A Local Bubble-in-Bubble (BB) Multiverse Model Time, CP-Reversals, Classical Physics and Fundamental Constants Arise from Just Two Variables

Jay Alfred[1]

[1]Plasma and Dark Astrobiology Independent Researcher Singapore, Singapore

Publication Date: 2026/09/22

Abstract: We present a novel minimalistic physical framework in which all observable properties of spacetime, matter, and fundamental sector constants emerge from the evolution of two master variables in a multiverse landscape during dimensional descent: (A) the rotation speed of bubble universes, and (B) the vacuum energy density within each bubble universe. This provides a minimal, dynamical explanation for the emergence of classical universes from higher-dimensional sectors and pre-geometric origins. We humbly claim that this model dissolves, resolves or renders obsolete the mass hierarchy, measurement and measure problems, the Anthropic principle and the Fermi paradox. It explains the Dark Flow, Cold Spot, predicts chiral anomalies in gravitational waves and the CMB. It explains why CTC (closed timelike curves) will not violate causality in higher dimensional sectors in the local multiverse (and hence Hawking's chronology protection is not required in these sectors). Starting from an 11-dimensional all-spatial Euclidean manifold, we show that conservation of angular momentum forces rotational speed to increase as nested bubble universes descend to lower-energy states. This rotation drives dimensional reduction, generates chirality and CP-offset universes, and converts one spatial dimension into a timelike dimension as it rotates towards the axis of rotation (this increases the speed of light and causal depth, while decreasing time dilation). Simultaneously, decreasing vacuum energy density (the second master variable) drives the evolution of all physical sector constants: Planck scales, fine-structure constant, Bohr radius, gravitational constant, and stabilizes the speed of light and time dilation, while entropy increases and mass scales shift downwards.

Keywords: *Angular Momentum, Bohr Radius, Bubble Universe, Causality, Chirality, Classicality, CP-Reversal, Cold Spot, Dark Flow, Dimensional Descent, Entropy, Fine-Structure Constant, Fundamental Constants, Geometry, Gravitational Constant, Inflation, Inter-Dimensional Black Holes, Multiverse, Nested Bubble Universes, Parity Offset, Planck Scale, Quantum, Rotation, Spacetime, Speed of Light, Time, Time Dilation, Vacuum Energy Density.*

How to Cite: Jay Alfred (2026) A Local Bubble-in-Bubble (BB) Multiverse Model Time, CP-Reversals, Classical Physics and Fundamental Constants Arise from Just Two Variables. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology,* 11(9), 764-853. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the local BB (Bubble-in-Bubble) multiverse model. The BB multiverse is not a spatial ensemble of parallel worlds but a genealogical hierarchy of structural instantiations, each arising from the one before it through a sequence of symmetry breakings, dimensional reorganizations, and stability transitions. These instantiations unfold across *three ontological domains*, each introducing a distinct mode of existence and each contributing a different layer of structure to the lineage that culminates in our classical 3D universe.

Domain 1 lies at the foundation as the mathematical possibility space. It is a realm of pure abstraction, containing no geometry, no dynamics, and no physical quantities. It consists solely of relational and combinatorial constraints that determine which universes are possible and how they may relate. The directed simplicial complex, the cosmological polytope, and the combinatorial time-crystal all reside here as structural blueprints.

Domain 1 does not describe a world; it describes the conditions or the rulebook under which a world may be instantiated.

Domain 2 emerges as a pre-geometric relational vacuum from this purely mathematical domain. In Domain 2, structural factorizations, coherence partitions, and non-metric adjacency patterns become meaningful, allowing the first

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

bubble universe in Domain 3 to be instantiated as a stable relational factor. This is not a quantum event but a structural instantiation, the moment when geometry becomes inducible. Domain 2 is therefore (figuratively speaking) the compiler layer of reality: the place where mathematical possibility becomes inducible structure, where the seeds of geometry, matter, and classicality are prepared but not yet expressed.

Domain 3 is the classical limit in which geometry, time, and matter become fully realized in stages. Quantum decoherence, understood here not as a quantum process but as the stabilization of relational variability, produces persistent classical records, and the induced manifold of the bubble evolves into a spacetime manifold. (This model requires us to reformulate quantum mechanics in a multi-dimensional space, as discussed immediately below.) Space emerges from the organization of relational structure; time emerges when one relational axis becomes distinguished as a direction of ordered change; matter emerges as excitations of induced relational fibers. As the bubble evolves, it undergoes dimensional descent: higher-dimensional configurations contract and reorganize into lower-dimensional phases, each shaped by symmetry breaking and rotational compression and compactification of the underlying relational structure.

The local multiverse is therefore a lineage of nested bubble universes or sectors, each inheriting the same relational configuration and undergoing its own sequence of dimensional reorganizations until our own familiar 3D bubble universe appears at the lowest energy level. We begin with the first bubble universe, the U11-sector, an 11-dimensional *Euclidean* space as the ancestor bubble; then the *Lorentzian* S10-sectors when time first emerges, spanning from 10D down to 7D universes; and finally, the *Lorentzian* E6-sectors, from 6D down to the 3D universes.

This inheritance explains the continuity of physical laws across the lineage. Each bubble universe carries forward the same foundational relational content, expressed differently as dimensionality decreases and (metric) stability increases. The sector constants and symmetries observed in our universe are not arbitrary; they are the classical residues of a deeper pre-geometric ancestry. The BB multiverse model thus provides a unified account of the origins of geometry, the emergence of classicality, and the structural relationships connecting all bubble universes.

The remainder of this paper develops the mechanisms by which bubble universes nucleate or bud, evolve, and interact. It examines the mathematical principles governing their instantiation, the relational dynamics that shape their internal structure, and the classical signatures they imprint on observable phenomena. The BB multiverse is not merely a theoretical construct; it offers concrete explanatory pathways for features such as the Cold Spot and Dark Flow, as well as anomalies in gravitational waves, the cosmic microwave background, and black holes, while explaining the observed morphology of dark-matter halos and predicting lepton non-universality (which violates the Standard Model and points to new physics). By tracing the lineage of bubble universes and analyzing their inherited relational structures, this framework bridges the gap between abstract mathematical possibility and tangible physical reality.

Ultimately, the BB multiverse invites a reconsideration of existence, causality, and cosmological structure. It emphasizes that our universe is not an isolated entity but one expression within a vast hierarchy of induced geometries, all woven from the same pre-geometric vacuum. Through dimensional descent, contraction, faster rotation and structural compactification, each bubble universe becomes a unique realization of a shared relational ancestry. Our universe is one such realization—classical, geometric, and stable—emerging from a lineage that begins in pure mathematics and passes through a pre-geometric compiler before crystallizing into the spacetime we inhabit.

II. CUSTOMIZING QUANTUM PHYSICS

Quantum physics has been indispensable in revealing the structure of our universe. To fully utilize what has historically been achieved we will need to tailor and re-interpret our existing understanding for use in the BB multiverse model.

➢ *Three Phases of a Multiversal Excitation*

In the BB ontology, the elementary particles of the Standard Model are not intrinsically three dimensional entities. They are sectoral cross sections of higher dimensional excitations whose full relational structure cannot be expressed within the dimensional constraints of any single classical sector. This view is deeply consonant with a broad body of theoretical work [1–15]. Randall–Sundrum models treat our universe as a localized slice of a higher dimensional bulk, where matter fields appear as sharply localized zero mode projections while gravity extends into the extra dimension. Kaluza–Klein theory, universal extra dimension models, and the AdS/CFT correspondence all reinforce the same geometric intuition: the fields we observe are lower dimensional shadows of higher dimensional excitations. Within the BB multiverse, this means that the familiar 3D classical sector representation of the particle is a truncated projection of a multiversal excitation, not the excitation itself.

Broadly speaking, there are three phases in the journey of a higher-dimensional excitation in the multiverse to a particle measured in the laboratory on Earth. Firstly, there is the *multiversal phase* where there are higher dimensional excitations, linearity and unitarity, as described by the wavefunction. There are different measures of existence of these excitations in different sectors.

Secondly, there is an unstable *transition phase,* when the higher dimensional excitation is first encountered in a lower dimensional sector through weak measurements. This is the first sectorization (historically: classicalization). Here, the higher dimensional excitation has not yet undergone dimensional transmutation, but it is constrained by the lower dimensional sector. Dimensional transmutation is the geometric analogue of kinetic mixing: a change of identity induced not by interactions but by geometry. A higher

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

dimensional particle cannot exist stably in a 3D vacuum without dimensional contraction or reduction. The particle must adopt the identity appropriate to the relational measure of the new vacuum. So, a higher dimensional excitation would decompose into two or more lower dimensional particles and go through both slits in an experiment or be in two places at the same time.

The third phase or stage is the *sectoral phase* where dimensional transmutation is completed during strong measurement, and the excitation behaves like a 3D particle (this is the second sectorization).

- *The Multiversal Phase: Higher-Dimensional Excitations and Unitary Evolution*

At the most fundamental level, every physical system is a higher-dimensional multiversal excitation. Its dynamics are governed by linearity and unitarity, and its full relational structure is encoded in what quantum mechanics calls the *wavefunction*. In this stage, the excitation spans multiple sectors with different measures of existence in each. No sector has yet imposed its dimensional constraints; the excitation retains its full dimensionality. This is the true ontological level of quantum theory, though historically it was only partially glimpsed through the formalism. At the multiversal stage, there is no superposition of a single excitation. There is a single higher-dimensional excitation with different measures of existence across sectors. The wavefunction (in the context of the BB model) is not a superposition of "the same particle in many places," but a description of how one excitation is distributed—measure-wise—over different sectors (or universes) in the multiverse.

