arXiv:2110.07338v2 [physics.class-ph] 19 Oct 2021

Lorentz-equivariant flow with four delays of neutral type

Jayme De Luca[a]

[a]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, São Paulo 13565-905, Brazil*

Abstract

The electromagnetic two-body problem must be solved as a variational boundary-value problem because it is not a semiflow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$. In order to allow forward integration by the method of steps, we generalize electrodynamics by adding another time-reversible interaction along lightcones. The equations of motion are time-reversible and define a flow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with four state-dependent delays of neutral type and nonlinear gyroscopic terms. The flow includes an inversion boundary layer where attraction turns into repulsion. Moreover, the forward propagation of velocity discontinuities requires two additional constraints; the energetic Weierstrass-Erdmann conditions, which define the boundary layer neighborhood where velocity denominators become small. In order to display the boundary layers in the simplest form, we discuss the motion restricted to a straight line by the initial condition.

Keywords: neutral differential-delay equations; state-dependent delay, ODEs and semiflows.

1. Introduction

A. Significance of the problem and contents

Variational electrodynamics possesses neutral differential-delay equations of motion (NDDE) with state-dependent delays [1–3]. A hindrance to integrating these NDDE forward like an ordinary differential equation (ODE) is the non-invertibility of the linear form containing the most advanced acceleration. Here we cure the non-invertibility by adding a specific Lorentz-invariant term to the action functional. For the two-body problem, the equation of motion for each charge is a NDDE with two state-dependent **delays**, which can be integrated like an ODE, using, for example, the MATLAB function **ddensd**. A variational principle is an economical way to derive time-reversible Lorentz-equivariant models possessing

Email address: jayme.deluca@gmail.com (Jayme De Luca)

differential-delay equations of motion free of divergencies. Some important details to keep in mind are

- Lorentz-equivariant two-body dynamics involves *two* partial Lagrangians made of Lorentz-invariant interactions, as it should by the no-interaction theorem [4]. Each partial Lagrangian poses an Euler-Lagrange problem yielding a NDDE with *two* state-dependent delays of neutral type for each charge[1–3]. The complete NDDE for the two-body problem has *four* state-dependent delays of neutral type.

- According to [5], there are basically **three** interaction terms in a Lorentz-invariant functional with interactions in lightcone; (i) the electromagnetic interaction, (ii) a second type henceforth called the ε-strong interaction. The former is introduced here to yield a Lorentz-equivariant semiflow for any $\varepsilon \neq 0$, and (iii) the gravity-like interaction, which is not needed to produce a semiflow and was left out for simplicity.

- Variational orbits can have velocity discontinuities on a countable set of breaking points, which happen inside boundary layers where near-luminal velocities are reached and velocity denominators become small [1–3]. The possibility of velocity discontinuities complicates the definition of a domain set for the semiflow.

- Widespread use in quantum mechanics has done a disservice by comparing the electromagnetic two-body problem to a supposed finite-dimensional low-velocity limit (the Coulomb-mechanical ODE). The former ignores crucial details of variational electrodynamics, namely the velocity denominators and the possibility of velocity discontinuities. A complex problem follows when the velocity denominators become small, which neighborhoods are treated here as the collisional boundary layers of the breaking points.

- Besides the collisional boundary layer, the Lorentz-invariant ε-strong interaction can change the effective interaction from attractive to repulsive and vice-versa. The former happens inside an inversion layer which acts as a natural bumper for the particles.

- Unperturbed electrodynamics is **not** a semiflow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ and **must** be studied as a boundary-value problem [6–8].

- After the 1970s, differential-delay equations started to be studied as infinite-dimensional problems using the theory of semiflows [9–12].

B. How this paper is divided

In §2 and in the caption of Fig. 1 we explain our (new) notation for indices, introduce the lightcone condition and state a multi-purpose Lemma 2.1 about velocity denominators. In §2-A we introduce the Lorentz-invariant functional as an ε-perturbation of electrodynamics. In the caption of Fig. 2 we illustrate the data for the boundary-value problem and Theorem 2.1 is an inequality to estimate the parameter region of electromagnetic dominance. In §2-B we state the critical point conditions and define some quantities to be used throughout the paper. In §2-C we put the time-reversible Euler-Lagrange equations of motion. In §2-D we outline the Weiestrass-Erdmann extremum conditions for minimizers with discontinuous velocities. In §3 and in the caption of Fig. 3 we explain the method of steps. In §3-A we discuss the reconstruction of the most advanced acceleration. In §3-B we discuss the rank deficiency that prevents unperturbed electrodynamics to be a semiflow and prove Theorem 3.1 that electrodynamics is not a semiflow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$. In §3-C we write the full NDDE for numerical integration by the method of steps and prove theorem 3.2 on a semigroup property of the perturbed case. In §3-D we discuss the case of motion restricted to a straight line by the initial condition and give the straight-line NDDE for numerical integration by the method of steps. Our §3-E is designed to guide future experiments with numerical calculations and discusses domains of initial-history sets for the method of steps. In §4 we discuss the forward continuation of orbits with velocity discontinuities; §4-A has three lemmas about an a priori continuation of the partial-momentum sector of the Weiestrass-Erdmann conditions, i.e., Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. In §4-B we discuss the over-determination by the two (scalar energetic) Weierstrass-Erdmann conditions, which define the collisional boundary-layer neighborhood of the breaking point. In §4-5 we discuss in detail the straight-line motion to motivate further numerical studies, and to classify some collisions-at-a-distance, i.e., Lemmas 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. In §6 we put the discussions and conclusion. The appendix has two small subsections; §7-A describing the action of the one-dimensional Lorentz group and §7-B has the outer-cone Lemma 7.1 on the optimal position of mutual-recoil collisions-at-a-distance.

2. Lorentz-invariant functional with one parameter

Our notation for sub-indices is **character-sensitive**, as follows: the greek-letter sub-index α designates charges in general, and, when specified, $\alpha = e$ denotes the electronic quantities and $\alpha = p$ denotes the protonic quantities. The speed of light is $c \equiv 1$ in our unit system, and the electronic charge and electronic mass are $e_e \equiv -1$ and $m_e \equiv 1$, respectively. The quantities (e_p, m_p) are arbitrary in our flexible setup. To describe the repulsive electromagnetic problem one can take $e_p < 0$ and arbitrary m_p. The proton is described in

our unit system by using $m_p = M_p \simeq 1837$ and $e_p = 1$. We adopt an inertial frame where every point has a time t defined by Einstein synchronization, and spatial coordinates $\mathbf{x} \equiv (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $(t, x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^4$. The two-body problem has coordinates $(t_p, x_p, y_p, z_p, t_e, x_e, y_e, z_e) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ and we present the equations of motion by giving the derivatives of the (three) spatial coordinates of each particle respect to its time t_α, for $\alpha \in (e, p)$. An **orbit** of the two-body problem is a pair of twice-differentiable functions $(\mathbf{x}_e(t_e), \mathbf{x}_p(t_p)) \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ and satisfying the equations of motion, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_\alpha : t_\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \to (x_\alpha, y_\alpha, z_\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\alpha \in (e, p)$, while each $\mathbf{x}_\alpha(t_\alpha)$ is called the **trajectory** of charge α. Orbits with discontinuous velocities in a countable set are studied in the class of continuous functions possessing two derivatives piecewise, henceforth $\hat{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$. Our notation becomes character-sensitive when sewing chains are involved, as illustrated in Figure 1. The former convention is adapted to display formulas involving one charge *and* the past and the future positions in lightcone of the other charge, in which case the sub-indices are chosen as three consecutive roman characters taken from (s, k, i, j) in the former order, to denote the sewing chain illustrated in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Illustration of the $(skij)$ convention and the unit vectors emanating from the respective positions. When used on the equation of motion for the proton at point i, the past electronic position is at point k while the future electronic position is at point j. On the equation of motion for the electron at point k, the past protonic position is at point s while the future protonic position is at point i.

Our theory is sensible for trajectories possessing a velocity with a modulus smaller than the speed of light $c \equiv 1$ almost everywhere, i.e.,

$$||\mathbf{v}_\alpha|| < 1, \quad \alpha \in (e, p), \tag{1}$$

henceforth subluminal trajectories. For orbits satisfying (1), the **lightcone conditions** are defined by

$$t_\alpha = t_i \pm ||\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_\alpha(t_\alpha)|| \equiv t_i \pm r_{\alpha i}(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i), \tag{2}$$

for $\alpha \in (k,j)$, where double bars stand for the $\mathbb{R}^3$ norm. In Ref [3] we show that for orbits belonging to $\hat{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$ and satisfying (1), each sign of the implicit condition (2) has a unique solution defining continuous and twice differentiable maps $t_\alpha(t_i,\mathbf{x}_i):\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ and $r_{\alpha i}(t_i,\mathbf{x}_i):\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ for $\alpha\in(k,j)$ (illustrated in Fig. 1), where

$$r_{\alpha i}(t_i,\mathbf{x}_i)\equiv||\mathbf{x}_i-\mathbf{x}_\alpha(t_\alpha)||=|t_i-t_\alpha|. \tag{3}$$

In Ref. [3] we show that the time-in-lightcone t_α and the inter-particle distance $r_{\alpha i}$ defined respectively by (2) and (3) satisfy

$$\frac{\partial t_\alpha}{\partial\mathbf{x}_i}(t_i,\mathbf{x}_i)=\pm\nabla_i\, r_{\alpha i}(t_i,\mathbf{x}_i)=\frac{\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha}{(1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)}\,, \tag{4}$$

where

$$\mathbf{n}_\alpha\quad\equiv\quad\frac{(\mathbf{x}_i-\mathbf{x}_\alpha)}{r_{\alpha i}}\,. \tag{5}$$

The upper sign in (4) holds when $\alpha=j$, while the lower sign holds when $\alpha=k$. The denominators of (4) are henceforth called *velocity denominators*, which introduce a singularity in the equations of motion derived next. Several quantities in this paper involve the denominator $(1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta)$, which is nonzero for subluminal orbits. The following Lemma defines a ubiquitous quotient that is finite for subluminal orbits, even in the limit when $|\mathbf{v}_\alpha|\to 1$, which is a useful regularization for the numerical calculations.

Lemma 2.1. *For an arbitrary unit direction* $\mathbf{n}_\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^3$ *and* $||\mathbf{v}_\beta||<1$ *we have*

$$\frac{(1-\mathbf{v}_\beta^2)}{(1-(\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta)^2)}<2. \tag{6}$$

Proof. The left-hand side of (6) can be factored as

$$\frac{(1-\mathbf{v}_\beta^2)}{(1-(\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta)^2)}=\Big(\frac{(1+||\mathbf{v}_\beta||)}{1+||\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta||}\Big)\Big(\frac{1-||\mathbf{v}_\beta||}{1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta}\Big). \tag{7}$$

The sign in front of $\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta$ in the last denominator of (7) is a plus if $\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta<0$ and a minus if $\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\beta>0$. The proof is completed by inspecting the right-hand side of (7): the first factor is lesser than two while the second factor is lesser than one when $||\mathbf{n}_\alpha||=1$. □

