton-Randers theory.** Several important issues need to be clarified and developed in our proposal. Some of them are briefly indicated below.

**HR-models and number theory.** One of the most urgent issues to address is to find a concrete dynamical system full-filling all the assumptions that we have made for Hamilton-Randers systems. Several possibilities are being investigated by the author. Among them, we find very interesting the analogy with the *Riemann flow* models based on of analytical number theory and quantum chaos. Indeed, it can be argued that HR-systems are  $8N$ -dimensional relativistic versions (in the sense of compatibility with the Lorentz group) of deformed  $xp$ -Hamiltonian models for the Riemann flow (see for instance [11, 12, 20, 54, 55]). It is remarkable that several characteristics explicitly proved or theoretically required for HR-systems are indeed found to hold in certain  $xp$ -models of Riemann dynamics. For instance, it is worth while to compare the Hamiltonian (3.32) with the Berry-Connes Hamiltonian [11, 20] to observe at least a formal remarkable similarity. But in addition,

a particular class of  $xp$ -Hamiltonian, namely, the theory develop by G. Sierra [55] appears closer to our assumptions of models with maximal speed and maximal acceleration, since Sierra's theory contains an (ad hoc) maximal acceleration and maximal speed (the speed of light in vacuum). Hence we make the suggestion that Sierra's model is an example of HR-system and viceversa, these similarities make HR-models candidates to the quantum mechanical approach to the Riemann hypothesis.

Our counting of states of fundamental Hamilton-Randers theory (3.40) suggests that the Hilbert-Polya conjecture is realized, not at the atomic or quantum level as has been argued elsewhere [54], but at a more fundamental level of the physical reality which can be the Fundamental scale by an  $8N$ -dimensional version of a  $xp$ -model.

Furthermore, there exists a deep connection between the theory of congruences and the formal aspect that Hamilton-Randers theory must take, a connection that we believe will be more obvious once the theory is formulated in terms of a discrete dynamics.

**Relation between macroscopic observables and microscopic operators.**

Another open question in our approach to the foundations of quantum mechanics is how to construct quantum mechanical observables in terms of *fundamental operators* acting on ontological states  $\{|x_k^\mu, y_k^\mu\rangle\}_{k=1, \mu=1}^{N, 4}$ . The transition from the description of the dynamics provided by  $\hat{H}_{matter,t}(\hat{u}, \hat{p})$  to the description by  $\hat{H}_{matter,t}(\hat{X}, \hat{P})$  requires either to know the structure of the operators  $\{\hat{X}, \hat{P}\}$  in terms of the operators  $\{\hat{u}, \hat{p}\}$  or a formal argument to identify the quantum operators  $\{\hat{X}, \hat{P}\}$  from the sub-quantum operators.

We should address in this contest the relation between the mass  $m$  of each sub-quantum molecule and the spectrum of masses of elementary quantum particles and other properties as emergent properties.

Related with this problem is the issue of which are the quantum operators that must be translated to the level of *fundamental operators*. For instance, if the underlying models are Lorentz invariant or covariant, are spin operators to be translated to fundamental operators? Are there representations of the (possibly deformed) Lorentz group in terms of fundamental operators? Quantum spacetime models as Snyder spacetime could be involved in answering these questions, but it is only if we have on hand complete examples of Hamilton-Randers models that we can address conveniently these problems. Examples of such models are free particles described in *section 5*. But further analysis is required of how these models can be compatible with quantum operators. One possibility is to study invariants under the  $U_t$ -flow as possible values defining the compatible representations of the Lorentz group with Hamilton-Randers theory.

Another important question to address is how quantum field theories arise from Hamilton-Randers models. The operators of a field theory are different than the operators of a first quantized theory. Thus it is possible that one needs to consider first deterministic field theories from the beginning in the formulation of Hamilton-Randers theories. Other possibility is to interpret relativistic quantum field theories

as an effective description of an otherwise discrete, first order quantized theory.

**Quantum non-locality and entanglement.** The notion of 2-dimensional time parameter  $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  is beneath our interpretation of the fundamental non-local properties of quantum mechanical systems. In order to describe the state of a system at a given instant, in Hamilton-Randers theory we need to specify the two time parameters  $(t, \tau) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . If only the parameter  $\tau$  is specified in a dynamical description of a physical system (as it is done in usual field theory and quantum mechanics) and if the system is not in an localized state for the  $U_t$  dynamics, an apparent non-local behavior of the state associated with the ergodicity of the dynamics emerges. We think that this is the origin of the phenomenological non-local properties of quantum systems.