- *The Transition Phase: First Sectorization Under Weak Measurement*

When a lower-dimensional sector first interacts with a higher-dimensional excitation in a weak measurement, the excitation does not undergo dimensional transmutation. Instead, it is constrained by the representational limits imposed by the sector. This is the stage historically misinterpreted as "classicalization," but it is more accurately described as the first sectorization. The excitation remains higher-dimensional, but the sector can only register sectoral projections of it. Because the excitation has not yet transmuted, its multiversal structure is compressed into multiple sectoral images. Hence, a single excitation may appear as two lower-dimensional particles passing through both slits, or a single excitation "in two places at once," or a delocalized interference-capable object. These are usually interpreted as "superpositions."

However, these are not paradoxes. The phenomena demonstrates the relativistic effects of dimensional framing. Here, a multi-dimensional phenomena is observed through a lower-dimensional frame of reference. Superpositions are the sectoral decompositions of a higher-dimensional excitation that has not yet been forced into the sector's dimensional basis. Superposition properly appears only in the transition zone, and only relative to a lower-dimensional frame. Weak measurements probe this transitional regime: they reveal the compressed shadow of the multiversal excitation without collapsing its higher-dimensional structure.

- *The Sectoral Phase: Second Sectorization Under Strong Measurement*

A strong measurement forces the excitation to undergo full dimensional transmutation. This is the second sectorization (Q: classicalization) threshold, where the excitation becomes fully compatible with the dimensional structure of the sector. In this stage, the excitation is re-expressed entirely in the 3D basis of the sector. The NC (non-classical, i.e., non-sectoral) components are not destroyed; they simply no longer appear in the 3D projection – they are (still) existent in other sectors. The excitation now behaves as a 3D particle with classical identity, localization, and definite outcomes. This is the stage historically associated with "collapse," but in the BB ontology it is a *dimensional phase transition*, not a stochastic erasure of information.

Nothing mysterious occurs at any stage. What changes is which dimensional representation of the same excitation is accessible to the observer's sector. This framework also explains why the wavefunction "predicts" phenomena that appear paradoxical in 3D: the wavefunction is describing the multiversal excitation, while experiments register only its sectoral manifestations.

➢ *Complex Plane*

Given the above re-interpretation, the complex plane that appears in the Schrödinger equation is not an arbitrary algebraic convenience but the compressed remnant of a higher-dimensional geometric structure or excitation. In the 10-dimensional spatial phase of the bubble, the manifold carries an almost-complex structure J that pairs the ten Euclidean directions into five complex planes. This structure is intrinsic to the geometry of the bubble itself: it is not imposed externally, nor is it a property of the internal fiber. It arises directly from the Euclidean dynamics of the 11-dimensional ancestor bubble U_{11}, which endows the spatial manifold with a symplectic form and an associated almost-complex pairing.

When rotation induces a signature shift and one direction becomes timelike, the symmetry transitions from Spin(11) to Spin(10,1). The newly emergent time direction leaves the domain of J, but the remaining nine spatial directions continue to support the almost-complex structure. Four of the original five complex planes survive intact, and one is partially broken by the extraction of its real partner into the timelike sector. The complex geometry of the spatial manifold therefore persists, but in a reduced form: a 9-dimensional Euclidean space equipped with a rank-4 almost-complex structure. The complex plane, embedded in Schrödinger's equation, is a projection of this structure. It is the 2-dimensional Euclidean slice of one of the surviving complex planes on which J acts as multiplication by i. The familiar complex numbers of quantum mechanics are thus the shadows of higher-dimensional geometric rotations,

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

implying a multiverse in the backdrop. The factor of i in the Schrödinger equation is the algebraic residue of a geometric rotation that the 3D slice cannot represent explicitly.

This geometric origin, however, is only one half of the story. The *linearity* of the Schrödinger equation does not arise from the 10D almost-complex geometry but from the deeper Euclidean dynamics of the 11-dimensional ancestor bubble. The fundamental multiversal excitation Ψ evolves according to a linear Hamiltonian flow on U_{11}, where the symplectic structure and the Euclidean geometry jointly enforce the bilinearity of the Poisson bracket and the linearity of the evolution operator. At this multiversal level there is no superposition of multiple excitations; there is only a single higher-dimensional process whose measures of existence differ across the nested vacuum sectors. What appears in a 3D quantum description as "superposition" is simply the sectoral decomposition of this single 11D excitation when viewed through the severe projection constraints of a low-dimensional phase. The linearity of quantum evolution is therefore not a contingent feature of microscopic systems but the sectoral imprint of the linear Hamiltonian flow native to U_{11}.

Measurement corresponds to a *focussing* into a single sector, a process that eliminates the need for the compressed complex encoding by restricting the system to a configuration fully expressible within one 3D branch. In this focussing, the projection becomes maximally severe: the geometric degrees of freedom that previously required a complex representation are no longer active in the effective description. The imaginary component does not vanish because it was unreal; it vanishes because the projection has become fully sectoral, suppressing the higher-dimensional geometry that originally necessitated the complex structure.

Taken together, these two origins—*the 11D dynamical origin and the 10D geometric origin—reveal the true nature of the Schrödinger equation. Its linearity derives from the Euclidean Hamiltonian flow of the ancestor bubble; its complex plane derives from the almost-complex geometry of the 10D spatial phase; and its superposition principle reflects the sectoral decomposition of a single multiversal excitation.* Quantum mechanics in 3D is therefore not a fundamental law but a projection law: the effective description that arises when the dynamics of an 11D excitation are viewed through the narrow representational constraints of a low-dimensional sector.

When this higher-dimensional flow is first projected into a 3D sector equipped with emergent time—during the transitional phase associated with weak measurement—the induced equation of motion necessarily retains this linear structure, appearing in the familiar sectoral form $i\hbar\, \partial_t \psi = \hat{H}_{3D}\psi$. Thus, the superposition principle is not a mysterious feature of the 3D world, but the sectoral imprint of a fundamentally linear evolution defined on the full 11-dimensional Euclidean manifold. What early quantum theorists interpreted as a peculiar property of microscopic particles was, in fact, the mathematical shadow of a higher-dimensional Euclidean substrate whose structure they had already encoded—without yet recognizing its ontological origin.

Superpositions, entanglements, quantum tunnelling, and related "quantum" phenomena arise only in this second transitional phase. They are not properties of the multiversal excitation itself but artifacts of the first sectorization: when a higher-dimensional excitation is constrained by a lower-dimensional frame, it decomposes into multiple sectoral images. What appears in 3D as "one particle in many places at once" is, in the higher-dimensional frame, a single undivided excitation—an explicit demonstration of the relativity of dimensional frames.

This higher-dimensional origin of linearity also clarifies the historical development of the central quantum phenomena. Superposition, tunneling, and entanglement all entered physics first as mathematical necessities of the wavefunction formalism and only later as experimentally detectable sectoral signatures. Superposition followed immediately from the *linearity* of the Schrödinger equation: if ψ_1 and ψ_2 solve the equation, then any linear combination $a\psi_1 + b\psi_2$ must also be a solution. Long before any experimental probe existed, the mathematics already required that quantum states possess this compositional structure, and only later did interference experiments (using weak measurements during the transitional phase) —most famously the electron double-slit experiment—reveal sectoral patterns consistent with this underlying linearity (which betrays its 11-dimensional Euclidean origin).

Quantum tunneling emerged in the same way: the Schrödinger equation permits exponentially decaying solutions inside classically forbidden regions, implying a nonzero transmission probability through a potential barrier. This initially formal result found empirical confirmation in alpha decay, whose rates were successfully explained by Gamow and contemporaries, and later in technological realizations such as the tunnel diode and the scanning tunneling microscope. Entanglement, introduced by Schrödinger in 1935 as the non-factorizability of composite wavefunctions, likewise began as a purely mathematical property; the EPR argument highlighted its conceptual strangeness, but the first sectoral signature of spatially separated entanglement did not appear until the 1949 Wu–Shaknov experiment, with decisive confirmation arriving decades later through Bell-test experiments by Aspect, Zeilinger, and others.

In all three cases, the pattern is the same: the mathematics predicted structures that were not directly observable but whose *sectoral consequences* (during the first sectorization) —interference fringes, decay rates, correlation statistics—eventually became measurable. The historical record therefore supports a conclusion that these phenomena were not observed directly but inferred from the mathematical architecture of the wavefunction, with experiments later confirming only the projected consequences rather than the underlying structures

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

themselves. The mathematics came first; the sectoral confirmations followed, often long after the theoretical framework had already committed to these features as unavoidable. Within the BB multiverse ontology, this sequence is no longer surprising: the wavefunction formalism was always describing the geometry and dynamics of the Euclidean U11, while experiments could only reveal the shadows cast by this higher-dimensional structure (or excitation) onto the 3D sector.

➢ *Dissolution of Gap Between "Quantum" and "Classical"*

The BB multiverse is not a spacetime-based ontology but a relational geometric one. Its fundamental objects—excitations, sectors, bubbles, and classical particles—are not entities embedded in a pre-existing space. They are patterns of relation defined on the combinatorial substrate of Domain 1. From this substrate emerges the relational geometry of Domain 2, and from that geometry the classical sectors of Domain 3 are projected. A multiversal excitation is therefore a high-dimensional relational structure with no intrinsic location, shape, or dimensionality. Its properties arise from the relations it instantiates across the multiversal manifold: adjacency, resonance, classicality weight, and sectoral compatibility. An excitation is never "in" a sector; it has sectoral expressions, each determined by how its relational geometry can be fit into that sector's dimensional structure.