A. Perturbed functional

The most general Lorentz-invariant action with interactions in lightcone has only **three** interaction terms [5]. Here we generalize electrodynamics using an action written in Ref. [5] with renamed coefficients. After some inspection, one finds that the first term in equation 47 of Ref. [5] does not perturb electrodynamics to a semiflow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$, so we chose its coefficient to be zero. We

chose the coefficient of the electromagnetic sector to be the usual product of the charges. Essential for a semiflow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ is the third term of the functional in equation 47 of Ref.[5], henceforth called the ε-strong interaction. We chose its coefficient to be the parameter $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, yielding our Lorentz-invariant functional for minimization, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon \;\equiv\; & -\sum_{\alpha=e,p} \int m_\alpha \sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}\, dt_\alpha - e_e e_p \int_{H_B} \delta(s_{ep}^2)(1-\mathbf{v}_e\cdot\mathbf{v}_p)\, dt_e dt_p \\ & -\varepsilon \int_{H_B} \delta(s_{ep}^2)\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_e^2}\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_p^2}\, dt_e dt_p, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_\alpha \equiv \frac{d\mathbf{x}_\alpha}{dt}|_{t_\alpha}$ is the cartesian velocity of particle $\alpha \in (e,p)$ at time t_α and $s_{ep}^2(t_e,\, t_p)$ is the Lorentz-invariant four-separation defined as a general function of two times $s_{ep}^2 : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$s_{ep}^2(t_e,\, t_p) \;=\; (t_e - t_p)^2 - r_{ep}^2(t_e,t_p)\,, \tag{9}$$

where

$$r_{ep} \equiv \|\mathbf{x}_p(t_p) - \mathbf{x}_e(t_e)\|, \tag{10}$$

is the inter-particle distance as a function of two times, and double bars stand for the $\mathbb{R}^3$ norm. Still in Eq. (8), the dot represents the scalar product of $\mathbb{R}^3$, the integration variables are the particle times and the double integration is to be carried over the boundary histories H_B defined in Fig. 2. The lightcone condition is the condition $s_{ep}^2(t_e,\, t_p) = 0$, and in the following we use the standard delta-function-identity of summation over the zeros of the argument (e.g. see chapter 14 of Ref. [13]) to integrate (8) over t_e with a fixed t_p, yielding

$$\delta(s_{ep}^2(t_p,\, t_e)) = \sum_{\mathfrak{z}=\pm 1} \frac{\delta(t_e - t_p \mp \mathfrak{z} r_{ep})}{|\frac{\partial s_{ep}^2}{\partial t_e}|_{t_e = t_p \pm r_{ep}}} = \frac{\delta(t_e - t_p - r_{ep})}{2r_{ep}(1+\mathbf{n}_e\cdot\mathbf{v}_e)} + \frac{\delta(t_e - t_p + r_{ep})}{2r_{ep}(1-\mathbf{n}_e\cdot\mathbf{v}_e)}, \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbf{n}_e$ is defined by Eq. (5) with $i = p$ and $\alpha = e$. In the denominators of (11) and henceforth, r_{ep} is the distance in lightcone as a function of time t_p only, and the plus sign goes when the electronic position is in the future lightcone of t_p, i.e., $t_e = t_p + r_{ep}$, while the minus sign goes when the electronic position is in the past lightcone of t_p, i.e., $t_e = t_p - r_{ep}$. We notice that $\delta(s_{ep}^2(t_p,\, t_e))$ can be expressed by an alternative formula obtained from (11) by exchanging e and p, which should be used when one is integrating over t_p to derive the electronic partial Lagrangian. In view of Lemma 2.1, action (8) is well defined in the domain of trajectory pairs where the denominators of (8) are Lebesgue integrable, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Peano}} \equiv \Big\{(\Gamma_e,\Gamma_p)\in C^2(\mathbb{R})\Big|\int \frac{dt_\ell}{r_{\ell j}(1-\mathbf{v}_\ell^2)} < \infty\,;\int \frac{dt_j}{r_{ji}(1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)} < \infty\Big\}, \tag{12}$$

named after the Cauchy-Peano theorem for ODE's. In order to define the region of electromagnetic dominance, we show next that the electromagnetic interaction dominates the ε-strong interaction of (8) when $|\varepsilon| < 1$.

Theorem 2.1. *For arbitrary* $(\mathbf{v}_p, \mathbf{v}_e) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *with* $|\mathbf{v}_p| \leq 1$ *and* $|\mathbf{v}_e| \leq 1$, *we have*

$$\Delta_{ep} \equiv (1 - \mathbf{v}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_p)^2 - (1 - \mathbf{v}_p^2)(1 - \mathbf{v}_e^2) \quad \geq \quad 0. \tag{13}$$

Proof. The proof is simple and proceeds by re-arranging Eq. (13), yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{ep} &\equiv (1 - \mathbf{v}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_p)^2 - (1 - \mathbf{v}_e^2)(1 - \mathbf{v}_p^2) \\
&= \mathbf{v}_e^2 + \mathbf{v}_p^2 - 2\mathbf{v}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_p + (\mathbf{v}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_p)^2 - \mathbf{v}_e^2 \mathbf{v}_p^2 \\
&= (|\mathbf{v}_e| - |\mathbf{v}_p|)^2 + 2(|\mathbf{v}_e||\mathbf{v}_p| - \mathbf{v}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_p) + (\mathbf{v}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_p)^2 - \mathbf{v}_e^2 \mathbf{v}_p^2 \\
&= (|\mathbf{v}_e| - |\mathbf{v}_p|)^2 + 2|\mathbf{v}_e||\mathbf{v}_p|(1 - \cos(\theta))\Big(1 - |\mathbf{v}_e||\mathbf{v}_p| \cos^2(\frac{\theta}{2})\Big) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where θ is the angle between vectors $\mathbf{v}_e$ and $\mathbf{v}_p$. □

The history sets to be used as boundary data for the variational formulation are illustrated in red in Fig. 2 below.




Figure 2: Boundary chain $H_{\rm B}$ (dashed red segments and solid red dots). The datum includes the protonic position at the initial time, t_p^O and the continuous and $\hat{C}^2$ electronic trajectory in (t_e^{O-}, t_e^{O+}) (lower red segment), which interval has endpoints in lightcone with the protonic position at the initial time t_p^O. At the other end the datum includes the electronic position at the end time t_e^L and the continuous $\hat{C}^2$ protonic trajectory on (t_p^{L-}, t_p^{L+})(upper solid red segment), which interval is inside the lightcone of the electronic position at the end time t_e^L. The continuous $\hat{C}^2$ trajectories have two continuous derivatives at every point but at a countable set of points along sewing chains of breaking points. Trajectory information on the former closed intervals is enough to formulate the variational problem. Illustrated in gold is a sewing chain of particle positions in lightcone, (o, s, k, i, j, ℓ), and the dashed black lines indicate the lightcones. Notice that the chain H_B includes the last point of each sewing chain starting from any point along the boundary trajectories, either forward or backward.

B. Critical point conditions

Minimization of (8) poses two conditions [2]: (i) Euler-Lagrange equations along the piecewise C^2 segments of each trajectory and (ii) the Weierstrass-Erdmann conditions at the breaking points of each trajectory. The critical point of (8) when $i = p$ is obtained by varying the protonic trajectory while fixing its endpoints and its history segments, and fixing the electronic trajectory. The partial Lagrangian of particle $i = p$ is obtained by integrating the double integrals of (8) once over the domain of t_e; the delta function picks the two zeros of $s^2_{ep}(t_e,\, t_p)$ when t_e varies, which define the two lightcones. Using (11) to integrate (8) over t_e yields a Lagrangian minimization to find min $\int_{t_O}^{t_L} \mathscr{L}_i(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i(t_i), \mathbf{v}_i(t_i))dt_i$, where

$$\mathscr{L}_i(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i\,, \mathbf{v}_i) \equiv \mathcal{K}_i - \sum_{\alpha=k,j} e_i\big(\mathcal{U}_i - \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i\,\big) - \varepsilon\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}\,\mathsf{G}_i\,, \tag{14}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_i\,, \mathcal{U}_i\,, \mathbf{A}_i$ and G_i are given by

$$\mathcal{K}_i \equiv m_i(\,1-\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}\;\,), \tag{15}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_i \equiv \frac{e_k\mathbf{v}_k}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)} + \frac{e_j\mathbf{v}_j}{2r_{ji}(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}, \tag{16}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_i \equiv \frac{e_k}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)} + \frac{e_j}{2r_{ji}(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}, \tag{17}$$

$$\mathsf{G}_i \equiv \frac{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_k^2}}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)} + \frac{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_j^2}}{2r_{ji}(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}\,, \tag{18}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_k \equiv d\mathbf{x}_k/dt|_{t=t_k}$ is the electronic velocity evaluated on the past lightcone and $\mathbf{v}_j \equiv d\mathbf{x}_j/dt|_{t=t_j}$ is the electronic velocity on the future lightcone. Notice that $\mathcal{K}_i, \mathcal{U}_i, \mathbf{A}_i$ and G_i are functions of $(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$ by Eqs. (2) and (3). As with any Lorentz-invariant action, and unlike classical mechanics, action (8) defines a different partial Lagrangian for each particle[4]. Equation (14) defines the protonic partial Lagrangian, while the electronic partial Lagrangian is obtained from (14) by exchanging $(kij) \to (ski)$ in Eq. (14), i.e., replacing i with k and restricting the summation to the nearest neighbors $\alpha \in (s, i)$ of particle k on the sewing chain of Fig. 1.

C. Euler-Lagrange equations of motion

The Euler-Lagrange equations for particle i on the $\widehat{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$ segments are

$$\begin{aligned}(m_i + \varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i)\Big(\frac{\mathbf{a}_i}{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}} + \frac{(\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\mathbf{a}_i)\mathbf{a}_i}{(1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)^{3/2}}\Big) \;&=\; \frac{1}{2}e_i\sum_{\alpha=k,\,j}(\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i} + \mathbf{v}_i\times\mathbf{B}_{\alpha i}) \\ &\quad -\varepsilon\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}\Big(\nabla\mathsf{G}_i + \gamma_i^2\frac{d\mathsf{G}_i}{dt_i}\mathbf{v}_i\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where

$$\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i} \equiv e_\alpha\Big(\frac{(1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2)(\mathbf{n}_\alpha \pm \mathbf{v}_\alpha)}{r_{\alpha i}^2(1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)^3} + \frac{\mathbf{n}_\alpha \times \big((\mathbf{n}_\alpha \pm \mathbf{v}_\alpha)\times \mathbf{a}_\alpha\big)}{r_{\alpha i}(1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)^3}\Big), \tag{20}$$

$$\mathbf{B}_{\alpha i} \equiv \mp\mathbf{n}_\alpha \times \mathbf{E}_{\alpha i}\,, \tag{21}$$

are, respectively, the electric and the magnetic fields of the other particle. When $\alpha = k$ the other particle is in the past lightcone position and the lower sign applies. Otherwise when $\alpha = j$ the other particle is in the future lightcone position and the upper sign applies. In Eqs. (20) and (21), $\mathbf{v}_\alpha \equiv d\mathbf{x}_\alpha/dt|_{t=t_\alpha}$ and $\mathbf{a}_\alpha \equiv d\mathbf{v}_\alpha/dt|_{t=t_\alpha}$ are, respectively, the other charge's velocity and acceleration evaluated at either the retarded or at the advanced lightcone. Notice in Eq. (19) that the electromagnetic sector of the Euler-Lagrange equation involves a semi-sum of the Liénard-Wiechert fields (20) and (21) combined in the Lorentz-force form [13]. Last, in Eqs. (20) and (21) the unit vector from $\mathbf{x}_\alpha$ to $\mathbf{x}_i(t_i)$ is defined by (5). Multiplying (19) by $\mathbf{v}_i$ yields

$$\frac{(m_i + \varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i)}{(1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)^{3/2}}\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\mathbf{a}_i = \Big(\frac{1}{2}e_i\sum_{\alpha=k,\,j}\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i}\cdot\mathbf{v}_i\Big) - \varepsilon\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}\Big(\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\nabla_i\mathsf{G}_i + \gamma_i^2\mathbf{v}_i^2\frac{d\mathsf{G}_i}{dt_i}\Big), \tag{22}$$

and substituting (22) into the left-hand side of (19) and using (18) yields

$$\Big(\frac{m_i + \varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i}{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}}\Big)\mathbf{a}_i = \frac{1}{2}e_i\sum_{\alpha=k,\,j}\Big(\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i} + \mathbf{v}_i\times\mathbf{B}_{\alpha i} - (\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i})\mathbf{v}_i\Big) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sum_{\alpha=k,\,j}\mathbf{f}_{\alpha i}\,, \tag{23}$$

where

$$\mathbf{f}_{\alpha i} = \sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}\big(\nabla_i G_i + \frac{\partial G_i}{\partial t_i}\mathbf{v}_i\big) \equiv \frac{b_{\alpha i}\,(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{a}_\alpha)\mathbf{u}_{\alpha i}}{(1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)} + c_{\alpha i}\mathbf{\Omega}^\dagger_{\alpha i}\,, \tag{24}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv (\mathbf{n}_\alpha \pm \mathbf{v}_\beta) \;\text{ for } \alpha\in(k,j),\ \beta\in(\alpha,i), \tag{25}$$

$$\mathbf{\Omega}^\dagger_{\alpha i} \equiv \big(\frac{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}{1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha}\big)\mathbf{n}_\alpha \mp (\mathbf{v}_\alpha + \mathbf{v}_i) \;\text{ for } \alpha\in(k,j), \tag{26}$$

$$b_{\alpha i} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}}\,\Big(\frac{1}{r_{\alpha i}(1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)}\Big)\Big(\frac{dt_\alpha}{dt_i}\Big), \tag{27}$$

$$c_{\alpha i} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}}\,\big(\frac{e_i\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i}}{e_i e_\alpha}\big)\,, \tag{28}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha \equiv \Big(\frac{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}{1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha}\Big)\mathbf{n}_\alpha \pm \mathbf{v}_\alpha. \tag{29}$$