**Interpretation of entangled states and derivation of Bell's inequalities.** A dynamical system interpretation of the quantum entanglement could be developed in our framework, with a theory of entangled states, based on the embedding  $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Fun}$  in the construction given by the expression (5.2) can be constructed using the methods of *sections 4* and *section 5*. In particular, we expect that for product states, there is few mixing of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom composing each factor, while for entangled states, there will be mixing of the sub-quantum degrees of freedom.

Although we have envisaged a geometric way to understand quantum non-local phenomena, a complete mathematical treatment must be investigated: how exactly is related the projection  $(t, \tau) \mapsto \tau$  and ergodicity with Bell's inequalities [9]?

**Synchronization of emergent systems.** Given two quantum systems, our description in sub-section 8.4 of the emergence of  $\tau$ -time as described by quantum clocks implies an inherent de-synchronization of each quantum system. How is it possible that, on the contrary, we perceive different quantum objects as co-existing at the same local time, for a given observer? One possibility is to invoke super-determinism and argue that there is an underlying conservation law that induces an *universal synchronization*. However, we found this possibility rather un-natural in the present framework, even if our theory is consistent with super-determinism. Other possibility is to invoke a higher order mechanism, currently present in quantum mechanics, that allows for a transition from a *emergent quantized time* as it is suggested in sub-section 8.4, to a continuously local time synchronized macroscopic reality in systems with many parts or components.

**Absolute structures in HR-theory and emergence of maximal acceleration extensions of general relativity.** It is a problematic point of our theory that the metric  $\eta_4$  and the collection of metrics  $\{\eta_4^k\}_{k=1}^N$  are background structures. We expect that an improved version of our theory should provide a natural dynamics for  $U_t$  and  $U_\tau$ , hence for the Hamilton-Randers geometric structures. The existence of the metastable equilibrium regime  $D_0$  implies that the  $U_t$  flow determines a thermodynamical limit. Hence it is possible to derive field equations for the metrics  $\{\eta_4^k\}_{k=1}^N$  valid in the metastable domain as equation of state for the system described in terms of macroscopic observables, in the thermodynamical equilibrium condition. A suggestion in this direction is that it could exists a fundamental

relation between our notion of emergent gravity and several proposals of viewing general relativity as a thermodynamical limit of classical systems. Furthermore, our geometric structures are Lorentz invariant, although a more precise description of the geometry structure in presence of proper maximal acceleration is required [30]. This could be important as a mechanism to avoid singularities within a completely classical theory of gravity.

**The relation with weak measurements and Bohmian mechanics.** It has been discussed that in Hamilton-Randers theory the macroscopic observables are well defined prior a measurement is made by an observer. In recent times, weak measurements have been study and apply to *proof* the reality of the wave function. We think that weak measurements can be indeed reconsidered in the framework of Hamilton-Randers theory and at the same time keep the epistemic interpretation of the wave function.

## EPILOGUE OF THE FIRST PART OF HAMILTON-RANDERS THEORY

The theory developed in this work is only the skeleton of a possible consistent deeper understanding of quantum mechanics and gravity. We have develop only the general structure of a theory that requires further development. The problems addressed are in that direction, but together with them, contact with the current problems of modern physics must be done. Any new proposal of a theory of gravity should try to address the origin and nature of dark matter and dark energy or the formulation of a theory without singularities. An investigation of these problems in our framework requires the specification of concrete realization of the Hamilton-Randers theory, a question remain of complete development.