A crucial feature of the BB ontology is that the sectoral and multiversal views are not disjoint descriptions but lie on a continuous dimensional ladder. A sector such as the 3D classical sector represents the lowest-dimensional, highest-compression slice of the multiversal excitation. As one ascends the energy gradient of the BB multiverse, the dimensionality of the sector increases, and with it the fidelity of the sectoral representation. Each higher-dimensional sector retains more of the relational geometry of the full excitation. In the limit of sufficiently high dimensionality, the sectoral view becomes indistinguishable from the multiversal view. Thus, the classical sector is not an alien domain requiring a separate ontology; it is the lowest-resolution projection of the same multiversal structure. This makes the reconciliation between sectoral (classical) and multiversal (quantum) descriptions mathematically seamless and conceptually natural.

Mathematically, the relational geometry of the BB multiverse model is expressed through fibered structures, sectoral bundles, and projection maps. Each sector corresponds to a lower-dimensional fiber bundle whose base manifold is the classical spacetime of that sector and whose fibers encode the internal degrees of freedom inherited from Domain 2. A multiversal excitation is a section of the full multiversal bundle, not of any individual sectoral bundle. When projected into a sector, the excitation undergoes dimensional filtration, yielding a classical particle, a resonance, or a non-classical excitation depending on its classicality weight in that sector.

The projection from Domain 2 to Domain 3 sectors is governed by two sectorization thresholds, as already discussed above. These thresholds are not dynamical events but geometric constraints: a sectoral manifold can instantiate only those excitations whose relational structure is compatible with its dimensionality and symmetry.

Within this framework, the wavefunction is not a description of a particle in 3D space. It is the full mathematical representation of the multiversal excitation, encoding all of its possible sectoral expressions, adjacency relations, and non-classical components across the entire multiverse. In other words, the wavefunction itself contains the complete distribution of existence-measures across all sectors, but the observer extracts from it only the components compatible with the geometry of their own sector. What appears in the 3D classical sector is therefore a sectorized *interpretation* of the wavefunction—a projection of a higher-dimensional relational structure into a lower-dimensional observational frame. The underlying mathematics is multiversal; the sectorization is an additional layer, arising from the sectoral limitations of the observer rather than from the structure of the wavefunction itself.

The extensive literature on superposition, entanglement, quantum tunneling, and nonlocality can be understood as a long record of attempts to describe multiversal phenomena that is filtered through the sector (during the second transitional phase) using sectoral language. What quantum mechanics calls "superposition" is simply the fact that a higher dimensional excitation decomposes into multiple lower dimensional particles initially (before it dimensionally transmutates during the transition phase). What it calls "entanglement" is the fact that two 3D particles are adjacent in a higher-dimensional sector—or are projections of a single higher-dimensional excitation—so their relational geometry remains unified even when their 3D projections during the transition phase are widely separated. Tunneling reflects the oscillatory redistribution of multiple lower dimensional particles across boundaries within the sector. Nonlocality reflects the projection of a unified multiversal relation into a sector whose dimensional constraints cannot represent that unity as a local structure. None of these phenomena are paradoxical when the multiversal and sectoral realities are properly distinguished; they are simply the sector-filtered signatures of a higher-dimensional relational geometry during the transition phase.

➢ *The Mathematics of Quantum Mechanics is Repurposed*

In the BB multiverse model, the mathematics of quantum mechanics—Hilbert spaces, linear superposition, Fourier transforms—arises naturally as the projection-domain approximation of this relational geometry. Fourier transforms appear because the projection from Domain 2 to Domain 3 is holographic: a high-dimensional relational structure is compressed into a lower-dimensional classical manifold. The wavefunction is therefore the Fourier-domain shadow of the multiversal excitation. Quantum mechanics is a linearized, sectoral representation of a deeper relational ontology. Classical

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

physics, by contrast, is the physics of sectoral instantiation. It describes the behavior of excitations after the second sectorization, when the relational geometry has been fully compressed into the classical basis of the sector. Classical (or sectoral) physics remains unchanged in this formulation; it is the correct description of the sectorial reality that emerges from the multiversal projection. The relational geometric formulation of the BB multiverse model therefore unifies the multiversal and sectoral domains.

This ontology provides the foundation for a coherent multiversal physics. It preserves the mathematical power of quantum mechanics while embedding it in a structure that explains its paradoxes, clarifies its domain of applicability, and reveals its true meaning as a projection theory of multiversal reality. The BB multiverse contains no discontinuity between "quantum" and "classical" descriptions; the dimensional index of the sectoral view can be raised stepwise until it reconciles exactly with the multiversal view. For this reason, the present formulation avoids the historical quantum-mechanical paradigm and its terminology, which obscure the geometric origin of the phenomena and reify an artificial dichotomy.

Nevertheless, quantum physics has developed a sophisticated mathematical vocabulary for describing relational behavior in low-dimensional slices. Operators, symmetry structures, and measurement theory remain valuable because they capture the effective behavior of relational projections when viewed from within a 3D observational frame. Since many readers are fluent in this vocabulary, the present formulation will occasionally invoke quantum-theoretic analogues as interpretive guides. These references are strictly pedagogical rather than ontological. *They appear in curved brackets with an affixed "Q"—for example, (Q: ...)*—to signal that the comparison is heuristic and not a claim about underlying reality. While the phenomenology may resemble familiar quantum behavior, the ontology is entirely different. The analogies serve only as navigational aids, not as conceptual foundations. Now that we have clarified the role of quantum mechanics in the context of the BB multiverse, we will proceed to provide more information about the model.

III. THE THREE-DOMAIN ONTOLOGICAL GRADIENT

- *Domain 1 — Mathematical*

Every cosmological framework, from classical inflation to quantum-gravity proposals, presupposes a background rule-set that determines what counts as an admissible evolution. Even in theories that claim the universe emerges from "nothing," the "nothing" is never truly empty. Every cosmological framework, from classical inflation to quantum-gravity proposals, implicitly assumes a background rule-set that governs what counts as a valid dynamical evolution. As Vilenkin has emphasized, even in models of eternal inflation—where spacetime is said to arise from "nothing"—the "nothing" is never truly empty. He notes the following: "The laws of physics must have existed even prior to the universe itself. The laws are not created in the same event that brought the universe into existence." [16] "The laws of quantum mechanics are assumed to hold even when there is no universe." [17] He emphasizes, "Even in the absence of classical spacetime, the quantum rules governing tunneling and nucleation must still be assumed," [18] elaborating, "The tunneling process is described by the Wheeler–DeWitt equation, which we assume to be valid even in the absence of classical spacetime." [19]

These observations reveal a deeper point: all cosmologies rely on an unspoken list of lawful regularities that is rarely made explicit. One must still assume a hidden substrate of admissible transitions, allowed vacuum configurations, and lawful regularities. Most theories leave this substrate unarticulated, embedding a silent book of rules inside the vacuum itself. The BB multiverse model confronts this directly. Domain 1 is the explicit formalization of the rule-layer every cosmology tacitly assumes but does not articulate, so that nothing is smuggled in under the guise of "empty space."

Domain 1 is not a physical arena, not a pre-geometric proto-spacetime, and not a hidden physics. It is the mathematical stratum. It contains only relational, combinatorial, and symmetry-theoretic constraints. No physical quantities exist here: no metric, no energy, no matter fields, and no spacetime. It is the deepest ontological layer of the BB framework, the place where the rules of admissibility are defined before anything physical can arise. Domain 1 consists of the pure combinatorial skeleton that determines which instantiation events are possible, which relational factorizations can occur in Domain 2, which vacuum manifolds can be induced in Domain 3, and how lineage-level symmetry breaking is ordered across the multiverse. Mathematically, this structure is encoded in the cosmological polytope P.

The vertices of P represent admissible causal-combinatorial configurations, while its facets encode the allowed factorization channels. The adjacency relation $v_i \sim v_j$ implies that a valid factorization or nucleation transition exists. It defines the relational backbone of the entire multiverse. These relations are not geometric; they are purely combinatorial constraints on how relational structures may decompose or reorganize. The facet equations of the polytope, $\sum_i c_i x_i = 0$, with coefficients determined by causal-combinatorial consistency, specify the permitted interference and compatibility structures of Domain 2. In this way, Domain 1 determines the grammar of possible universes without containing any physical content itself.

Crucially, Domain 1 is not invoked to explain the physics of Domain 3. Geometry, fields, vacuum energy, symmetry breaking, and cosmological evolution can all be described entirely within Domain 3 using standard physical laws. Domain 1 is not a hidden dynamical engine; it is the pre-physical constraint layer. As an analogy, Domain 1 therefore plays the role that the rules of chess play relative to any particular game. The rules do not move pieces, do not generate trajectories, and do not encode strategy. They

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

merely define which configurations are legal and which transitions are admissible. Without such constraints, no game is possible - we need a rulebook before any game can start. Domain 1 is precisely this kind of pre-dynamical constraint-architecture for universes.

To summarize, Domain 1 is the Platonic stratum of the BB multiverse ontology. It is a purely mathematical phase in which all structure is relational, combinatorial, and symmetry-based. No physical quantities exist here. What Domain 1 contains instead are the crystalline, algebraic constraints that determine which universes can exist, how instantiation events are ordered, and which relational alignments are admissible. It is the explicit answer to the question: what rules must already be present for any cosmology to get off the ground?

- *The Directed Nucleation Complex*

Although the BB multiverse contains only a single genuine instantiation event—the emergence of the first eleven-dimensional bubble—the genealogy of the multiverse is still a directed partial order of structural transitions. The appropriate mathematical object for encoding this genealogy is a directed simplicial complex $N = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$, where vertices represent instantiation events (the primordial induction and all subsequent symmetry-breaking reorganizations), edges encode admissible successor relations, two-simplices encode triple-branch compatibility, and higher simplices encode higher-order relational constraints. This complex is not embedded in space; it is a purely combinatorial object.