Observations: (i) notice that the second term on the right-hand side of (24) is acceleration-independent, (ii) the dagger in Eqs. (24) and (26) indicates that the sign convention is reversed for the second $\pm$ of formula (26), (iii) on the right-hand side of Eq. (27) we have introduced the derivative of time t_α respect to t_i, as obtained by taking a derivative of the lightcone condition (2), i.e.,

$$\frac{dt_\alpha}{dt_i} = \Big(\frac{dt_i}{dt_\alpha}\Big)^{-1} \equiv \Big(\frac{1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_i}{1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha}\Big), \tag{30}$$

(iv) the positivity of the right-hand side of (30) ensures that all deviating times are monotonically increasing, (v) Eq. (25) is generalized to be used in several places of the manuscript, and the upper sign applies when (α,β) is either (j,j) or (j,i), while the minus sign applies when (α,β) is either (k,k) or (k,i), (vi) in Eqs. (24), (26), (27), (28) and (29), the upper sign applies when $\alpha = j$, while the lower sign applies when $\alpha = k$, (vii) the electric field $\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i}$ appearing in Eq. (28) is defined by Eq. (20), (viii) notice that Eq. (22) also follows from Eq. (23), and henceforth equation (23) is called the **equation of motion of particle i**, as derived from partial Lagrangian (14), in which case the advanced index is $\alpha = j$ and the retarded index is $\alpha = k$. The **equation of motion of particle k** is obtained by replacing i with k in Eq. (23) and restricting the summation to the nearest neighbors of index k on the sewing chain of Fig. 1, i.e., $\alpha \in (s,i)$, in which case the most advanced index is $\alpha = i$, (ix) the future and the past lightcones exchange positions upon time-reversal, and in the next section we show that the time-reversible dynamics defines a flow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ when $\varepsilon \neq 0$, and (x) notice on the right-hand side of (24) that the far-fields of the ε-sector have non-zero components along $\mathbf{n}_j$ *and* along the vector $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha$ defined by (29), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{n}_\alpha \;=\; (1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)\geq 0, \tag{31}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha}\cdot\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha \;=\; (1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)\geq 0\,, \tag{32}$$

where again $\alpha\in(j,k)$, the upper sign applies when $\alpha = j$, and the lower sign applies when $\alpha = k$.

D. Weierstrass-Erdmann extremum conditions

On breaking points, the Weierstrass-Erdmann extremum conditions must be satisfied instead of the Euler-Lagrange equation. These are the continuity of each partial momentum and the continuity of each partial energy **at** the breaking point. The partial momentum derived from the partial Lagrangian (14) is

$$\mathbf{P}_i \equiv \frac{\partial\mathscr{L}_i}{\partial\mathbf{v}_i} \;=\; (m_i+\varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i)\gamma_i\mathbf{v}_i + e_i\mathbf{A}_i\,, \tag{33}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i$ and G_i are defined respectively by (16) and (18) and

$$\gamma_\alpha \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}}, \tag{34}$$

for $\alpha\in(i,k)$. The partial energy of the partial Lagrangian (14) is

$$\mathscr{E}_i \equiv \mathbf{v}_i\cdot\frac{\partial\mathscr{L}_i}{\partial\mathbf{v}_i} - \mathscr{L}_i = (m_i+\varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i)\gamma_i + e_i\mathcal{U}_i\,, \tag{35}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_i$ and G_i are defined respectively by (17) and (18) and again γ_i is defined by (34). At every breaking point there is a velocity defined from the left-hand side and a different velocity defined from the right-hand side, which velocity jumps must compensate in order for (33) and (35) to be continuous at the breaking point.

3. The method of steps

Here we show that the equations of motion (23) can be integrated forward like an ODE when $\varepsilon \neq 0$ and the initial datum belongs to the set of trajectory segments with a full-swing sewing chain in $C^2(\mathbb{R})$, as explained in Fig. 3. The case when $\varepsilon = 0$ is henceforth called pure electrodynamics. The integration uses the most advanced acceleration of each equation of motion as an ODE for the other particle, as illustrated in Fig. 3.




Figure 3: Full swing C^2 initial segment $H_{\rm init}$ for the method of steps (solid red segments), i.e., the time segments $[T_1, T_3]$ and $[T_0, T_2]$ with endpoints in lightcone. The most advanced leg of each equation of motion is used to extend the other particle's trajectory, as follows. *The protonic equation of motion (particle i)* is used with present time running inside the upper red segment, $t_i \in [T_1, T_3]$, in order to extend the electronic trajectory along the most advanced time t_j (thus drawing the lower blue segment). Simultaneously, the *electronic equation of motion* is used with present time running from $t_j = T_2$ and past protonic time running from $t_i = T_1$. The most advanced electronic time runs on the newly created lower blue segment, thus drawing the upper green extension of the protonic trajectory. One step of integration must integrate the electronic equation of motion until the past protonic time is $t_i = T_3$ (not illustrated), thus making the upper green and lower blue segments simultaneously for a full swing of the sewing chain. This is our basic method of steps.

A. Reconstruction of the most advanced acceleration

For $\varepsilon = 0$, the left-hand side of (23) contains the acceleration in a linear form inherited from the far-field component of (20), i.e., $\mathbf{n}_\alpha \times \big((\mathbf{n}_\alpha + \mathbf{v}_\alpha) \times \mathbf{a}_\alpha\big)$, which linear form vanishes along the eigendirection

$$\mathbf{a}_\alpha \propto \mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha} \equiv (\mathbf{n}_\alpha + \mathbf{v}_\alpha), \tag{36}$$

where the last equality is definition (25) for $\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha}$. The acceleration can be reconstructed using a geometric identity, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{a}_\alpha = \frac{\mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{a}_\alpha}{(1+\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)}(\mathbf{n}_\alpha+\mathbf{v}_\alpha) - \frac{\mathbf{n}_\alpha\times\big((\mathbf{n}_\alpha+\mathbf{v}_\alpha)\times\mathbf{a}_\alpha\big)}{(1+\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)}. \tag{37}$$

The last term on the right-hand side of (37) is proportional to the acceleration linear-form contained in the near-field of (20), i.e., the $\frac{1}{r_{ji}}$ component. Because of Eq. (21), the right-hand side of (23) is a function of $\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ only. The existence of the null direction (36) prevents the most advanced acceleration $\mathbf{a}_j$ to be reconstructed from the right-hand side of (23). In other words, the value of E_{ji} does not define the coefficient $\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{a}_j$ of the first term on the right-hand side of (37). This is the reason we had to perturb electrodynamics in the first place. An identity displaying the rank-deficiency is obtained by comparing definition (29) with a re-arranged version of the scalar product of $\mathbf{v}_\alpha$ with formula (20), yielding

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{a}_\alpha &= \hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{a}_\alpha + \frac{\mathbf{v}_\alpha\cdot[\mathbf{n}_\alpha\times(\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha}\times\mathbf{a}_\alpha)]}{(1+\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)}\\ &= \hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{a}_\alpha + \frac{\mathbf{v}_\alpha\cdot[(\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha})\mathbf{E}_{ji} - (\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{E}_{ji})\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha}]}{\zeta_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{u}_{\alpha\alpha})^2},\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where

$$\zeta_{\alpha i} \equiv \frac{e_\alpha}{r_{\alpha i}(1+\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_\alpha)^3}. \tag{39}$$

Notice on the numerator of the second equality of (38) that we have subtracted the near-field from $\mathbf{E}_{ji}$. The reconstruction of $\mathbf{a}_\alpha$ with (37) and (38) requires the linear form $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{a}_\alpha$, as provided by the far-field perturbation (24) **plus** the information contained in the electric field (20).

B. ε-strong interaction cures rank deficiency

The equation of motion (23) can be re-arranged with the most advanced acceleration terms on the left-hand side, i.e.,

$$\digamma^{e\ell}_{ji} + \varepsilon b_{ji}\,\hat{\mathcal{R}}_j\cdot\mathbf{a}_j\left(\frac{\mathbf{u}_{ji}}{\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji}}\right) = \Lambda^{\rm dat}_i, \tag{40}$$

where

$$\digamma^{e\ell}_{\alpha i} \equiv e_i(1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i} \mp e_i(\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i})\mathbf{u}_{\alpha i}\,, \tag{41}$$

$$\Lambda^{\rm dat}_i \equiv 2(m_i+\varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i)\gamma_i\mathbf{a}_i - \digamma^{e\ell}_{ki} - \varepsilon\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i\,, \tag{42}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i \equiv c_{ji}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^\dagger_{ji} + c_{ki}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^\dagger_{ki} + \varepsilon b_{ki}\,\hat{\mathcal{R}}_k\cdot\mathbf{a}_k\Big(\frac{\mathbf{u}_{ki}}{\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ki}}\Big). \tag{43}$$

Observations: (i) $\mathbf{E}_{\alpha i}$ is defined by (20) in Eq. (41), (ii) the term containing the most advanced acceleration $\mathbf{a}_j$ was passed to the left-hand side in (40), and the remaining terms were collected in formula (43) with $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_i$ representing **two times** the remaining non-electromagnetic terms of the right-hand side of (23), (iii) the scalar product of the left-hand side of (40) with the killing-vector

$$\mathbb{k}_{ji} \equiv \Big(\frac{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}{1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i}\Big)\mathbf{n}_j + \mathbf{v}_i\,, \tag{44}$$

vanishes the ε-independent acceleration term of the electromagnetic sector, i.e.,

$$\digamma_0 \equiv \mathbb{k}_{ji}\cdot\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell} = (1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)(e_i\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{E}_{ji}) = \frac{e_ie_j(1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)(1-\mathbf{v}_j^2)}{r_{ji}^2(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)^2}\,. \tag{45}$$

The acceleration-independent reminder (45) is due to the near-field, (iv) in order to reconstruct the acceleration $\mathbf{a}_j$ using (37) and (38) with $\alpha = j$ we need $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_j\cdot\mathbf{a}_j$, which elusive ingredient is recovered from the scalar product of $\mathbb{k}_{ji}$ with (40) **only** at $O(\varepsilon)$, i.e.,

$$\varepsilon b_{ji}\,\hat{\mathcal{R}}_j\cdot\mathbf{a}_j \;\;=\;\; \mathbb{k}_{ji}\cdot\Lambda_i^{\rm dat} - \digamma_0. \tag{46}$$

In Eq. (46) we used that $\mathbb{k}_{ji}\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji} = \mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji}$, a useful identity to keep in mind. Equation (46) at $\varepsilon = 0$ is a constraint on the possible values of $\Lambda_i^{\rm dat}$. Otherwise, when $\varepsilon \neq 0$, the right-hand side of (46) involves $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_j\cdot\mathbf{a}_j$ multiplied by a non-zero coefficient, and $\Lambda_i^{\rm dat}$ is unconstrained. In order to solve for $\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell}$ in terms of past data, we subtract Eq. (46) multiplied by $\mathbf{u}_{ji}/(\mathbb{k}_{ji}\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji})$ from Eq. (40) and re-arrange, yielding

$$\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell} \;\;=\;\; \frac{\digamma_0}{(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)}\mathbf{u}_{ji} - \frac{\mathbb{k}_{ji}\times(\mathbf{u}_{ji}\times\Lambda_i^{\rm dat})}{(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)}\,, \tag{47}$$

where again we have used

$$\mathbb{k}_{ji}\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji} = \mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji} = (1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i). \tag{48}$$

and (v) we can calculate $e_i\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ by taking the scalar product of $\mathbf{v}_i$ with the two lines on the right-hand side of (41). After dividing away the scalar product by the non-zero factor $(1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)$ and substituting the resulting formula for $e_i\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ back into (41) we have a formula for $\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ in terms of $\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell}$, i.e.,

$$e_i(\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{u}_{ji})\mathbf{E}_{ji} \;\;=\;\; \gamma_i^2\Big(\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell} \pm (\mathbf{v}_i\cdot\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell})\mathbf{n}_j + \mathbf{v}_i\times(\mathbf{v}_i\times\digamma_{ji}^{e\ell})\Big). \tag{49}$$

Our next theorem explores the rank-deficiency in another way.