To the author, exciting as well is the possibility to relate the contents of this theory with fundamental problems in number theory. At the end od the day, we are working with discrete structures that have resemblance with the structure of the natural numbers, in concrete between the prime numbers and the periods. Thus the conjectures that we are starting to formulate in these pages is that the fundamental dynamics at the fundamental sub-quantum level is equivalent or deeply related with the Riemann dynamics conjectured by Pólya on the distribution of the zeroes of the Riemman's zeta function as eigenvalues of a quantum Hamiltonian.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by PNPd-CAPES n. 2265/2011, Brazil. I am glad to thank professor J. M. Isidro for several important comments and encourage, to the whole group of Prof. P. Fernández de Córdoba at IUMPA at the Polytechnical University of Valencia for their kind hospitality during several scientific visits in the last years. Finally, I am in debt with my wife for support and encourage during the development of this project.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Acosta, P. Fernández de Córdoba, J. M. Isidro, J. L. G. Santander, *Emergent Quantum Mechanics as a classical, irreversible thermodynamics*, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **10**, No. 04 1350007 (2013).
- [2] S. L. Adler, *Quantum Theory as an Emergent Phenomenon: The Statistical Mechanics of Matrix Models as the Precursor of Quantum Field Theory*, Cambridge University Press (2004).
- [3] Y. Aharonov and L. Vaidman, *The Two-State Vector Formalism of Quantum Mechanics an Updated Review*, In: Juan Gonzalo Muga, Rafael Sala Mayato, Iigo Egusquiza (eds.): Time in Quantum Mechanics, Volume 1, Lecture Notes in Physics 734, pp. 399-447, 2nd ed., Springer (2008).
- [4] T. M. Apostol, *Introduction to analytical number theory*, Springer (1976).
- [5] V. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, Springer (1989).
- [6] V. I. Arnold and A. Avez, *Ergodic problems of classical mechanics*, Princeton University (1968).
- [7] D. Bao, S.S. Chern and Z. Shen, *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 200, Springer-Verlag.
- [8] I. Bars, *Survey of Two-Time Physics*, Class.Quant.Grav. **18** 3113-3130 (2001).
- [9] J. S. Bell, *On the Einstein-Podolski-Rosen paradox*, Physica **1**, 195 (1964).
- [10] M. Berger A panoramic view of Riemannian Geometry, Springer-Verlag (2002).
- [11] M. V. Berry, *The Bakerian Lecture, 1987: Quantum Chaology*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **413**, 183-198 (1987).
- [12] M. V. Berry and J. P. Keating,  *$H = xp$  and the Riemann zeros*, in *Supersymmetry and Trace Formulae: Chaos and Disorder*, ed. J. P. Keating, D. E. Khemelnitskii, L. V. Lerner, Kluwer 1999; M. V. Berry and J. P. Keating, *The Riemann zeros and eigenvalue asymptotics*, SIAM REVIEW **41** (2), 236 (1999).
- [13] M. Blasone, P. Jizba and F. Scardigli, *Can Quantum Mechanics be an Emergent Phenomenon?*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **174** (2009) 012034, arXiv:0901.3907[quant-ph].
- [14] D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory*, Prentice Hall, Inc (1951).
- [15] D. Bohm, *A suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of Hidden variables. I*, Phys. Rev. **85**, 166-179 (1952); *A suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of Hidden variables. II*, Phys. Rev. **85**, 180-193 (1952); D. Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, London: Routledge, (1982).
- [16] M. Born and C. Jordan, *Zur Quantenmechanik*, Z. Physik **34**, 858-888 (1925).
- [17] M. Born, W. Heisenberg and C. Jordan, *Zur Quantenmechanik II*, Z. Physik **35**, 557-615 (1925).
- [18] R. Colella and A. W. Overhauser, *Experimental test of gravitational induced quantum interference*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 1237 (1974).
- [19] R. Colella, A. W. Overhauser and S. A. Werner, *Observation of gravitationally induced interference*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **34**, 1472 (1975).
- [20] A. Connes, *Trace formula in noncommutative geometry and the zeros of the Riemann zeta function*, Selecta Mathematica (New Series) **5**, 29 (1999).
- [21] L. Diósi, *Gravitation and quantum-mechanical localization of macro-objects*, Phys. Lett. A **105**, 199; L. Diósi *Phys. Rev. A* **40** 1165, (1989).
- [22] P. A. M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Fourth Edition, Oxford University Press (1958).
- [23] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?*, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [24] H.T. Elze *Quantum mechanics emerging from "timeless" classical dynamics*, Trends in General Relativity and Quantum Cosmology, ed. C.V. Benton (Nova Science Publ., Hauppauge, NY, 79-101 (2006); H.T. Elze, *The Attractor and the Quantum States*, Int. J. Qu. Info. **7**, 83