The directionality of N does not represent temporal evolution. It represents *seriality*: the partial order governing which instantiation events may follow which others. In this sense, the directed nucleation complex is the first structure in Domain 1 that resembles a “base space” in a pre-geometric sense. Its adjacency relations determine which branches of the multiverse can interact, which portal transitions are admissible, and which higher-order relational structures are allowed. When Domain 2 is induced, these adjacency relations become the permitted channels of relational flow within the amplitude-bearing vacuum.

- *The Cosmological Polytope as Geometric Dual*

The geometric dual of the directed nucleation complex is the cosmological polytope P, following the framework developed by Arkani-Hamed and collaborators [21]. The polytope is the first stratum in which the abstract combinatorial relations of Domain 1 acquire a geometric representation. Its facets correspond to admissible sub-histories, its vertices correspond to extremal relational configurations, and its full structure encodes the kinematic possibility space of the local BB region.

The polytope is static and timeless. The entire genealogical architecture of the multiverse is encoded in its facets and adjacency relations. Seriality appears as a partial order on facets and vertices, not as a trajectory in time. When Domain 2 is induced, the relational structure must respect the combinatorial geometry of the polytope: its factorization structure, its admissible entanglement topologies, and its allowed transitions are all constrained by the geometry of P.

- *The Amplituhedron and Positivity Constraints*

The amplituhedron is the positivity-structured “volume” associated with the cosmological polytope. It provides a geometric representation of relational propagation in which unitarity, causality, and positivity appear as convexity and volume constraints. In the local BB multiverse, the cosmological polytope inherits these positivity structures, allowing the amplituhedron to function as the mechanism that translates the static combinatorial geometry of Domain 1 into the relational-flow rules of Domain 2.

Portal transitions must preserve the positivity of the amplituhedron volume, ensuring that all relational redistribution across the polytope corresponds to meaningful, admissible processes. In this way, the amplituhedron forms the bridge between pure mathematical structure and the emergent dynamics of the induced domains.

- *Combinatorial Time Crystal*

Wilczek’s proposal of time crystals introduced the idea that a maximally symmetric configuration can spontaneously acquire a preferred periodicity, generating an intrinsic ordering principle [22]. Although equilibrium time crystals are not physically realizable, the underlying mechanism—spontaneous ordering in a symmetry-maximal system—remains conceptually powerful. In the BB framework, this mechanism provides the ignition principle for the emergence of Domain 3.

The pre-temporal substrate of Domain 3 possesses no intrinsic time coordinate; it is a symmetry-maximal configuration space. The static amplituhedron requires an ordering principle to convert its geometry into a sequence of admissible relational transitions. The combinatorial time crystal supplies this principle. Before this symmetry breaking, the multiverse is a frozen Platonic structure. Afterward, the relational substrate acquires a periodic ordering that seeds the first temporal axis and initiates the hierarchy of descendant sectors.

In Domain 1, this “time crystal” is not temporal at all. It is a periodicity in the poset of instantiation events, a crystalline pattern imposed on the directed simplicial complex N. This periodicity selects which chains of simplices are admissible, which sequences recur with regular frequency, and which transitions are favored or suppressed. It is a property of the event-poset, not of any temporal parameter.

When Domain 2 is induced, this combinatorial periodicity becomes a constraint on relational flow. The pattern encoded in N is realized as a selection rule on portal transitions: some transitions are permitted, some are suppressed, and some are forbidden, mirroring the crystalline regularities of the Domain 1 poset. The time crystal therefore shapes the relational vacuum without presupposing time. It is the structural prior that determines which histories are even kinematically available once a temporal description becomes meaningful in Domain 3.

- *Domain 1 vs. Tegmark's Mathematical Universe: Passive Structuralism vs. Agentic Generativity*

Max Tegmark's Mathematical Universe Hypothesis (MUH) proposes that physical existence and mathematical existence are identical: every consistent mathematical structure exists, and each such structure constitutes a universe [23]. In this view, the mathematical universe is a vast, static ensemble of structures—an ontological library in which each "book" is a self-contained mathematical object. These structures do not interact, do not generate one another, and do not participate in any higher-order dynamics. They simply are. Tegmark's multiverse (what he defines as a "Level IV multiverse") is therefore a passive structuralism: a totality of mathematical forms without internal agency, lineage, or generative logic.

Domain 1 of the BB multiverse shares with Tegmark the commitment to mathematics as ontologically fundamental, but it diverges sharply in its interpretation of what a mathematical universe *is* and *does*. In the BB ontology, Domain 1 is not a static catalogue of structures. It is a mathematical substrate with generative power—a structured, relational, and symmetry-constrained phase that actively determines which universes can instantiate, how instantiation events are ordered, and which entanglement relations are admissible. Domain 1 is therefore not merely mathematical; it is *agentic*.

This distinction becomes clear once we situate the BB multiverse within the larger mathematical universe. The BB multiverse is explicitly a local multiverse: one lineage of instantiations arising from a particular cosmological polytope. Other multiverses exist, but they are not causally connected to ours. Their existence is inferred from the fact that the larger mathematical universe contains other cosmological polytopes, each encoding its own relational constraints and generative logic. Domain 1 is thus the mathematical universe of *our* lineage, not the totality of all mathematical structures. It is a local mathematical engine embedded within a broader mathematical landscape.

Where Tegmark's mathematical universe (MU) is a passive catalogue of structures, Domain 1 is structurally articulated. Its internal architecture consists of combinatorial adjacency relations, symmetry groups, and polytope-encoded constraints that jointly determine the admissible pathways of instantiation. These structures do not act or evolve; they simply define which relational configurations are possible. In this sense, Domain 1 does not generate a pre-geometric vacuum, symmetry-breaking cascades, or physical laws. Rather, it specifies the constraint-space within which Domain 2 can compile a pre-geometric vacuum and within which Domain 3's physical laws can emerge.

To be more precise, Domain 1 is ontologically Platonic—a timeless layer of abstract mathematical relations—but it is *functionally generative* in the sense that its relational architecture determines which structures *can* exist downstream. It does not generate universes or dynamics; it generates the constraints that make any universe possible. It is therefore not a passive archive like Tegmark's MU but a mathematical operator of admissibility: a rule-layer that governs the unfolding of the local multiverse by delimiting the space of possible instantiations. Its purpose is to constrain, not to generate, the unfolding of the multiverse.

The agentic character of Domain 1 also resolves a long-standing problem in cosmology that Tegmark's MUH leaves unaddressed. As Alex Vilenkin has noted, as discussed above, all cosmological theories implicitly rely on a "hidden rulebook" embedded in the vacuum: a set of mathematical constraints that must be assumed for any dynamics to occur. Tegmark's MUH does not specify this rulebook; it simply asserts that mathematical structures exist. Domain 1, by contrast, *is* the rulebook. It makes explicit the relational, combinatorial, and symmetry-theoretic constraints that all cosmological models presuppose but rarely articulate. In doing so, it provides a principled foundation for the emergence of physical laws without reducing them to arbitrary postulates.

Thus, *the contrast between Tegmark's MUH and Domain 1 is not a matter of scale but of ontological function*. Tegmark's mathematical universe is a passive ensemble of structures; Domain 1 is an active mathematical substrate that generates, constrains, and orders the instantiation of universes within a local multiverse. The BB model therefore preserves the mathematical primacy of Tegmark's vision while replacing its passivity with a rigorous, relational, and generative architecture. Domain 1 is mathematics not as description, but as operative ontology—a structured engine of possibility from which the dynamics of Domains 2 and 3 emerge. It sits inside a much larger mathematical reality.

➢ *Domain 2 - The Pre-Geometric Vacuum*

Domain 2 is the first stage at which mathematical structures acquire the capacity for physical instantiation, but it is not yet geometric. It contains no spacetime, no metric, no fields, and no dynamical evolution; instead, it is a pre-geometric vacuum defined entirely by coherence relations, compatibility constraints, and non-metric adjacency patterns. Nothing exists in this vacuum except what the formalism explicitly allocates—relational amplitudes, inner-product-like coherence, and adjacency constraints. These structures are not located anywhere because location presupposes geometry, and they do not evolve because evolution presupposes time.

Within this non-spatial, non-temporal medium, the BB model employs Hilbert spaces not as quantum state spaces but as relational configuration spaces: complete inner-product structures capable of encoding coherence, superpositional relational possibilities, and compatibility constraints. These proto-fibers have no geometric anchoring and no underlying manifold; they are purely relational degrees of freedom organized without metric structure.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

The directed simplicial complex N, its dual polytope P, and the combinatorial time-crystal pattern determine which relational factorizations are admissible. Each simplex functions not as a region of space but as a region of coherence propagation, and the pre-geometric vacuum assigns to each simplex a relational fiber R_{σ_k}, forming a relational bundle over $|N|$. This bundle is not geometric; its "connection" encodes coherence transport and adjacency compatibility rather than gauge transport.

A transition to Domain 3 occurs when a stable relational factorization appears—a structural fixed point in the adjacency network. This stabilization allows a vacuum manifold to be defined: the first geometric object, whose points correspond to equivalence classes of relational configurations. Once this manifold exists, the proto-fibers become genuine fibers, adjacency becomes metrizable, and a connection becomes definable. At this moment, the structure $\pi: E \to M_{\text{vac}}$ becomes physically instantiated. (π is the projection map which assigns each fiber to its base point; enables metrization, connection, and physical instantiation. E is the relational fiber bundle – i.e., the total space containing all inducible structures (geometry, fields, symmetries, and sectors). M_{vac} is the vacuum manifold - the first geometric object.)