Theorem 3.1. *Electrodynamics is not a semiflow on* $C^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Electrodynamics is defined by (23) with $\varepsilon = 0$. The proof by contradiction assumes that the most advanced acceleration exists and is continuous for a generic full-swing element of $C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Using formula (49) we can calculate $\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ in terms of the most advanced quantities $\mathbf{n}_j$ and $\mathbf{v}_j$, of the velocity $\mathbf{v}_i(t_i)$, and of the data contained in $\Lambda_i^{\rm dat}$. From $\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ one can calculate $\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{a}_j$ by taking a **derivative**, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{a}_j &= \frac{\big(\ell_{jj}^2 - \ell_{jj} \cdot \ell_{ji}\big)}{r_{ji}(1 + \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_i)} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_j)^3 \frac{d}{dt_j}\Big(\frac{1}{(1 + \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_i)^2}\Big) \\ &= \frac{\big(\ell_{jj}^2 - \ell_{jj} \cdot \ell_{ji}\big)}{r_{ji}(1 + \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_i)} - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_j)^3 \frac{d}{dt_j}\Big(\frac{r_{ji}^2 \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}_{ji}}{e_j(1 - \mathbf{v}_j^2)}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where

$$\ell_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \mathbf{n}_\alpha \times \mathbf{v}_\beta, \tag{51}$$

which is a function of $(\mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v}_i)$ and the past data contained in $\Lambda_i^{\rm dat}$ by formula (42). If we have a semiflow on $C^2(\mathbb{R})$, the quantities $\mathbf{a}_j$ and $\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{a}_j$ are continuous, and Eq. (42) must have a continuous derivative in order for the second line on the right-hand side of (50) to be sensible. The former implies that the orbit actually belongs to $C^3(\mathbb{R})$, contradicting the hypothesis that it was a generic element of a dense subset of $C^2(\mathbb{R})$. □

C. Differential-delay equation of motion with two delays of neutral type

Numerical integration of differential-delay equations with two delays is a topic of modern interest, e.g., [14, 15]. In order to prepare a numerical study using, for example, the function **ddensd** of MATLAB, we put together the equation of motion of particle j by reconstructing its acceleration with (38), (46) and (49). Solving the first identity of (38) for $\mathbf{a}_j$ we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r_{ji}}\Big(\frac{dt_j}{dt_i}\Big)\mathbf{a}_j = \frac{1}{r_{ji}}\Big(\frac{dt_j}{dt_i}\Big)(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{a}_j)\Big(\frac{\mathbf{u}_{jj}}{\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj}}\Big) - \frac{1}{e_i e_j}\mathrm{S}_{ji}, \tag{52}$$

where the gyroscopic term S_{ji} is defined by

$$\mathrm{S}_{ji} \equiv e_i(\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj})(\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{ji})\Big(\mathbf{E}_{ji} - \hat{\mathcal{R}}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{E}_{ji}\Big(\frac{\mathbf{u}_{jj}}{\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj}}\Big)\Big), \tag{53}$$

with $\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ expressed in terms of past data by (49). The gyroscopic term can be expressed in terms of past data by defining

$$\mathbb{L}_{\mathbf{E}} \equiv e_i(\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{ji})\mathbf{n}_j \times \mathbf{E}_{ji} = \mathbf{n}_j \times F_{ji}^{e\ell} + \gamma_i^2(\mathbf{v}_i \cdot F_{ji}^{e\ell})\ell_{ji}\,, \tag{54}$$

where ℓ_{ji} defined by (51). Using (54) to express the gyroscopic term (53) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{S}_{ji} &= \Big((\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{ji})\ell_{jj}^2 e_i \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}_{ji} - \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj}\ell_j \cdot \mathbb{L}_{\mathbf{E}}\Big)\mathbf{n}_j - (\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj})\mathbf{n}_j \times \mathbb{L}_{\mathbf{E}} \\ &\quad + \Big(\ell_{jj} \cdot \mathbb{L}_{\mathbf{E}} + (\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{u}_{ji})(\mathbf{n}_{jj} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj} - \ell_{jj}^2)e_i \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}_{ji}\Big)\Big(\frac{\mathbf{n}_j \times \ell_{jj}}{\mathbf{n}_{jj} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{jj}}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where ℓ_{jj} is defined by (51) and $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbf{E}}$ is defined by (54). In order to display (52) in its explicit singular form, we multiply (52) by ε and use (46) to eliminate $\varepsilon\hat{\mathcal{R}}_j\cdot\mathbf{a}_j$, yielding

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{r_{ji}}\Big(\frac{dt_j}{dt_i}\Big)\mathbf{a}_j = \Big(\frac{dt_j}{dt_i}\Big)\Big(\frac{\mathbb{k}_{ji}\cdot\Lambda_i^{\rm dat}-\digamma_0}{b_{ji}r_{ji}}\Big)\Big(\frac{\mathbf{u}_{jj}}{\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{u}_{jj}}\Big) - \frac{\varepsilon}{e_ie_j}\mathrm{S}_{ji}, \tag{56}$$

where $\digamma_0$ is defined by (45). Again, the singularity of Eq. (56) is a consequence of the rank-deficiency of the electromagnetic sector. Observations: (i) the equation of motion for the most advanced protonic acceleration, $\mathbf{a}_\ell$, is obtained from (56) by shifting the indices with the permutation $(kij)\to(ij\ell)$, (ii) the gyroscopic term S_{ji} includes a longitudinal term along the direction $\mathbf{n}_j$ with a coefficient that is a nonlinear function of the transverse quantities (51) and (54), and (iii) the quantity $\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ appearing in (55) is independent of the most advanced acceleration.

Theorem 3.2. *Equation (56) with $\varepsilon\neq 0$ defines a finite most advanced acceleration when the past data involved in Λ_i^{dat} belong to $C^2(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. The proof is the reconstruction of the most advanced acceleration $\mathbf{a}_j$ in $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ starting from Eq. (56) and past data belonging to $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ to yield the most advanced electronic acceleration. An equation of motion for the most advanced protonic acceleration, $\mathbf{a}_\ell$, is obtained from (56) by shifting the indices acording to the permutation $(kij)\to(ij\ell)$. □

NDDE (56) takes arbitrary full-swing past data in $C^2(\mathbb{R})$. The existence of a semiflow like (56) is already an stability statement, because the dynamics can start from continuous non-smooth accelerations. Notice that the right-hand side of (56) is independent of the most advanced accelerations $\mathbf{a}_j$ and $\mathbf{a}_\ell$. Again, the protonic equation of motion for $\mathbf{a}_\ell$ is obtained from (56) by shifting the indices $(kij)\to(ij\ell)$. This completes the method of steps explained in the caption of Fig. 3. NDDE (56) together with its index-shifted protonic equation for $\mathbf{a}_\ell$ can be used to build the function **ddensd** of MATLAB.

D. Unfolding Driver's degeneracy

Here we discuss the unfolding of the one-dimensional electromagnetic problem henceforth called Driver's riddle [16]. Namely, **if** the motion is restricted to a straight-line by the initial condition [16–18], the Euler-Lagrange equations of electrodynamics turn out to be independent of the most advanced acceleration *and* the far-field interaction vanishes. We start from the one-dimensional version of partial-Lagrangian (14), i.e.,

$$\mathsf{L}_i(t_i,\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{v}_i)\equiv m_i(1-\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}\,)-\sum_{\alpha=k,j}\frac{1}{2r_{\alpha i}}\Big(e_ie_\alpha\mathsf{VA}_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{v}_i,\mathbf{v}_\alpha)+\varepsilon\mathsf{VG}_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{v}_i,\mathbf{v}_\alpha)\Big), \tag{57}$$

where $\mathsf{VA}_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_\alpha)$ and $\mathsf{VG}_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_\alpha)$ are given by

$$\mathsf{VA}_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_\alpha) \equiv \frac{(1 - \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha)}{(1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha)}, \tag{58}$$

$$\mathsf{VG}_{\alpha i}(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_\alpha) \equiv \frac{\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}_i^2}\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}}{(1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha)}. \tag{59}$$

A significant simplification is achieved by using hyperbolic velocity-angles ϕ_α for the one-dimensional velocity of each charge, $\mathbf{v}_\alpha \equiv v_\alpha \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v}_\alpha \equiv v_\alpha \hat{\mathbf{x}} \equiv (\tanh \phi_\alpha)\, \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \tag{60}$$

and using (60) to express (34) we have

$$\gamma_\alpha = \cosh(\phi_\alpha). \tag{61}$$

We henceforth assume that particle i stands on the right-hand side with a positive coordinate while particle k stands on the left-hand side with a negative coordinate, i.e., particle trajectories never cross and the position of each particle falls on its respective side along the light-cone direction $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and we have $\mathbf{n}_j = \mathbf{n}_k \equiv \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathbf{n}_i = \mathbf{n}_s = \mathbf{n}_\ell \equiv -\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. The one-dimensional version of G_i as defined by (18) is

$$\mathsf{G}_i = \Big(\frac{e^{\phi_k}}{2r_{ki}} + \frac{e^{-\phi_j}}{2r_{ji}}\Big). \tag{62}$$

In order to describe the details of both the repulsive and the attractive case, we define the relative parameter by

$$\varepsilon_* \equiv -\big(\frac{\varepsilon}{e_e e_p}\big), \tag{63}$$

The Euler-Lagrange equation of (57) writ in a time-symmetric way is

$$\begin{aligned}(m_i + \frac{\varepsilon e^{\phi_k}}{2r_{ki}} + \frac{\varepsilon e^{-\phi_j}}{2r_{ji}})\dot{\phi}_i \;=\; & \big(\frac{\varepsilon e^{\phi_k}}{2r_{ki}}\big)\big(\frac{dt_k}{dt_i}\big)\dot{\phi}_k + \big(\frac{\varepsilon e^{-\phi_j}}{2r_{ji}}\big)\big(\frac{dt_j}{dt_i}\big)\dot{\phi}_j \\ & + \frac{e_i e_k e^{2\phi_k}}{2r_{ki}^2}\Big(\frac{1}{\cosh\phi_i} - \varepsilon_* \cosh\phi_k\big(1 - \tanh\phi_i \tanh\phi_k\big)\Big) \\ & + \frac{e_i e_j e^{-2\phi_j}}{2r_{ji}^2}\Big(\frac{1}{\cosh\phi_i} - \varepsilon_* \cosh\phi_j\big(1 - \tanh\phi_i \tanh\phi_j\big)\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where (dt_α/dt_i) is defined by (30) and, when expressed by velocity angles it becomes

$$\frac{dt_\alpha}{dt_i} = \frac{e^{\mp\phi_\alpha}\cosh\phi_\alpha}{e^{\mp\phi_i}\cosh\phi_i}. \tag{65}$$

Notice in Eq. (64) that the terms proportional to $1/r_{ik}$ and $1/r_{ij}$ are $O(\varepsilon)$, i.e., the far-field interaction is proportional to ε for the one-dimensional motion.