- (2009); H.T. Elze, *Symmetry Aspects in Emergent Quantum Mechanics*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **171**, 012034 (2009).
- [25] H. T. Elze, *Action principle for cellular automata and the linearity of quantum mechanics*, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 012111 (2014); H. T. Elze, *Are nonlinear discrete cellular automata compatible with Quantum Mechanics?*, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **631**, 012069 (2015).
- [26] P. Fernández de Córdoba, J. M. Isidro and Milton H. Perea *Emergent Quantum Mechanics as thermal ensemble*, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **11**, 1450068 (2014).
- [27] R. Feynman, R. B. Leighton and M. Sands, *The Feynman lectures on Physics*, Ad. Wesley (1964).
- [28] R. Gallego Torromé, *Average Structures Associated with a Finsler Structure*, <http://arxiv:math/0501058v13>.
- [29] R. Gallego Torromé, *A Finslerian version of 't Hooft Deterministic Quantum Models*, J. Math. Phys. **47**, 072101 (2006).
- [30] R. Gallego Torromé, *An effective theory of metrics with maximal acceleration*, Class. Quantum Grav. **32** 245007 (2015).
- [31] G.C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber, *Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems*, Physical Review, D **34**, 470 (1986).
- [32] G. Ghirardi, R. Grassi and A. Rimini, *Continuous-spontaneous-reduction model involving gravity*, Phys. Rev. A **42** 1057 (1990).
- [33] M. A. de Gosson, *Born-Jordan quantization and the equivalence of matrix and wave mechanics*, eprint arXiv:1405.2519.
- [34] G. Grössing, *Emergence of Quantum Mechanics from a Sub-Quantum Statistical Mechanics*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B, **28**, 1450179 (2014).
- [35] M. Gromov, *Riemannian structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Birkhäuser (1999).
- [36] S. W. Hawking, *Chronology protection conjecture*, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 603 (1992).
- [37] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An introduction to the theory of number*, Sixth Edition, Oxford University Press (2008).
- [38] G. 't Hooft, *Determinism and Dissipation in Quantum Gravity*, hep-th/0003005.
- [39] G. 't Hooft, *Emergent Quantum Mechanics and Emergent Symmetries*, 13th International Symposium on Particles, Strings, and Cosmology-PASCOS 2007. AIP Conference Proceedings **957**, pp. 154-163 (2007).
- [40] G. 't Hooft, *How a wave function can collapse without violating Schrödinger's equation, and how to understand the Born's rule*, arXiv:1112.1811v3.
- [41] G. 't Hooft, *The Cellular Automaton Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, Fundamental Theories in Physics Vol. **185**, Springer Verlag (2016).
- [42] C. Isham, *Lectures on quantum theory: mathematical and theoretical foundations*, Imperial College Press (1995).
- [43] N. Jacobson, *Basic algebra I*, Second ed. Dover (2009).
- [44] A. Kobakhidze, *Gravity is not an entropic force* Phys. Rev. D **83** Rapid Communication, 0215202 (2011).
- [45] S. Kochen and E. Specker, *The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics*, J. of Mathematics and Mechanics **17**, 59-87 (1967).
- [46] I. Kolar, P. W. Michor and J. Slovák, *Natural operators in differential geometry*, Springer-Verlag (1993).
- [47] B. O. Koopman, *Hamiltonian Systems and Transformations in Hilbert Space* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **17** (5), 315 (1931).
- [48] V. D. Milman and G. Schechtman, *Asymptotic theory of Finite Dimensional normed spaces*, Lecture notes in Mathematics 1200, Springer (2001).
- [49] R. Miron, H. Hrimiuc, H. Shimada and S.V. Sabau, *The geometry of Hamilton and Lagrange spaces*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (2002).
- [50] R. Penrose, *On Gravity's Role in Quantum State Reduction*, Gen. Rel. and Gravit. **8**, No. 5, 581 (1996); R. Penrose, *The Road to Reality*, Vintage, London (2005).

- [51] H. B. Rademacher, *Nonreversible Finsler Metrics of positive flag curvature*, in Riemann-Finsler Geometry, MSRI Publications Vol. **80**, 261-303 (2004).
- [52] G. Randers, *On an Asymmetrical Metric in the Four-Space of General Relativity*, Phys. Rev. **59**, 195-199 (1941).
- [53] J.J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* Addison-Wesley (1994).
- [54] G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, *Landau levels and Riemann zeroes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 110201 (2008).
- [55] G. Sierra, *The Riemann zeros as energy levels of a Dirac fermion in a potential built from the prime numbers in Rindler spacetime*, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47** 325204 (2014).
- [56] L. Smolin, *A real ensemble interpretation of quantum mechanics*, Found. of Phys. **42**, Issue 10, pp 12391261 (2012).
- [57] M. H. Stone, *On One-Parameter Unitary Groups in Hilbert Space* Ann. of Math. Second Series, Vol. **33** pp. 643-648 (1932).
- [58] H. S. Snyder, *Quantized Space-Time*, Phys. Rev. **71** (1), 38-41 (1947).
- [59] M. Talagrand, *A new look at independence*, Ann. Probab. **24**, Number 1, 1-34 (1996).
- [60] E. Verlinde, *On the origin of gravity and the Laws of Newton*, JHEP **1104**, 029 (2011).
- [61] J. von Neumann, *Zur Operatorenmethode In Der Klassischen Mechanik*, Annals of Mathematics **33** (3): 587642 (1932); J. von Neumann, *Zusatze Zur Arbeit "Zur Operatorenmethode...."*, Annals of Mathematics **33** (4): 789791 (1932).
- [62] F. Warner, *Foundations of Differentiable Manifolds and Lie Groups*, Scott, Foresman and Company (1971).
- [63] J. H. C. Whitehead, *Convex regions in the geometry of paths*, Quarterly Journal of Mathematics - Quart. J. Math. **3**, no. 1, pp. 33-42 (1932).