The resulting fiber bundle is not a primitive physical entity but a geometrically induced organization of relational degrees of freedom. Its fibers encode local relational configuration spaces; its base manifold encodes emergent spacetime; its connection encodes relational gauge structure. None of these exist prior to geometric induction. Thus, Hilbert spaces and Hilbert bundles appear in the BB multiverse model not because the ontology is quantum, but because these mathematical structures provide the most precise way to represent relational organization before and after geometry emerges. Their role is structural, not quantum mechanical.

Bubble nucleation does not occur within Domain 3; it is the structural factorization in Domain 2 that *creates* Domain 3. Hence, it is the cause of Domain 3, not something that happens inside Domain 3. Thus, bubble nucleation is neither a geometric formation nor dynamical. It is a pre-geometric stabilization: the moment when a relational factor becomes coherent enough that a vacuum manifold can be defined. That definability is the birth of geometry. Bubble nucleation in Domain 2 is a functorial lift from mathematical possibility to pre-geometric instantiation.

In standard cosmology, "bubble nucleation" is a geometric event: a bubble forms *in spacetime*. In the BB multiverse model, that interpretation is explicitly rejected. Hence, the first eleven-dimensional bubble universe in Domain 3 arises when the pre-geometric vacuum undergoes a structural factorization—a spontaneous symmetry breaking in the space of admissible relational configurations—producing a "bubble factor" and its complement. The bubble factor is the stabilized relational subspace that can induce geometry; the "complement" is everything that remains in Domain 2 and never becomes geometric. Hence, the first bubble is not born into a pre-existing spacetime; rather, its spacetime is the first geometric expression of its internal relational structure.

Finally, the structure, previously called the Hilbert Fiber Bundle, is repurposed and renamed as the *Relational Fiber Bundle*, reflecting its relational rather than quantum interpretation. The mathematical object remains the same, but its physical meaning is entirely different: the fibers encode relational content, the base manifold encodes induced geometry, and the connection encodes relational transport. The new terminology aligns the formalism with the model's ontological commitments: geometry is induced, relational structure is primary, and the bundle formalism organizes relational degrees of freedom rather than quantum states.

- *Relational Fiber Bundle*

Once a bubble is instantiated, its relational fiber bundle becomes the organizing structure of its internal relational content. The fiber is "infinite-dimensional" only in the sense that it contains the full spectrum of inducible structures that may later manifest as geometry, fields, symmetries, and vacuum sectors. This is analogous to the role played by a Hilbert fiber bundle in quantum physics, but the analogy is purely mathematical: the BB multiverse uses relational geometry, not quantum theory.

The relational fiber does not change as the base manifold evolves. It remains the unified relational content of the bubble, while the base manifold expresses only the currently realized geometric configuration. Dimensional descent—from an eleven-dimensional Euclidean configuration to a ten-dimensional spatial manifold with an emergent time axis, and eventually to the three-dimensional vacuum—reorganizes the geometry of the base but leaves the relational fiber intact. The various sectors (i.e., the nested bubble universes) in the multiverse remain encoded in the fiber even when their geometric expression disappears. Sector formation is therefore a reorganization of the fiber's internal relational structure, not the creation of new fibers. The bubble universe is thus not fundamentally a geometric object but a relational object whose geometry is induced from its internal structure.

The relational bundle provides the unifying framework that allows a single bubble to contain an entire hierarchy of universes without requiring additional factorizations. Domain 2 thus provides the unified relational vacuum from which all geometric phases will later emerge. It is the ontological bridge between pure mathematics and classical physics.

- *Geometric Wavefunctions*

Subsequent to the discussions above, and noting the multiversal role of the quantum wavefunction, the quantum wavefunction is now repurposed and renamed the multiversal "geometric wavefunction." It is the mathematical object that assigns, to every sector of the

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

induced vacuum, a sectorization (Q: classicality) weight describing how strongly a given relational excitation stabilizes into a classical soliton within that sector. It is not a spatial wave, not a physical field, and not a dynamical entity propagating through space. It is a sectoral distribution defined over the cosmological polytope, specifying the degree to which an excitation attains classical stability in each sector of the multiverse. The Born rule appears here not as a postulate of measurement theory but as a geometric identity: the squared amplitudes correspond to the relative volumes of the polytope facets through which the excitation can stabilize.

➢ *Probability Assignment by the Geometric Wavefunction – Simple Analogy*

To build an intuition for how the geometric wavefunction assigns probabilities of classical instantiation across sectors, imagine a higher-dimensional object intersecting a lower-dimensional world. A useful analogy, in this respect, is a 3D sphere passing through a 2D sheet inhabited by flat observers. The sphere exists fully in 3D, but the 2D observers can only perceive its 2D cross-sections. As the sphere intersects their sheet. At the first moment of contact, the intersection is a single point. For the 2D observer, this corresponds to a very low probability of classical instantiation. As the sphere moves deeper, the intersection becomes a small circle, then a larger circle.

These circles represent the increasing probabilities of classical instantiation. Eventually the circle reaches a maximum size, representing the highest probability of classical existence in that 2D sector. *Even at maximum, the circle never equals the full sphere*, just as a sector never contains the full relational profile. As the sphere moves past the midpoint, the circles shrink again, representing decreasing probability.

This analogy captures three essential features of the geometric wavefunction. Firstly, the higher-dimensional object exists fully elsewhere. The sphere is always a complete 3D object, just as the relational profile is always a multiversal excitation spanning all sectors. Secondly, each sector receives only a "slice" of the full object. The 2D circles are sectoral projections of a higher-dimensional entity. The geometric wavefunction quantifies the "size" of each slice in terms of classical stability. Thirdly, probability corresponds to the extent of intersection space, not the classical object itself. The sphere represents the relational profile. The varying circle sizes represent the Born-rule probabilities assigned by the geometric wavefunction. The 2D sheet represents a sector (e.g., our 3D universe). The moment when the circle is largest corresponds to the sector where the relational profile is most likely to condense into a classical particle when focussed upon. The fact that the sphere always exists fully in 3D in the analogy underscores the fact that the relational profile always exists in the multiverse and spans all sectors.

A real multiversal excitation is vastly more complex than a 3D sphere in the analogy, and the geometric wavefunction is defined over a high-dimensional non-geometric sectoral space in Domain 2, not physical space. (Domain 2 sectors are non-geometric relational modes in the pre-physical vacuum. They carry amplitudes but have no spatial extension or metric structure. When a Domain 2 sector is projected into Domain 3, it becomes a geometric sector — a physically instantiated universe with spacetime, locality, and classical stability). But the analogy captures the essential idea: *Classical instantiation is a sectoral cross-section of a multiversal object, and the geometric wavefunction quantifies the size of that cross-section.*

➢ *Probability Assignment by the Geometric Wavefunction – Mathematical Description*

Here, we present a measure-theoretic and geometric formulation. Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the multiversal configuration space in which a relational profile lives. Equip $\mathcal{M}$ with a σ-algebra Σ and a normalized measure μ, so that $(\mathcal{M}, \Sigma, \mu)$ is a probability space. A given relational profile is then represented by a probability measure μ (or, when a density exists, by a function $\rho: \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho \, d\lambda = 1$) describing how the excitation is distributed over multiversal configurations.

In this measure-theoretic formulation, sector space $\mathcal{S}$ refers to Domain 2 pre-geometric relational sectors. These pre-geometric sectors are encoded by a measurable map $\pi: \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is the pre-geometric sector space. For any measurable subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, the pushforward measure $\nu(A) = \mu(\pi^{-1}(A))$ defines the induced probability distribution on sectors. If $\mathcal{S}$ is discrete or has a suitable reference measure, we can write a geometric wavefunction $\psi: \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\psi(s)|^2 = \nu(\{s\}) = \mu(\pi^{-1}(\{s\}))$, i.e. the Born-rule probability that the relational profile is classically instantiated in sector s. The geometric wavefunction is thus the amplitude representation of the pushforward measure $\nu = \pi_* \mu$. It does not "live" in physical space but on the sector space $\mathcal{S}$, and it does not collapse; it is a static encoding of how the multiversal measure μ distributes sector (Q: classical) stability across the sectors.

The sphere–sheet analogy can be formalized in this language. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a 3D ball (the higher-dimensional relational profile) and let $\mathcal{S}$ be a 2D sheet. The map π sends each point of the ball to its intersection point on the sheet (when it exists). The pushforward measure $\nu = \pi_* \mu$ then describes how much of the ball's measure is "seen" on each region of the sheet. Where the intersection region (the circle) is small, ν is small and $|\psi|^2$ is low; where the intersection region is largest, ν is maximal and $|\psi|^2$ is highest. The ball itself—μ on $\mathcal{M}$—never changes; only its projection into $\mathcal{S}$ is being read.

In the BB framework, classical instantiation or geometric condensation corresponds to focussing on a particular sector $s \in \mathcal{S}$ via a measurement or observation.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

Mathematically, this is described not by a collapse of μ, but by passing from the global measure μ to a conditional measure on $\pi^{-1}(\{s\})$, or equivalently, by conditioning ν on the event "sector s is observed". The underlying relational profile remains a multiversal object with measure μ on $\mathcal{M}$; the geometric wavefunction ψ remains a global amplitude on $\mathcal{S}$. What changes is the *sectorial lens*: once a particular sector is selected by observation, the effective description is restricted to the corresponding fiber $\pi^{-1}(\{s\})$, and the excitation appears as a localized sector (Q: classical) particle in that sector, while remaining wave-like (low $|\psi|^2$) in other sectors in the local multiverse.

In this way, *the geometric wavefunction is precisely the Born-rule amplitude* associated with the pushforward measure $\pi_*\mu$, and "probability of classical instantiation in a sector" is just the measure of the corresponding pre-image in $\mathcal{M}$. The analogy with a sphere intersecting a sheet is then a concrete visualization of a general measure-theoretic fact: different geometric sectors see different projections of the same multiversal measure, and the geometric wavefunction encodes how large each projection is.