Observations: (i) the dot in $\dot\phi_\alpha \equiv \frac{d\phi_\alpha}{dt_\alpha}$ indicates derivative respect to time t_α, as always in this manuscript, (ii) the equation of motion for the most advanced protonic acceleration $\dot\phi_\ell$ is obtained from (64) by shifting the indices $(kij) \to (ij\ell)$, as always, (iii) when $\varepsilon = 0$, Eq. (64) lacks the most advanced derivative, giving rise to the riddle found in Refs.[16–18]. Moreover, the far-field terms vanish, (iv) Eq. (64) and its protonic counterpart form the simplest NDDE with two delays for the two-body problem in semiflow form, an interesting testbed for numerical calculations, (v) the **inversion layer** is triggered by a mechanism involving the last two lines of (64) when $\varepsilon_* > 0$, as follows; (vi) in the attractive case, when the velocities become large and opposite, the factor $(1 - \tanh\phi_i \tanh\phi_k) \simeq 2$ on the second line of (64) changes the force to repulsive after $\gamma_i\gamma_\alpha > 1/|\varepsilon|$. This might change the velocities from opposite to parallel, a precursor for the sticky collision discussed in §4-B, (vii) vice-versa, in the repulsive case, when the velocities become large and opposite, the factor $(1 - \tanh\phi_i \tanh\phi_k) \simeq 2$ of the second line of (64) changes the force from repulsive to attractive after $\gamma_i\gamma_\alpha > 1/|\varepsilon|$, leading to the eventual collision of equal charges and (viii) because of (60), the subluminal condition places a bound on ϕ_α, i.e., $|\phi_\alpha| < B(r_{ep})$. The former opens the possibility of collisions to act as Lipshitz moderators and keep the delay r_{ep} bounded away from zero by bouncing the trajectories at a finite particle separation, thus keeping the right-hand-side of (64) Lipshitz continuous [19]. Items (vi) and (vii) suggest that a Lipshitz moderating collision should come **before** the inversion layer in the electron-electron case and **after** the inversion layer in the electron-proton case, which should be confirmed by numerical calculations, and last (xix) in order to use Eq. (64) in the method of steps one should solve it for the most advanced derivative, which by use of (65) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon e^{-2\phi_j}\cosh\phi_j}{r_{ji}}\Big)\dot\phi_j \;=\; & \Big(2m_i + \frac{\varepsilon e^{\phi_k}}{r_{ki}} + \frac{\varepsilon e^{-\phi_j}}{r_{ji}}\Big)\cosh\phi_i\;\dot\phi_i \\ & -\Big(\frac{\varepsilon e^{2\phi_k}\cosh\phi_k}{r_{ki}}\Big)\;\dot\phi_k \\ & -\frac{e_ie_je^{-2\phi_j}}{r_{ji}^2}\Big(1-\varepsilon_*\cosh\left(\phi_j-\phi_i\right)\Big) \\ & -\frac{e_ie_ke^{2\phi_k}}{r_{ki}^2}\Big(1-\varepsilon_*\cosh\left(\phi_i-\phi_k\right)\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

which is our simplest version of a neutral differential-delay equation with two state-dependent **delays**. As already mentioned in item (ii), the equation for $\dot\phi_\ell$ is obtained from Eq. (66) by shifting the indices $(kij) \to (ij\ell)$.

E. Domains of initial histories

This section is designed to guide future numerical experiments. The most advanced accelerations, $\mathbf{a}_j$ and $\mathbf{a}_\ell$, given respectively by (52) and its index-shifted

formula are continuous functions that can be integrated by the method of steps of Fig. 3. For straight-line obits the equations of motion reduce to Eqs. (66) and its index-shifted formula. Integration must start from sufficiently long orbital segments that include **two** flights of the sewing chain, as illustrated in Fig. 3 and henceforth called **full-swing histories**. Moreover, in order to have a unique extension, we need a subset of $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ where the accelerations are Lipshitz continuous. An obvious non-empty initial-history set to start from when $\varepsilon = 0$ is the set of full-swing segments of circular orbits[22, 20], because the circular orbits are globally defined. For $\varepsilon \neq 0$, circular orbits still exist because time-reversal exchanges $\mathbf{v}$ by $-\mathbf{v}$ in Eq. (23). Reference [5] mentions the small-ε circular orbits, which should be unstable like the $\varepsilon = 0$ orbits [20]. IF $\varepsilon \neq 0$ the method of steps of Fig. 3 acts as a **semiflow** on the set of full-swing segments of ε-circular orbits: for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and for every full-swing element $\phi_{FS} \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $t_p \in [T_1, T_3]$ and $t_e \in [T_0, T_2]$, the method of steps takes ϕ_{FS} to (another) full-swing element, i.e., $\psi_\tau : (\tau, \phi) \to C^2(\mathbb{R})$. The function ψ_τ has the semigroup property that $\psi_0 = I$ and $\psi_{\tau_1} \circ \psi_{\tau_2} = \psi_{\tau_1+\tau_2}$. In the following we attempt to construct larger initial-history sets where the method of steps would work.

Inspecting Eq. (52) we find that $\mathbf{a}_j$ is bounded if $r_{ji}\,\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}_{ji}$ is bounded. Analogously, using the index-shifted (52) we find that $\mathbf{a}_\ell$ is bounded whenever $r_{\ell j}\,\mathbf{n}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\ell j}$ is bounded. Inside the Peano domain (12) our Eq. (52) is transformed into an ODE with a bounded right-hand side. Using Lemma 2.1 and Eq. (52) we also find that whenever the orbit belongs to the Peano domain (12), one can define a new independent variable $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for the $\mathbf{a}_j$ equation of motion and a new independent variable $\xi_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ for the $\mathbf{a}_\ell$ equation, i.e.,

$$\xi_\ell \equiv \int \frac{dt_\ell}{r_{\ell j}(1-\mathbf{v}_\ell^2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_j \equiv \int \frac{dt_j}{r_{ji}(1-\mathbf{v}_i^2)}, \tag{67}$$

If the minimizer orbit belongs to (12) we can integrate the method of steps until the time of a full-swing. Notice that (52) with $\varepsilon \neq 0$ is an accomplishment in itself above the Coulomb problem, since integration of (52) is simpler than the gravitational problem, as follows: (i) the singularity in the $\varepsilon \neq 0$ case is proportional to $1/r_{ji}$ (versus $1/r_{ji}^2$ for the gravitational problem), and (ii) a change of the integration variable like (67) would not work for the gravitational problem. In fact, a similar coordinate transformation is just a first step of the Levi-Civita regularization[24].

A Lipshitz set of history segments must avoid a physical collision **and** prevent superluminal orbits. As discussed above Eq. (66), there is hope that the inversion boundary layer is sufficient to avoid collisions when extending most segments with Eq. (66). Otherwise, a way to extend arbitrary full-swing segments is to introduce collisions-at-a-distance as perturbations designed to avoid both the physical collision[19] and the speed of light by enforcing

$$0 < \delta_1 < \min\Big(r_{ji}(1-\mathbf{v}_j^2), r_{\ell j}(1-\mathbf{v}_\ell^2)\Big). \tag{68}$$

In view of Lemma 2.1, even the general equation of motion (52) has finite denominators $r_{ji}\,\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{E}_{ji}$ and $r_{\ell i}\,\mathbf{n}_\ell\cdot\mathbf{E}_{\ell i}$ if the orbit satisfies (68). As the integration marches forward, whenever the orbit violates (68), one can halt the integration and modify the history by introducing a breaking point with a convenient velocity-discontinuity designed to enforce (68). Integration must be re-calculated with the last two flights of the modified history, while earlier history should either be discarded or used in a perturbation theory analogous to the one described in [26]. The best type of collision to use in a perturbation theory is the mutual-recoil collision at a distance, as given by the outer-cone Lemma 7.1 of subsection 7-B of the appendix.

4. Forward continuation of velocity discontinuities

A. A priori continuation based on the continuity of the partial momenta

For initial data belonging to $\hat{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$, the integration must proceed piecewise. As outlined in §2-D and explained in the caption of Fig. 3, one must halt the forward integration at each breaking point in order to satisfy the **four** continuity conditions, i.e., (33) and (35). We start by showing that only the continuity of the vector part, Eq. (33), is sufficient to propagate the velocity discontinuity of each particle. Notice that (33) involves **three** velocity vectors, i.e., $\mathbf{v}_i$, $\mathbf{v}_k$ and $\mathbf{v}_j$, which allows one to consider $\mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_k$ as independent variables and solve (33) for the most advanced velocity $\mathbf{v}_j$. The former inversion can be performed only inside proper domains, as we explain in the next three Lemmas.

The continuous partial momentum (33) splits in a term containing the most advanced velocity $\mathbf{v}_j$ and a local part containing only $\mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_k$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}_i \equiv m_i\gamma_i\mathbf{v}_i - a_{ki}(\mathbf{v}_k,\mathbf{v}_i) - a_{ji}(\mathbf{v}_j,\mathbf{v}_i), \tag{69}$$

where

$$a_{ji}(\mathbf{v}_j) \equiv \frac{-1}{2r_{ji}(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}(e_ie_j\mathbf{v}_j + \varepsilon\gamma_i\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_j^2}\ \mathbf{v}_i)\,, \tag{70}$$

$$a_{ki}(\mathbf{v}_k) \equiv \frac{-1}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)}(e_ie_k\mathbf{v}_k + \varepsilon\gamma_i\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_k^2}\ \mathbf{v}_i)\,. \tag{71}$$

At the breaking point for $\mathbf{v}_i$ the discontinuity of the future velocity $\mathbf{v}_j$ makes the quantity

$$a_{ji} \equiv \Big(m_i\gamma_i\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{P}_i\Big) - a_{ki}, \tag{72}$$

to be discontinuous in order to compensate for both the discontinuity of $\mathbf{v}_k$ on the past lightcone and for the discontinuity of $\mathbf{v}_i$ itself. Equation (72) defines a_{ji} as a function of a_{ki} on both sides of the breaking point. In the following we invert definitions (71) or (70) in order to express either $\mathbf{v}_j$ or $\mathbf{v}_k$ as a function

of $a_{\alpha i}$, ε, the present velocity, and either the future or the past velocity, e.g., $\mathbf{v}_j = \vec{\rho}\,(a_{ji}, \varepsilon, \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_k)$. The generalized expression for $\mathbf{v}_\alpha$ is used in many places of the manuscript, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v}_\alpha = \vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i}) + \varepsilon_* \gamma_i \sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}\; \vec{q}\,(a_{\alpha i}, \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{v}_i), \tag{73}$$

where ε_* is defined by (63), the functions $\vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i}, \mathbf{n}_\alpha, r_{\alpha i})\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\vec{q}\,(a_{\alpha i}, \mathbf{n}_\alpha, \mathbf{v}_i)\colon \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ are defined by

$$\vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i}, \mathbf{n}_\alpha, r_{\alpha i}) \equiv \frac{2 r_{\alpha i} a_{\alpha i}}{(-e_i e_\alpha \mp 2 r_{\alpha i} \mathbf{n}_j \cdot a_{\alpha i})} = \frac{a_{\alpha i}}{(\frac{-e_i e_\alpha}{2 r_{\alpha i}} \mp \mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot a_{\alpha i})}, \tag{74}$$

$$\vec{q}\,(a_{\alpha i}, \mathbf{n}_\alpha, \mathbf{v}_i) \equiv \mathbf{v}_i \pm (\mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_i)\, \vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i}), \tag{75}$$

and γ_i is defined by (34). Observations: (i) for economy of notation, we henceforth abbreviate the list of arguments of (74) and (75), keeping only the first argument, e.g., $\vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i})$, (ii) the plus sign in every definition below (74) holds when $\alpha = j$, while the minus sign holds when $\alpha = k$, (iii) because the functional (8) is time-reversible, (73) is equivariant under a time-reversal operation on the indices if every $\pm$ sign is exchanged, e.g, $(kij) \to (iks)$. Eq. (73) is also invariant in form under a forward shift of indices, $(kij) \to (ijl)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Equation (73) with $\varepsilon_* = 0$ defines a **unique** electronic velocity $\mathbf{v}_\alpha$ for each $a_{ji} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ inside a paraboloid of revolution domain of $\mathbb{R}^3$.*