➢ *Curvature*

The term *curvature* appears in two different contexts within the BB multiverse framework, and these contexts refer to distinct geometric properties. Clarifying this distinction upfront is essential for understanding why curvature behaves differently in the S10 sectors and during dimensional descent into the E6 sectors.

In the S10 regime, curvature refers to the intrinsic geometric structure of the high-dimensional vacuum manifold. Higher-dimensional sectors possess a larger number of independent curvature directions; each associated with a distinct axis along which spacetime can bend. These directions are stiff, tightly constrained, and energetically costly to deform. The vacuum is rigid, highly symmetric, and resistant to perturbation. *This form of curvature describes the richness and stiffness of the manifold itself rather than the bending of the bubble membrane.* Because the manifold is so rigid, classical structures cannot form, gravitational instability is suppressed, and the sector behaves like a high-Λ de Sitter equilibrium state with minimal entropy production.

During dimensional descent, the meaning of curvature changes. As vacuum-energy density falls, the bubble's radius contracts and the membrane becomes more elastic. Curvature in this context refers to the extrinsic *bending amplitude* of the bubble membrane in response to matter, rotation, and the decreasing rigidity of spacetime. Lower-dimensional sectors possess fewer curvature directions, but each direction becomes far more flexible. The membrane bends more sharply, gravitational responsiveness increases, and matter begins to deform spacetime. This intensification of curvature is therefore a measure of how strongly the membrane can bend not how many directions it can bend in.

The two uses of the term "curvature" thus describe different geometric phenomena. The higher-dimensional S10 sectors exhibit curvature richness and stiffness: many curvature directions with minimal bending. The lower-dimensional E6 sectors exhibit curvature amplitude: fewer curvature directions with far greater flexibility. *Dimensional descent reduces the number of available curvature directions while increasing the bending amplitude of each remaining direction.* This explains why curvature appears to intensify as the bubble moves into lower-dimensional sectors even though the high-dimensional manifold originally possessed more curvature directions.

➢ *Projection Modes of Geometric Wavefunction*

The geometric wavefunction is the mathematical object that distributes sectorization (Q: classicality) across the admissible sectors. It is defined over Domain 2 non-geometric sectors, not over physical space. A multiversal excitation is not a particle, not a field configuration, and not a localized object. Its identity is defined in Domain 2, where it occupies a non-geometric sectoral space and carries a distribution of sector (Q: classicality) weights across the admissible sectors of the induced vacuum. When such an excitation is projected into a lower-dimensional Domain 3 sector, it does not appear in a single uniform manner. Its manifestation is entirely determined by the sectoral or classicality weight assigned to that sector by the geometric wavefunction. The same excitation may therefore appear as a stable classical particle (on strong measurement during the sectoral phase), as a semi-classical resonance (on weak measurement during the transitional phase), as a non-classical relational excitation (on ultra-weak measurement in the multiversal phase), or, in extreme cases, as a microscopic or macroscopic black hole (on ultra-strong measurement). These modes are not different ontological categories but different geometric expressions of the same multiversal entity under different sectoral conditions.

When the geometric wavefunction assigns a high classicality weight to a sector—one that exceeds the solitonic threshold—the excitation crystallizes there as a *classical soliton*. In such a sector, the excitation becomes localized, curvature-stable, and capable of generating persistent sectoral or classical records. This is the familiar particle-like mode of existence: electrons, protons, and other stable constituents of matter are simply the sectoral or classical projections of multiversal excitations whose geometric wavefunctions assign high classicality to the 3D sector.

When the classicality weight is intermediate—above the threshold for partial stabilization but below the threshold for persistent solitonic existence—the excitation appears as a *semi-classical resonance*. Muons, taus, hadronic resonances, and other unstable particles exemplify this mode. They are not fundamentally different species of excitation; they are lower-dimensional sectors in which the sectoral or classicality weight is sufficient to produce a transient geometric condensation but insufficient to maintain long-term stability. Their decay is not a dynamical collapse

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

but a sectoral reversion: the excitation loses classicality in that sector and reverts to a non-classical relational mode.

When the classicality weight is low, the excitation cannot stabilize at all. It persists in that sector as a *non-classical relational excitation*: extended, delocalized, and incapable of producing classical records. This is the wave-like mode of existence, not metaphorical but physically real. It corresponds to the excitation's relational support in that sector being insufficient to produce a soliton. Interference phenomena arise precisely from this mode: the excitation is present in the sector, but only as a non-classical relational mode of the fiber bundle.

A fourth mode arises when the projection of a higher-dimensional excitation into a lower-dimensional sector generates an extreme concentration of classicality and energy density. Under such conditions, the *ultra-classical* projection manifests as a *black hole*. Within a 3D sector, black holes constitute the maximally classical or sectoral objects, and their finite mass, spin, and charge render them effectively indistinguishable from particles in many respects. In the BB ontology, this is not metaphorical but literal: a black hole is the geometric projection of a multiversal excitation whose classicality weight in the 3D sector is sufficiently large to saturate the sector's geometric capacity. Microscopic and macroscopic black holes correspond to fully ultra-classicalized projections of high-dimensional excitations or of aggregated excitations. In every instance, the black hole represents the extreme classical limit of sectoral projection.

Its squared amplitude gives the probability that the excitation will stabilize as a classical soliton in a particular Domain 3 geometric sector. When the classicality weight in a sector rises above its solitonic threshold, the excitation condenses into a localized classical configuration. In all other sectors, where the classicality weight remains below threshold, the excitation continues to exist as a non-classical relational mode. Stabilization is therefore a sector-specific transition: a re-expression of the same multiversal entity in the sector whose geometric conditions momentarily support classicality.

Because the geometric wavefunction distributes classicality across many sectors, a single excitation can be classical in one sector and a non-classical sectoral excitation in others. No sector ever receives the full classicality weight. The probability is never unity because every excitation is intrinsically multiversal: its relational support spans the entire induced vacuum. Even when an excitation is strongly stabilized in one sector, a residual amplitude always persists across the remaining sectors, where it appears as a non-classical relational excitation.

This distribution is not static. The classicality weights oscillate continuously due to micro-fluctuations in vacuum curvature, fiber-bundle torsion, and residual symmetry-breaking modes. As a result, the elementary constituents of physical systems—including those composing the bodies of observers—are constantly re-expressing themselves across the multiverse. They oscillate between particle-like existence in the sector where classicality is momentarily high and wave-like existence in the surrounding sectors where classicality is low. Classicality is therefore not an intrinsic property of an excitation, but a transient geometric condition determined by the evolving structure of the induced vacuum.

During dimensional descent in the BB multiverse, the bubble contracts as vacuum energy density falls. This contraction does not merely shrink the geometric volume; it increases the intrinsic curvature of the bubble's interior. In the BB ontology, curvature is not a passive geometric descriptor but a sector-modulating parameter that influences how Domain 2 relational modes project into Domain 3 geometric sectors.

Higher curvature increases the sectoral resolution of the induced vacuum. A more curved vacuum supports sharper distinctions between sectoral modes, and this increased resolution raises the sectoral classicality weight for excitations projected into that sector. In other words, as curvature increases, the sector becomes more capable of stabilizing excitations into classical solitons.

However, this does not override or contradict the geometric wavefunction. The geometric wavefunction already encodes the classicality distribution across sectors. Curvature changes simply shift the solitonic threshold of the sector. When curvature increases, the threshold for classical stabilization lowers, making it easier for the geometric wavefunction's existing classicality weight to exceed the threshold.

Thus, dimensional descent increases curvature. Increased curvature enhances sectoral classicality capacity. This does not replace the geometric wavefunction; it modifies the sectoral conditions under which the wavefunction's weights operate. The geometric wavefunction remains the governing object. Curvature determines how its weights are interpreted in a given sector. Classicality is therefore not intrinsic to the excitation but a joint function of the geometric wavefunction's distribution of classicality weights, and the curvature-dependent solitonic threshold of the sector.

Curvature changes the *sector*, not the *wavefunction*. The wavefunction determines the classicality weight; curvature determines whether that weight is sufficient for stabilization.

- *No Collapse – Just Different Degrees of Focussing and Manifestation*

Hence, in the BB multiverse, there is no collapse of the wavefunction. Classicality does not arise from a discontinuous elimination of amplitudes but from focussing: a sector-specific increase in the geometric wavefunction's classicality weight that raises the excitation above the solitonic threshold of that sector. Laboratory measurements that require "which-way" information, detector interaction, and resonant coupling are all forms of focussing that impose

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

the dimensional structure and curvature gradient of the observer's or detector's sector onto the multi-dimensional phenomena. This forces the multi-dimensional excitation into dimensional transmutation within the observer's sector. Focussing does not destroy amplitudes in other sectors – these continue to exist. It simply sharpens the geometric wavefunction in one sector until the excitation crystallizes or is imaged there as a particle (or any other phases), depending on the strength of focussing. Hence, the notion of "collapse" in this context is irrelevant and misleading. It would be like saying a galaxy collapsed when the observer focussed on a star with his/her telescope.

Ultra-weak focussing will only manifest a non-classical (Type-NC) relational excitation. A weak focussing event will manifest a wave phenomenon. A strong focussing event will manifest a particle. An ultra-strong focussing event—one that concentrates energy density beyond the geometric capacity of the sector—produces a microscopic black hole. Thus, the sequence of manifestations is continuous. There is no collapse anywhere in this sequence (other amplitudes as dictated by the geometric wavefunction continue to exist in other sector in the local multiverse). There is only increasing focussing. This resolves the conceptual tension in quantum theory: the transition from wave-like to particle-like behavior is not a discontinuous collapse but a continuous increase in sectoral classicality through stronger focussing by an observer or detector. This imposes the dimensional structure and curvature gradients of the specific sector onto the multi-dimensional excitation – forcing dimensional transmutation to varying degrees.