Proof. Squaring (73) with $\varepsilon_* = 0$ for a subluminal orbit we have

$$1 - \mathbf{v}_\alpha^2 = 1 - ||\vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i})||^2 \geq 0. \tag{76}$$

We choose an orthogonal system with the $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ axis along the $\mathbf{n}_\alpha$ direction to evaluate the inequality on the right-hand side (76), finding that $a_y \equiv \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot a_{\alpha i}$ is defined from the subluminal condition $||\rho_a(a_{\alpha i})||^2 < 1$ as

$$a_y \leq \frac{1}{4 r_{ij}} - r_{\alpha i}(a_x^2 + a_z^2)\,. \tag{77}$$

Condition (77) defines the interior of a paraboloid of revolution for $a_{\alpha i} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. □

Squaring (73) when $\varepsilon_* \in \mathbb{R}$ yields a quadratic equation for $\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}$, namely

$$(1 - \mathbf{v}_\alpha^2) + 2\mathsf{B}\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_\alpha^2} - \mathsf{C} = 0\,, \tag{78}$$

where

$$\mathsf{B}(a_{ji}) \equiv \frac{\varepsilon_* \gamma_i\, \vec{q}\,(a_{\alpha i}) \cdot \vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i})}{(1 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 ||\,\vec{q}\,(a_{\alpha i})\,||^2)}\,, \tag{79}$$

$$\mathsf{C}(a_{ji}) \equiv \frac{1 - ||\vec{\rho}\,(a_{\alpha i})||^2}{(1 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 ||\,\vec{q}\,(a_{\alpha i})\,||^2)}\,. \tag{80}$$

The roots of (78) behave as follows: (i) the minus root $(1-\mathbf{v}_j^2) = -\mathsf{B} - \sqrt{\mathsf{B}^2+\mathsf{C}}$ never belongs to $[0,1)$ and (ii) whenever $\mathsf{B} > 0$ and $0 < \mathsf{C} < 1$, the unique root inside $[0,1)$ is the plus root $(1-\mathbf{v}_j^2) = -\mathsf{B} + \sqrt{\mathsf{B}^2+\mathsf{C}}$ with $a_{ji} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is inside the paraboloid of Lemma 4.1. The domain where the unique (physical) root $(1-\mathbf{v}_j^2) = -\mathsf{B} + \sqrt{\mathsf{B}^2+\mathsf{C}}$ belongs to $[0,1)$ extends beyond the paraboloid of Lemma 4.1 when $\varepsilon_* \neq 0$ and $-\mathsf{B}^2 < \mathsf{C} \leq 0$, as follows:

Lemma 4.2. *Equation (73) with $\varepsilon_* \neq 0$ defines a **unique** electronic velocity $\mathbf{v}_\alpha$ for each $a_{\alpha i} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ belonging to the interior of an asymmetric paraboloid domain.*

Proof. As mentioned in item (i) below Eq. (80), the minus root in impossible and the unique root is given by Bhaskara's formula with the **plus** sign. Item (ii) below Eq. (80) is a condition for the plus root to be in $[0,1)$ is $0 < -\mathsf{B} + \sqrt{\mathsf{B}^2+\mathsf{C}} < 1$. The upper bound yields the trivial identity $0 < ||\vec{\rho} + \varepsilon_* \gamma_i \vec{q}||^2$ by use of (79) and (80), while the lower bound yields

$$\rho^2 < 1 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 q^2 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 \Big((\vec{q} \cdot \vec{\rho})^2 - \rho^2 q^2 \Big), \tag{81}$$

thus extending condition (76) of Lemma 4.1. Using (75) to re-arrange (81) yields

$$\rho^2 < 1 + \frac{\varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 (\mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + \vec{\rho} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i)^2}{1 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 ||\ell_{\alpha i}||^2}, \tag{82}$$

where $\ell_{\alpha i}$ is defined by Eq. (51). Without loss of generality we take the velocity vector $\mathbf{v}_i$ in a plane xy with the $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ axis defined along the $\mathbf{n}_j$ direction, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v}_i \equiv ||\mathbf{v}_i|| (\cos(\phi_i)\, \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sin(\phi_i)\, \hat{\mathbf{y}}). \tag{83}$$

Substituting (74) and (83) into (82) yields

$$a_y \leq \Big(\frac{1 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 \mathbf{v}_i^2}{4 r_{ij}} \Big) - r_{ij} a_z^2 - r_{ij} \frac{\Big(a_x - \frac{\varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 \mathbf{v}_i^2 \cos\phi_i \sin\phi_i}{2 r_{ij}} \Big)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon_*^2 \gamma_i^2 \mathbf{v}_i^2 \cos^2\phi_i)}, \tag{84}$$

which is the interior of an asymmetric paraboloid in the space $a_{\alpha i} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Notice that (84) reduces to (77) in the case of Lemma 4.1, i.e., when $\varepsilon_* = 0$. □

The protonic velocity at point ℓ in the sewing-chain of Fig. 1 is obtained from (84) by shifting the indices by one position forward along the sewing chain (o, s, k, i, j, ℓ), as illustrated in Fig. 2. Condition (84) and the analogous condition for the protonic velocity yield an a priori (tentative) forward continuation of the sewing chain, before even testing **if** the Weierstrass-Erdmann partial energy (35) is continuous for either particle. Equation (73) of Lemma 4.2 defines the most advanced velocity of either particle, i.e., $\alpha = (j, \ell)$, and in the following we use the function $\theta_{\alpha i} : \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ defined from the most advanced velocity by

$$\theta_{\alpha i} \equiv \frac{\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}_\alpha^2}}{1 \pm \mathbf{n}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{v}_\alpha}, \tag{85}$$

which quantity can be expressed in terms of $\mathbf{v}_i$ by the **outsider** Lemma explained next.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\alpha \in (j,k)$ be the past and the future neighbor of index i on a sewing chain. We have*

$$\frac{\varepsilon\gamma_i\theta_{\alpha i}}{2r_{\alpha i}} = \frac{\varepsilon_*^2\gamma_i^2}{(1+\varepsilon_*^2\gamma_i^2||\ell_{\alpha i}||^2)}\Big(\pm\frac{e_\alpha e_i \mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\mathbf{v}_i}{2r_{\alpha i}} - \ell_{\alpha i}\cdot(\mathbf{n}_\alpha\times a_{\alpha i})\Big), \tag{86}$$

where $\theta_{\alpha i}$ is defined by (85), $\ell_{\alpha i}$ is defined by (51), ε_* is defined by (63), the plus sign goes with the future index $\alpha = j$, the minus sign goes with the past index $\alpha = k$ and $a_{\alpha i}$ is expressed in terms of $\mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_k$ either by Eq.(72) when $\alpha = j$ or by its time-reversed version when $\alpha = k$.

Proof. Substituting formula (73) for the unique velocity of Lemma (4.1) into definition (85) we obtain

$$\theta_{\alpha i} = \frac{-\varepsilon_*\gamma_i}{(1+\varepsilon_*^2\gamma_i^2||\ell_{\alpha i}||^2)}\frac{\mathbf{v}_i\cdot(\vec{\rho}\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha)}{(1\pm\mathbf{n}_\alpha\cdot\vec{\rho})}, \tag{87}$$

expressed in terms of the vector function $\vec{\rho}$. Using the last term of Eq.(74) to eliminate ρ in terms of $a_{\alpha i}$ brings out formula (86). □

Observations: (i) Notice that the elimination of a nearest neighbor leaves a second order reminder, as seen by the ε_*^2 in formula (86).

B. Boundary layer of small denominators

As explained in §4-A, Lemma 4.2 is the result of using (33) to continue the sewing chain. The former *tentative* sewing chain still has to satisfy one last Weierstrass-Erdmann condition for each particle, i.e., the energetic constraints (35). In order to enforce (35) we split formula (17) into a continuous part plus a jumping part, i.e.,

$$e_i\mathcal{U}_i \;=\; \Big(\frac{e_ie_k}{2r_{ki}}+\frac{e_ie_j}{2r_{ji}}\Big)+\Big(\frac{e_ie_k\,\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)}-\frac{e_ie_j\,\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j}{2r_{ji}(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}\Big), \tag{88}$$

which is to be compared to the scalar product $\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{P}_i$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{P}_i = \Big(\frac{m_i+\varepsilon\mathsf{G}_i}{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}}\Big)\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i+\Big(\frac{e_ie_k\,\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_k}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}+\frac{e_ie_j\,\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j}{2r_{ji}(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_j)}\Big). \tag{89}$$

Adding (88) to (89), using (33) and (35), and defining the **continuous** function

$$\bar{u}_i \equiv \Big(\frac{e_ie_k}{2r_{ki}}+\frac{e_ie_j}{2r_{ji}}\Big), \tag{90}$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}_i \equiv \mathscr{E}_i + \mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{P}_i - \bar{u}_i \;=\; &\Big(\frac{1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i}{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_i^2}}\Big)m_i+\frac{e_ie_k(\mathbf{n}_j+\mathbf{n}_k)\cdot\mathbf{v}_k}{2r_{ki}(1-\mathbf{n}_k\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)}\\ &+\frac{\varepsilon\gamma_i(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)\theta_{ki}}{2r_{ki}}+\frac{\varepsilon\gamma_i(1+\mathbf{n}_j\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)\theta_{ji}}{2r_{ji}}.\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

The corresponding energetic condition for particle k is obtained analogously, yielding

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}_k \equiv \mathscr{E}_k + \mathbf{n}_s \cdot \mathbf{P}_k - \bar{u}_k \quad &= \quad \Big(\frac{1-\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\mathbf{v}_k}{\sqrt{1-\mathbf{v}_k^2}}\Big)m_k - \frac{e_i e_k(\mathbf{n}_s+\mathbf{n}_i)\cdot\mathbf{v}_i}{2r_{ki}(1+\mathbf{n}_i\cdot\mathbf{v}_i)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma_k(1-\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)\theta_{ik}}{2r_{ik}} + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma_k(1-\mathbf{n}_s\cdot\mathbf{v}_k)\theta_{sk}}{2r_{ks}}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

Observations: (i) the left-hand sides of (91) and (92) are continuous at the breaking point as a sum of three continuous functions, (ii) If $\varepsilon = 0$, Eqs. (91) and (92) are an overdetermination imposed on the velocity pair $(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_k)$, which define the boundary layer of the purely electromagnetic collision, (iii) otherwise, when $\varepsilon \neq 0$, Eqs. (91) and (92) include **two** inequivalent ε-dependent terms; the first term on the second line of the right-hand sides of either (91) or (92) is a coupling internal to the $(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_k)$ pair, while the last term of either line introduces couplings to either $\mathbf{v}_s$ or $\mathbf{v}_j$ nearest-neighbor velocities, and need to be eliminated using the outsider Lemma 4.3, thus yielding a **second order** perturbation when expressed back in terms of the $(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_k)$ pair.