Detectors do not collapse the wavefunction; they modulate the sectoral classicality threshold. A detector's internal coherence, amplification chain and curvature-modulating interactions with the induced vacuum determine how sharply the geometric wavefunction is focussed on. As focussing increases, the excitation's projection becomes more sectorized (Q: classical).

When focussing intensifies to the point that an excitation approaches the geometric limits permitted by its sector—whether through extreme energy concentration, coherent amplification, or engineered curvature modulation—the excitation is driven toward the sectoral Schwarzschild threshold, whose radius expands monotonically along the dimensional-descent chain. In the parent universe Alpha-1, the stiff spacetime fabric, suppressed gravitational constant, elevated vacuum energy density, and enlarged Planck scales place the Schwarzschild boundary at an exceptionally small radius, making curvature collapse difficult to initiate.

As the bubble descends into lower-energy sectors, the causal speed increases, the gravitational constant strengthens, the vacuum energy density relaxes, and the Planck scales contract, causing the Schwarzschild radius to grow progressively larger. When an excitation in any given sector is compressed past its local Schwarzschild radius—small in Alpha-1, larger in its descendants—it exceeds the curvature-support capacity of that sector's geometric fabric and produces a microscopic Schwarzschild-bounded puncture. This puncture manifests as a transient wormhole-like tunnel, momentarily linking the over-focussed excitation to the adjacent sector. This is a cross-sector interaction.

Other cross-sector interactions include resonances and extremely short-lived particles in a lower-dimensional and lower-energy detector's sector. These include muons and taus (representing second and third generations of standard model particles) that can only be detected in high energy environments. These are echoes or ricochets of particles manifesting in higher-dimensional and higher-energy sectors during focussing in those sectors.

Thus, laboratory measurement protocols, detector architectures, and engineered amplification systems do not collapse anything. They determine how a multiversal excitation is processed to produce an "image" that is congruent to the sector's dimensional structure and energy level. They determine whether the multiversal excitation appears as a delocalized non-classical (Type-NC) relational excitation (under ultra-weak focussing), a wave phenomenon (under weak focussing), a classical soliton (under strong focussing), or a microscopic black hole (under ultra-strong focussing). There is no final collapse. There are only graded focussing regimes corresponding to different stages of manifestation of the same multiversal excitation.

- *Experimental Support*

Laboratory physics provides strong support for the ingredients of the BB ontology, though not for Domain 2 itself. Stabilization, entanglement topology, symmetry breaking, and phase transitions are all well-established experimentally. In the pre-geometric formulation, these correspond to geometric stabilization, non-metric adjacency, structural phase selection, and relational reconfiguration. These experiments do not probe Domain 2 directly; they reveal how Domain 3 retains faint relational signatures of its pre-geometric origin. We have no direct access to pre-geometric factorization, the event that produces the first bubble. This is expected, because Domain 2 is non-geometric and Domain 3 experiments can only probe geometric projections of pre-geometric processes. Vacuum decay, bubble nucleation in field theory, and Kibble–Zurek defect formation are geometric analogues rather than pre-geometric instantiations. Sectorization or classicality, in the BB model, is the regime in which the relational vacuum has become fully stabilized into a persistent geometric manifold, with fixed dimensionality, rigid vacuum structure, and durable causal ordering. It is the completion of geometric induction.

Every laboratory measurement is a local geometric stabilization event rather than a miniature universe-creation event. It forms a classical pocket inside an already instantiated bubble whose global structure is fixed. The relational fibers in such regions are already fully geometrized and cannot revert to a pre-geometric state during the lifetime of the multiverse. Laboratory stabilization (Q: due to decoherence) is therefore

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

sectorization or classicalization inside a bubble, not bubble nucleation. The BB ontology distinguishes sharply between pre-geometric instantiation, which produces the first bubble, and geometric instantiation, which produces classical pockets within an existing bubble.

- *Domain 2 as the Compiler of Classical Reality*

Figuratively speaking, Domain 2 can be considered the compiler layer of reality. It is where the abstract structures of Domain 1 acquire the coherence and compatibility required for geometric induction. Domain 3 is the execution environment of that compilation, the classical, decohered, geometric world. In Domain 2, combinatorial structures acquire relational weightings, weightings acquire coherence, coherence acquires non-metric adjacency, adjacency acquires stability, and stability acquires geometric expression. This is the ontological gradient from mathematics to physics. Domain 2 is where the simplicial complex becomes the topological base of inducibility, the polytope becomes the kinematic arena for relational compatibility, and the time-crystal becomes the constraint on allowable transitions. Domain 3 is the geometric instantiation of these structures, the place where classical records form, spacetime emerges, and matter fields appear as excitations of induced relational fibers. Domain 2 therefore functions as a structural compiler, the pre-geometric vacuum in which relational configurations are prepared for geometric induction, where the first bubble nucleates, and where the lineage of universes begins.

Domain 2 relations are fluid, non-metric, and capable of reorganizing. Domain 3 relations are locked into a specific vacuum configuration. In Domain 2, dimensionality is latent. In Domain 3, dimensionality becomes fixed. In Domain 2, the vacuum manifold is a *potential* structure. In Domain 3, it becomes a *realized* geometric manifold. In Domain 2, nothing can be recorded—there is no geometry, no time, no persistence. In Domain 3, persistent records exist, i.e., structures that remain stable long enough to define history.

- *Domain 3 – Geometric Manifold*

Domain 3 is the domain in which geometry, time, matter, and causality become fully realized. It arises from a geometric induction event: the moment when a stable relational configuration in Domain 2 becomes capable of supporting a persistent geometric manifold. In the quantum-mechanical analogy, this corresponds to a factorization of a Hilbert space into a stable subsystem and its environment. This induction event is the first and only true instantiation event in the local multiversal lineage. All subsequent structure—every lower-dimensional universe, every vacuum branch, every internal bubble—arises within this first induced geometry through symmetry breaking, dimensional descent, rotational acceleration, and increasing stabilization.

A bubble in Domain 3 is simply a region in which relational variability has been reduced sufficiently to support geometric structure. Even the slightest stabilization is enough to define a bubble wall. At the formation of the first bubble, the relational vacuum of Domain 2 acquires a stable manifold, a coherent vacuum configuration, and a persistent causal ordering. These are not independent phenomena; they are different expressions of the same induction event. *The local BB multiverse is therefore a lineage, not a spatial ensemble.* It is a single induced geometry undergoing continuous symmetry breaking, progressive dimensional reorganization, rotational spin-up, and a monotonic increase in stabilization. All descendant universes inherit the same relational substrate and the same induced geometric framework. They differ only in the degree of stabilization, the dimensionality of their vacuum manifolds, and the internal symmetries that remain unbroken.

Stabilization is the structural process that governs the emergence and differentiation of Domain 3. In Domain 2, relations fluctuate freely because no vacuum manifold exists to anchor them. The induction of the first bubble imposes a coherent relational structure that acts as an attractor within the configuration space of the substrate. Stabilization refers to the progressive narrowing of this configuration space as the manifold becomes increasingly constrained. Symmetry breaking removes degrees of freedom, dimensional descent reduces the number of curvature directions available to the manifold, and the contraction of the bubble increases its geometric rigidity. Conservation of angular momentum forces the bubble to rotate more rapidly as its radius decreases, and this rotational acceleration produces gyroscopic stabilization: the faster the rotation, the greater the resistance to perturbations in the orientation, curvature, and internal symmetry structure of the vacuum manifold. Rotational dynamics therefore reinforce, rather than oppose, the metric stabilization gradient. The combined effects of vacuum induction, symmetry breaking, dimensional descent, bubble contraction, and gyroscopic rigidity produce a monotonic increase in metric stabilization as the multiverse evolves.

Domain 3 therefore exhibits a metric stabilization gradient, which appears in the quantum-mechanical analogy as a decoherence gradient. The first induced universe—the eleven-dimensional bubble—is purely spatial and only weakly stabilized metrically. As dimensional descent proceeds, the next four phases (ten-, nine-, eight-, and seven-dimensional) form high-dimensional, low-stability geometric regimes that still closely reflect the coherence of Domain 2. Below these lie the induced universes governed by the exceptional symmetry E6: the six-, five-, four-, and three-dimensional phases, together with their CP-offset partners. These represent progressively more metrically stabilized geometric configurations. The six- and five-dimensional phases are macroscopically semiclassical; the four- and three-dimensional phases—including our own—are fully macroscopically classical. Outside all bubbles, stabilization is zero, and no geometry exists.

Only the first eleven-dimensional bubble is produced by a genuine instantiation event. All subsequent universes arise internally, as reorganizations of the same induced geometry. As the bubble rotates, contracts, stabilizes, and

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

undergoes dimensional descent, its internal symmetry groups reorganize the vacuum manifold. The exceptional group E6 contains multiple degenerate minima corresponding to distinct induced vacua. When the vacuum manifold branches, each minimum becomes a distinct geometric region with its own dimensionality, chirality, and gauge structure. These regions behave like bubbles in the geometric sense but do not constitute new instantiation events. They remain embedded within the same induced geometry and share the same underlying relational substrate.

The multiverse that emerges inside the first bubble is therefore a bubble-in-bubble hierarchy, but not a sequence of independent creations. Each internal universe is a bubble of symmetry breaking, not a bubble of factorization. All these bubbles coexist within the same induced geometry, and their interactions are governed by the degree of stabilization that separates their internal regions. Stabilization is the underlying principle that organizes this hierarchy, determines the classicality of each sector, and governs the phenomenology of time, coherence, and causality across the entire multiversal lineage.