5. Straight line collisions-at-a-distance

In the neighborhood of the breaking point the velocities in (91) and (92) must be sufficiently large to allow a velocity discontinuity. The simplest descent to the breaking point is a collision-at-a-distance along a motion constrained to a straight line by the initial condition, henceforth straight-line or colinear collision-at-a-distance. Here we study only colinear collisions-at-a-distance of two point charges. The velocity-angles evaluated right before the breaking point are the natural parameters of the collision, and the one-parameter Lorentz group splits the two-parameter set into boost classes, as discussed in Appendix 1. For use in the numerical perturbation theory proposed next, an important outcome of the collision is if the velocity of relative approximation changes sign or not. We classify two types of collision; (i) **mutual recoil**, when both initially opposite velocities change sign upon collision, and thus the velocity of relative approximation changes sign, and (ii) **sticky collision**, when both initial velocities were pointed to the same direction and *after* the collision **both** velocities flip sign, in which case the relative approximation might either change sign or not. We henceforth assume the setup defined below (60) and represent each velocity by its scalar component along $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, i.e., $\mathbf{v}_\alpha = v_\alpha\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. The velocity of relative approximation in lightcone is

$$\frac{dr_{ki}}{dt_i} = \frac{d(t_i - t_k)}{dt_i} = 1 - \frac{dt_k}{dt_i} = \frac{v_i - v_k}{1 - v_k}, \tag{93}$$

where we have used (30). Using the details below (60) to evaluate Eqs. (91) and (92) in a neighborhood of a one-dimensional collision-at-a-distance we have

$$\mathbb{C}_i \equiv \mathscr{E}_i + \mathbf{n}_j \cdot \mathbf{P}_i - \bar{u}_i \;=\; \Big(\frac{1+v_i}{\sqrt{1-v_i^2}}\Big)m_i + \frac{e_i e_k v_k(1+v_k)}{2r_{ki}(1-v_k^2)} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2r_{ki}}\Big(\frac{1+v_i}{\sqrt{1-v_i^2}}\Big)\Big(\frac{1+v_k}{\sqrt{1-v_k^2}}\Big) + \frac{e_i e_k \varepsilon_*^2(1+v_i)v_i}{2r_{ji}(1-v_i^2)}\,, \tag{94}$$

where the last $O(\varepsilon^2)$ term was evaluated using Lemma 4.3. In order to express the formulas with an economy of parameters, we henceforth define scaled masses by

$$M_\alpha \equiv r_{ki} m_\alpha; \quad \alpha \in (i,k). \tag{95}$$

Substituting the hyperbolic velocity-angles (60) into (94) and the analogous version of (92), and disregarding the $O(\varepsilon^2)$ term yields

$$\lambda_i(\phi_i,\phi_k) \;\equiv\; r_{ki}\mathbb{C}_i + \frac{e_i e_k}{2} = M_i e^{\phi_i} + \frac{e_i e_k e^{2\phi_k}}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon e^{\phi_i} e^{\phi_k}}{2}. \tag{96}$$

$$\lambda_k(\phi_i,\phi_k) \;\equiv\; r_{ki}\mathbb{C}_k + \frac{e_i e_k}{2} = M_k e^{\phi_k} + \frac{e_i e_k e^{2\phi_i}}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon e^{\phi_i} e^{\phi_k}}{2}, \tag{97}$$

a great simplification that preserves the continuity of the left-hand sides of (94) and its electronic counterpart. Elimination of e^{ϕ_i} from (96) and substitution into (97) yields an algebraic equation of the fourth degree with coefficients depending on the constants $(M_i, M_k, \lambda_i, \lambda_k, e_i e_k, \varepsilon)$. In order to *create* a new discontinuity, the quartic polynomial must have at least **two** positive roots $e^{\phi_k} \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The collisions are not all equivalent by the Lorentz group, and in the following we analyze the most interesting ones. Some surprises are discovered with (96) and (97). In a nutshell, pure electrodynamics ($\varepsilon = 0$) can have mutual recoils only for the electron-electron case. On the other hand, for the attractive case only sticky collisions are possible, which distinguishes the purely electromagnetic electron-electron problem from the purely electromagnetic electron-proton problem.

Lemma 5.1. *The* ***collision*** $(\phi_i,\phi_k) \to (-\phi_i,-\phi_k)$ *when* $\varepsilon = 0$ *is a* ***mutual recoil*** *for* $e_i e_k = 1$ *(e.g., the electron-electron collision) and a* ***sticky collision*** *for* $e_i e_k = -1$ *(e.g., the electron-proton collision).*

Proof. Because the left-hand side of (96) is continuous, at the breaking point along trajectory i in a symmetric collision we have $\lambda_i(\phi_i,\phi_k) - \lambda_i(-\phi_i,-\phi_k) = 0$, yielding

$$M_i \sinh(\phi_i) \;=\; -\frac{e_i e_k}{2}\sinh(2\phi_k) = -e_i e_k \gamma_k \sinh\phi_k, \tag{98}$$

where we have used (61). Analogously, for the breaking point along trajectory k in a symmetric collision we have $\lambda_k(\phi_i,\phi_k) - \lambda_k(-\phi_i,-\phi_k) = 0$, yielding

$$M_k \sinh(\phi_k) \;=\; -\frac{e_i e_k}{2}\sinh(2\phi_i) = -e_i e_k \gamma_i \sinh\phi_i, \tag{99}$$

where $\gamma_i = \cosh(\phi_i) > 0$, showing that ϕ_i and ϕ_k must have the same sign before the collision when $e_i e_k = -1$, and we have a sticky collision. Otherwise, when $e_i e_k = 1$, Eq. (98) defines a mutual recoil where the $\phi' s$ have opposite sign. Equations (98) and (99) are linear equations relating $\sinh(\phi_k)$ and $\sinh(\phi_i)$, and the vanishing of the 2×2 determinant can be expressed as

$$\gamma_i / M_i = M_k / \gamma_k. \tag{100}$$

Squaring either (98) or (99), multiplying both sides by (100), and using $\sinh^2(\phi_\alpha) = \cosh^2(\phi_\alpha) - 1 = \gamma_\alpha^2 - 1$, yields

$$M_i \gamma_i (\gamma_i^2 - 1) = M_k \gamma_k (\gamma_k^2 - 1) \equiv 2 M_i M_k J, \tag{101}$$

where in the last term we have introduced the positive quantity J to parametrize both cubics. Any solution of (101) yields a solution to (98) and (99), which can easily be found with Cardano's formula. The two cubics of (101) have a single positive real root for any $J > 0$, and for sufficiently large J the solution can be approximated by

$$\gamma_i \approx M_k^{1/3} (2J)^{1/3}, \tag{102}$$

$$\gamma_k \approx M_i^{1/3} (2J)^{1/3}. \tag{103}$$

Eliminating J from (102) and (103) yields the large-J boundary layer condition

$$\gamma_k = \hbar \, \gamma_i, \tag{104}$$

where

$$\hbar \equiv (\frac{m_i}{m_k})^{1/3}. \tag{105}$$

Condition (104) holds when $J \gg \frac{\hbar^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{3}}$. □

Our next Lemma concerns symmetric collisions when $\varepsilon \neq 0$.

Lemma 5.2. *The symmetric collision $(\phi_i, \phi_k) \to (-\phi_i, -\phi_k)$ is a **sticky collision** when $e_i e_k = -1$ and $|\varepsilon| < 2$ (e.g., the electron-proton collision).*

Proof. We are going to keep ε and ε_* in the following despite that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_*$ when $e_i e_k = -1$, in order to refer to the formulas from outside of this lemma. Again we start from the continuity of the left-hand side of (96) at the breaking point, i.e., $\lambda_i(\phi_i, \phi_k) - \lambda_i(-\phi_i, -\phi_k) = 0$, which yields

$$\big(M_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\gamma_k\big) \sinh(\phi_i) \quad = \quad -e_i e_k \big(\gamma_k - \frac{\varepsilon_*}{2}\gamma_i\big) \sinh \phi_k, \tag{106}$$

where again we have used (61). Analogously, for the breaking point along trajectory k we have $\lambda_k(\phi_i, \phi_k) - \lambda_k(-\phi_i, -\phi_k) = 0$, yielding

$$\big(M_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\gamma_i\big) \sinh(\phi_k) \quad = \quad -e_i e_k \big(\gamma_i - \frac{\varepsilon_*}{2}\gamma_k\big) \sinh \phi_i, \tag{107}$$

where $\gamma_\alpha = \cosh(\phi_\alpha) > 0$. Equations (106) and (107) are linear equations relating $\sinh(\phi_k)$ and $\sinh(\phi_i)$, and the vanishing of the 2×2 determinant can be expressed either as

$$\frac{\left(\gamma_i - \frac{\varepsilon_*}{2}\gamma_k\right)}{\left(M_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\gamma_k\right)} = \frac{\left(M_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\gamma_i\right)}{\left(\gamma_k - \frac{\varepsilon_*}{2}\gamma_i\right)}, \tag{108}$$

or

$$\gamma_i\gamma_k = M_iM_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(M_i\gamma_i + M_k\gamma_k) + \frac{\varepsilon_*}{2}(\gamma_i^2 + \gamma_k^2). \tag{109}$$

Equation (108) reduces to (100) when $\varepsilon = 0$. For $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_* < 0$, Eq. (109) requires

$$M_iM_k > \gamma_i\gamma_k. \tag{110}$$

Equations (106) and (107) with $e_ie_k = -1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ predict a recoil when

$$\gamma_i > \frac{2\gamma_k}{\varepsilon} > \frac{4\gamma_i}{\varepsilon^2}, \tag{111}$$

which requires $\varepsilon > 2$. On the other hand, when $\varepsilon < 0$, Eqs. (106) and (107) predict a recoil for the case $e_ie_k = -1$ when

$$\gamma_i > \frac{2M_k}{|\varepsilon|}; \quad \gamma_k > \frac{2M_i}{|\varepsilon|}, \tag{112}$$

contradicting (110) unless $\varepsilon < -2$. Therefore the collision must be sticky if $|\varepsilon| < 2$. □

Squaring either Eq. (106) or Eq. (107), and multiplying both sides by (108) yields

$$\Big(\gamma_\alpha + \frac{\varepsilon}{4M_\alpha}(\varepsilon_*\gamma_\alpha^2 + \varepsilon M_i\gamma_i + \varepsilon M_k\gamma_k) + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon M_k - \varepsilon_*\gamma_k)\Big)(\gamma_\alpha^2 - 1) \equiv 2J\hbar^{\mp 3/2}, \tag{113}$$

where the plus sign is for $\alpha = k$ and the minus sign is for $\alpha = i$. Equation (113) is a quartic polynomial generalizing the cubic polynomial (101) for $\varepsilon \neq 0$, which introduces a singular root as discussed below. There is nothing wrong with a sticky collision-at-a-distance. In the electron-proton case ($e_ie_k = -1$) the boundary layer for sticky collisions starts after the inversion layer of electron-proton approximation, as explained in observations (vi) and (vii) below Eq. (65). On the other hand, the electron-electron collision-at-a-distance continues to be a **mutual recoil** for small ε, as follows.

Lemma 5.3. *The* ***symmetric collision*** $(\phi_i, \phi_k) \to (-\phi_i, -\phi_k)$ *must be a* ***mutual recoil*** *if* $e_ie_k = 1$ *and* $|\varepsilon| < \min(\hbar^3, \frac{1}{\hbar^3})$.

Proof. Assuming $e_ke_i = 1$ and $\varepsilon_* = -\varepsilon$, there are two cases:

1. In the case $\varepsilon > 0$, Eq. (106) accepts only mutual recoils.

2. In the case $\varepsilon < 0$, we can re-arrange Eq. (106) as

$$\frac{\sinh(\phi_i)}{\sinh(\phi_k)} = -\frac{2}{|\varepsilon|}\Big(\frac{\gamma_k - \frac{|\varepsilon|}{2}\gamma_i}{\gamma_k - \frac{2M_i}{|\varepsilon|}}\Big). \tag{114}$$

The positivity of (114) and of the respective re-arranged version of (107) requires both

$$\min\big(\frac{2M_i}{|\varepsilon|}, \frac{|\varepsilon|\gamma_i}{2}\big) < \gamma_k < \max\big(\frac{2M_i}{|\varepsilon|}, \frac{|\varepsilon|\gamma_i}{2}\big), \tag{115}$$

$$\min\big(\frac{2M_k}{|\varepsilon|}, \frac{|\varepsilon|\gamma_k}{2}\big) < \gamma_i < \max\big(\frac{2M_k}{|\varepsilon|}, \frac{|\varepsilon|\gamma_k}{2}\big). \tag{116}$$

The two alternatives are; (i) $\gamma_k > \frac{|\varepsilon|\gamma_i}{2}$ and $|\varepsilon| < 2\hbar^3$ with $\hbar$ defined by (105) or (ii) $\gamma_i > \frac{|\varepsilon|\gamma_k}{2}$ and $|\varepsilon| < 2\hbar^{-3}$, with $\hbar$ defined again by (105). Therefore, we have a mutual recoil until $|\varepsilon| < \min(\hbar^3, \frac{1}{\hbar^3})$.

□

The velocity transformations of §7-A define a unique breaking-point-frame where the velocity of one specific particle reflects upon collision. However, one can not simultaneously control the jump of the second particle's velocity. For that reason, there are several inequivalent classes of collisions to be studied, and the multiple outcomes are reminiscent of particle physics. However, we shall not develop here the study of all possible collisions-at-a-distance.

6. Discussions and conclusion

1. For motion with initial condition constrained to a straight line, the far-fields are $O(\varepsilon)$, as found inspecting Eq. (66) with $\varepsilon = 0$. On the other hand, the nonzero angular momentum case of Eq. (52) has an $O(1)$ gyroscopic term (53) that is **nonlinear** and includes resonances. Resonances were used in the Chemical Principle criterion [3] and in several prior estimates, see Refs. [1, 25]. According to Eq. (55), the gyroscopic term is nonlinear, transversal, and vanishes when the angular momenta vanish.
2. The cubic root of the mass ratio appeared in Ref. [21] and Eq. (105). Both are applications of the Weierstrass-Erdmann conditions; Ref. [21] used variational electrodynamics in a rough estimate of magnitudes for double-slit diffraction, see Eqs. (21) and (22) of [21], while in Eq. (105) the cubic root appeared in the boundary layer condition. Our ε-strong electrodynamics has only two parameters; (m_p/m_e) and ε, a far simpler theory than the standard model. Equations (104) and (105) predict a rough collisional boundary layer at $\left(\frac{1-\mathbf{v}_p^2}{1-\mathbf{v}_e^2}\right) = \left(\frac{m_p}{m_e}\right)^{2/3} \simeq 149.947$.

3. It would be useful to repeat our studies using the full action with **three** parameters given in Ref. [5] in order to try and simplify particle physics. Collisions with non-zero angular momentum should be studied as well.
4. By inspecting Eq. (64), we find that the inversion layer exists only for positive ε_*, which means a positive ε for the attractive case and a negative ε for the repulsive case. The former is due to the simple way functional (8) was defined here. As suggested in Ref. [5], one can change the definition of (8) by re-defining the original functional (8) to include an ε-strong charge q_α for each particle chosen such that $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_*} \equiv -\frac{q_i q_j}{e_i e_j} = 1$ in the re-defined version of (8). The former has ε with the same sign for both the attractive and the repulsive cases when $\varepsilon_* > 0$. Moreover, when $\varepsilon < 0$ the left-hand side of (64) might acquire a nonzero linear coefficient and become stiff, thus limiting the numerical use of (66). Our setup can generate several models to be studied numerically, e.g., a model for the exclusion principle, the Cooper pairs, and collisions seen in bubble chambers and particle accelerators. The subtle differences between cases should be studied numerically and then compared with physics. Some may differ from the standard model (or not).

7. Appendix

A. The action of the one-dimensional Lorentz group

Lorentz transformations take hyperbolas into hyperbolas, and the coordinate transformation from the synchronized watches (t_i, x_i) of an inertial frame into the synchronized watches $(\bar{t}_i, \bar{x}_i)$ of another inertial frame with boost velocity $-B$ is

$$\bar{t}_i = \frac{t_i - Bx_i}{\sqrt{1-B^2}}; \qquad \bar{x}_i = \frac{x_i - Bt_i}{\sqrt{1-B^2}}. \tag{117}$$

Notice that (117) preserves the light-cone condition, i.e., if $(t_i - t_k)^2 = (x_i - x_k)^2$ in the original frame, we also have $(\bar{t}_i - \bar{t}_k)^2 = (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_k)^2$ and the electromagnetic functional (8) is a Lorentz invariant. Notice that even though the light-cone condition is preserved, the distance in lightcone changes, i.e.,

$$\bar{r}_{ki}^2 = (\bar{t}_i - \bar{t}_k)^2 = \Big(\frac{(t_i - t_k) - B(x_i - x_k)}{\sqrt{1-B^2}}\Big)^2 = e^{-2\phi_B} r_{ki}^2, \tag{118}$$

where in the last equality we have introduced the boost angle by $B \equiv \tanh\phi_B$ and used the convention of Fig. 1 that i is in the future lightcone of k, namely $(t_i - t_k) = +(x_i - x_k)$. We notice that there is no such thing as a center of mass frame in the theory of relativity, and the boost transformation is to be applied to *each* breaking point separately. As we imagine describing the collision from another frame, it is nice to express the left- and right- velocities *at* the breaking point in terms of the pre-image with a boost parameter B, as follows. The Lorentz group transforms velocities by

$$\bar{v}_i = \frac{v_i - B}{1 - Bv_i}, \tag{119}$$

where B is the (boost) parameter and $\bar{v}_i$ is the image of v_i. In analogy with (60), we express the boost parameter B and the velocity $\bar{v}_i$ as

$$B \equiv \tanh\phi_B, \tag{120}$$
$$\bar{v}_i \equiv \tanh\bar{\phi}_i. \tag{121}$$

Actually, using the addition formulas for hyperbolic sines and cosines together with definitions (60), (120) and (121), the group action translates Eq. (119) into

$$\tanh\bar{\phi}_i = \tanh(\phi_i - \phi_B), \tag{122}$$

thus showing that a change of inertial frame simply shifts the velocity angle by the boost angle, i.e.,

$$\bar{\phi}_i = \phi_i - \phi_B. \tag{123}$$

B. The outer-cone distances of a mutual-recoil collision

Our next result is useful in a numerical perturbation theory of the electron-electron case. We show that the mutual-recoil is optimal in the sense that the outer lightcone distance of each charge is much larger than the internal lightcone distance when the respective recoiling velocity is large.

Lemma 7.1. *The outer lightcone distances $r_{\beta\alpha}$ for a mutual-recoil collision are given by*

$$r_{\beta\alpha} = \frac{2}{(1-\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\beta)} r_{k\alpha}. \tag{124}$$

Proof. Again, we assume the setup defined below (60) and further assume that particle k is in the past lightcone of particle i at time $t_i = 0$. By choosing the origin on the breaking point of particle i at time $t_i = 0$ we can extrapolate particle k's trajectory until the future lightcone of event $(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i) = (0,0)$ by

$$\mathbf{x}_k(t_k) = r_{ki}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + (t_k + r_{ki})\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j,$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j$ is the average velocity on the segment, an extrapolation valid from $t_k \geq -r_{ki}$ until the future lightcone time t_k^+, which according to the lightcone condition happens at

$$t_k^+ = ||\mathbf{x}_k(t_k^+) - 0|| = r_{ki} + (t_k^+ + r_{ki})(\hat{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j),$$

yielding the future lightcone time and inverse lightcone distance to be

$$t_k^+ = -r_{ki} + \frac{2r_{ki}}{(1-\hat{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)},$$
$$\frac{1}{r_{ki}} = \frac{(1-\hat{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\bar{\mathbf{v}}_j)}{2r_{ki}}.$$

□

References

[1] J. De Luca, *Variational Electrodynamics of Atoms*, *Progress In Electromagnetics Research B* **53** (2013), 147-186 (40pp).

[2] J. De Luca, *Equations of Motion for Variational Electrodynamics*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **260** (2016), 5816-5833 (18pp).

[3] J. De Luca, *Chemical Principle and PDE of Variational Electrodynamics*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **268** (2019), 272-300 (29pp).

[4] G. Marmo, G. N. Mukunda, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *Lagrangian proof of the no-interaction Theorem*, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 2110-2116 (1984).

[5] D. J. Louis-Martinez, *Relativistic non-instantaneous action-at-a-distance interactions*, *Physics Letters B* **632** (2006) 733-739.

[6] J. De Luca, *Variational principle for the Wheeler-Feynman electrodynamics*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **50** (2009), 062701 (24pp).

[7] J. De Luca, A. R. Humphries and S. B. Rodrigues, *Finite-element boundary value integration of Wheeler-Feynman electrodynamics*, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **236** (2012), 3319-3337.

[8] D. C. De Souza and J. De Luca, *Solutions of the Wheeler-Feynman equations with discontinuous velocities*, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **25** (2015), 013102 (10pp).

[9] J. Mallet-Paret, *Generic properties of retarded functional differential equations*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **81** (1975), 750-752, J. Mallet-Paret, *Generic periodic solutions of functional differential equations*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **25** (1977), 163-183.

[10] J. Mallet-Paret and R. Nussbaum, *Boundary layer phenomena for differential-delay equations with state-dependent time lags*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **477** (1996), 129-197 and *Boundary layer phenomena for differential-delay equations with state-dependent time lags-III*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **189** (2003), 640-692.

[11] J. Hale, *Theory of Functional Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag (1977), J. Hale and S. M. Verduyn Lunel *Introduction to Functional Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1993).

[12] N. Guglielmi and E. Hairer, *Numerical approaches for state-dependent neutral-delay equations with discontinuities*, *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* **95** (2013), 2-12 and G. Fusco and N. Guglielmi, *A regularization for discontinuous differential equations with application to state-dependent delay differential equations of neutral-type*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **250** (2011), 3230-3279.

[13] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1975).

[14] D. C. De Souza and M. C. Mackey, *Response of an oscillatory differential delay equation to a periodic stimulus, Journal of Mathematical Biology* **78** (2019) 1637-1679.

[15] H. Shu, W. Xu, X.-S. Wang and J. Wu, *Complex dynamics in a delay differential equation with two delays in tick growth with diapause*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **269** (2020) 10937-10963.

[16] R. D. Driver, *Can the future influence the present?*, *Physical Reviw D* **19** (1979) 1098-1107.

[17] E. B. Hollander and J. De Luca, *Two-degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian for the time-symmetric two-body problem of the relativistic action-at-a-distance electrodynamics*, *Physical Review E* **67**, 026219 (2003) (15pp).

[18] E. B. Hollander and J. De Luca, *Regularization of the collision in the electromagnetic two-body problem*, *Physical Review E* **14** (2004), 1093-1104 (12pp).

[19] J. Cheeger, *Differentiability of Lipischitz Functions on Metric spaces*, *GAFA Geometric and Functional Analysis*, **9** (1999) 428-517.

[20] C. M. Andersen and Hans C. von Baeyer, *Almost Circular Orbits in Classical Action-at-a-Distance Electrodynamics*, *Physical Review D* **5** (1972), 802.

[21] J. De Luca, *Electromagnetic models to complete quantum mechanics*, *Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience* **8**, (2011) 1040-1051.
[22] A. Schild, *Electromagnetic two-body problem*, *Phys. Rev.* **131**, (1963) 2762.
[23] J. De Luca, *Electrodynamics of helium with retardation and self-interaction*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998), 680-683 and J. De Luca, *Electrodynamics of a two-electron atom with retardation and self-interaction*, *Phys. Rev. E* **58** (1998), 5727-5741.
[24] S.J. Aarseth and K. Zare, *A regularization of the three-body problem*, *Celestial mechanics* **10** (1974) 185-205.
[25] J. De Luca, *Electrodynamics of helium with retardation and self-interaction*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998), 680-683 and J. De Luca, *Electrodynamics of a two-electron atom with retardation and self-interaction*, *Phys. Rev. E* **58** (1998), 5727-5741.
[26] A. Brault and A. Lejay, *The non-linear sewing lemma II: Lipischitz continuous formulation Journal of Differential Equations* **293** (2021) 482-519.