- *General Architecture of the Multiverse*

A bubble wall in Domain 3 is a transition region of finite thickness separating two geometric phases whose induced vacuum configurations differ in dimensionality, symmetry, or stability. It is not a material surface, nor a discontinuity in spacetime, but a boundary in the induced vacuum manifold. Distinct vacua correspond to distinct minima of the relational potential inherited from Domain 2; because these minima represent incompatible geometric organizations of the same underlying relational substrate, they cannot mix. Crossing from one vacuum to another requires traversing a structural barrier in the vacuum manifold, and once a transition occurs, the induced causal structure ensures that adjacent vacua remain dynamically isolated.

The first bubble wall marks the moment when geometry becomes possible. At this boundary, the pre-geometric relational substrate of Domain 2 undergoes a coordinated induction: a vacuum manifold is selected, a relational fiber structure becomes meaningful, and a connection encoding gauge structure emerges. These three elements appear simultaneously because they are different manifestations of the same induction event. The vacuum manifold becomes the base space of the induced geometry; the relational fibers become the internal degrees of freedom associated with each point; and the connection becomes the rule governing parallel transport, local interactions, and the evolution of induced structures.

The ancestor bubble contains the entire induced relational architecture compatible with its vacuum manifold. All geometric phases that can arise in its lineage—higher-dimensional remnants, CP-offset partners, and lower-dimensional universes—are encoded within this initial structure. As the bubble undergoes dimensional descent, the base manifold is reshaped while the relational fiber remains intact, and the connection is modified as the symmetry group breaks and decomposes. The bubble's internal history—its rotation, stabilization, dimensional contraction, and vacuum branching—is expressed as a continuous deformation of the same induced geometric structure that emerged at the first bubble wall.

Nested bubble universes arise naturally during dimensional descent as stabilization increases, vacuum energy decreases, and rotational compression reorganizes the geometry. Each descendant universe inherits the same relational substrate and the same induced geometric framework, differing only in the degree of stabilization and the pattern of symmetry breaking. No new relational bundles are created, nor is the fundamental relationship between base manifold and fiber altered; the entire multiversal lineage unfolds within the single induced architecture established at the first bubble wall.

In this framework, the multiverse is not a collection of independent creations, but a hierarchy of induced vacua nested within a single ancestral geometry. The bubble-in-bubble structure is real, but it is a structure of vacua within vacua, not a structure of separate origins. The first bubble is the only true instantiation event; all subsequent universes are emergent domains within the same induced relational geometry.

- *Dual Stabilization Gradients*

Stabilization is the dynamical process that governs how relational coherence is distributed across the bubbles of the BB multiverse. It does not eliminate bubbles, collapse dimensions, or extinguish higher-dimensional universes. All descendant bubbles—10D, 9D, 8D, 7D, 6D, 5D, 4D, and 3D—remain fully physical spacetimes with their own extended geometries, matter content, and internal dynamics. What stabilization regulates is not existence but relational accessibility: the degree to which one bubble can maintain coherent overlap with another.

Dimensional descent does not remove dimensions; it compactifies them. A bubble described as “3D” is not literally three-dimensional. It possesses the full dimensional stack inherited from the ancestor bubble, but only three curvature directions remain dynamically active. The remaining directions are flattened or compactified relative to that bubble's curvature budget. From the perspective of a 10D bubble, those same directions remain fully extended. Stabilization therefore acts differently in each bubble, depending on which directions are active and which are suppressed. It is a relational process, not a geometric deletion.

Because all bubbles share the same full-dimensional relational substrate inherited from the ancestor bubble, they also share the same induced connection and the same stabilization partition. This shared substrate ensures that bubbles are never strictly orthogonal. Even bubbles with different active dimensionalities retain a residual relational overlap mediated by their compactified directions. However, the degree of overlap depends on how their active curvature bases and induced connections align. As the bubble descends into vacua with fewer dynamically active dimensions, the induced geometry changes, and the relational basis rotates. This rotation suppresses overlap, but it does not eliminate it. Stabilization therefore produces a graded hierarchy of relational accessibility, not a binary separation.

CP-reversed bubble pairs within the same dimensional level retain the strongest relational alignment. A 6D bubble and its CP-reversed partner 6D′, a 5D bubble and 5D′, a 4D bubble and 4D′, and the 3D pair Alpha-1 and Alpha-2 all share the same active dimensional structure, the same curvature basis, and the same compactified geometry. They differ only by CP reversal and a small vacuum-energy offset. As a result, these pairs exhibit the highest degree of relational coherence and support limited but genuine interactions such as gravitational leakage, kinetic mixing, and parity-dependent portal couplings. Their relational alignment is dynamic: as both bubbles rotate, the parity offset can increase, decrease, or momentarily vanish, modulating the strength of their interactions.

Bubbles belonging to different dimensional levels—such as a 10D bubble and a 4D bubble—retain only the residual overlap mediated by their compactified directions. Their active curvature bases differ, and their induced connections are misaligned, so their relational overlap is suppressed to the point of effective isolation. They remain fully active universes, but their interactions with the 3D bubble become faint as stabilization strengthens. This suppression is not a sign of ontological separation but a consequence of the relational narrowing that accompanies dimensional descent.

The stabilization gradient is not a single quantity but the superposition of two independent stability gradients (dimensional and metrical) that evolve in opposite directions during dimensional descent.

➢ *Vacuum-Energy–Driven Dimensional Stability (Casimir-Dominated)*

At high vacuum energy, the density of allowable modes is large and Casimir-like stresses strongly repel curvature directions. This produces high dimensional stability. As a result, curvature directions remain sharply separated, dimensional identity is rigid, dimensional compactification is suppressed, and relational overlap is tightly constrained.

This stability applies to the dimensional scaffold, not to the metric. Even though dimensional identity is rigid, the metric is stiff and highly sensitive to perturbations, so curvature fluctuations are large and geodesics diverge rapidly. High dimensional stability therefore coexists with low metric stability.

As vacuum energy falls, Casimir stresses weaken and dimensional stability decreases. Curvature directions begin to merge, compactified directions soften, and dimensional descent proceeds. The dimensional stability gradient therefore *falls* monotonically with decreasing vacuum energy.

➢ *Matter-Driven Metric Stability (Gravity-Dominated)*

As vacuum energy decreases, the effective gravitational coupling increases and matter becomes dynamically relevant. The manifold becomes “softer” and hence, more deformable, curvature becomes classical and smooth, and geodesics converge rather than diverge. This produces high metric stability. As a result, curvature fluctuations diminish, gravitational time dilation becomes bounded, the causal structure becomes predictable, and classical trajectories emerge. Metric stability therefore rises as vacuum energy falls, complementing the decline in dimensional stability.

➢ *Overall Stabilization Gradient*

The overall stabilization gradient is the net effect of these two opposing stability gradients: Dimensional stability (Casimir-dominated) decreases during descent. However, metric stability (gravity-dominated) increases during descent. Because these gradients act on different structural features of the manifold, the multiverse remains globally stable throughout dimensional descent. High-vacuum bubbles are dimensionally rigid but metrically chaotic. Low-vacuum bubbles are dimensionally fluid but metrically classical. The transition between these regimes is smooth because the weakening of Casimir stabilization is compensated by the strengthening of gravitational stabilization. Hence, the stabilization gradients are complementary, resulting in an even overall stability. This is underpinned by gyroscopic stabilization due to increased rotational rates during dimensional descent.

➢ *Stabilization as the Organizer of the Bubble Hierarchy*

In this framework, stabilization is a mechanism by which bubbles are allowed to *coexist* while maintaining the degree of relational isolation necessary for their internal stability. It organizes the multiverse into a hierarchy of bubbles with varying degrees of coherence, ensuring that each bubble retains its own dynamical identity while remaining connected—however weakly—to the others through the shared relational substrate.

Stabilization is therefore the principle that allows the BB multiverse to contain many fully active universes within a single ancestor bubble, each differentiated by dimensional activation, symmetry structure, and CP orientation, yet all bound together by a common relational lineage. The dual stability gradients—vacuum-energy–driven dimensional stability and matter-driven metric stability—are the mechanisms that regulate this hierarchy across the entire descent from S10 to the classical 3D universe.

Stabilization—analogous to decoherence—acts as a dynamical filter. As the bubble descends through vacua with fewer active dimensions, the stabilization partition becomes increasingly selective about which relational configurations can remain mutually coherent. Higher-dimensional, CP-reversed, and dark-sector bubbles become progressively isolated, not because they are removed from the relational

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

fiber, but because the induced geometry can no longer support strong relational overlap between them. Despite this suppression, cross-bubble interactions never vanish entirely as long as the bubble hierarchy remains embedded within a single relational substrate.

In this framework, stabilization is not the mechanism by which bubbles disappear. It is the mechanism by which bubbles *coexist* while maintaining the degree of relational isolation necessary for their internal stability. It organizes the multiverse into a hierarchy of bubbles with varying degrees of coherence, ensuring that each bubble retains its own dynamical identity while remaining connected—however weakly—to the others through the shared relational substrate. Stabilization is therefore the principle that allows the BB multiverse to contain many fully active universes within a single ancestor bubble, each differentiated by dimensional activation, symmetry structure, and CP orientation, yet all bound together by a common relational lineage.

➤ *Dimensional Transmutation and the Apparent 1D Limit at High Instability*

Dimensional transmutation is the process by which the curvature structure of a bubble reorganizes as it moves through vacua with different vacuum energy densities. It is not a deletion of dimensions but a redistribution of dynamical activity across the full inherited dimensional stack. During dimensional descent, the active curvature directions contract, merge, or flatten relative to the bubble's curvature budget, while the compactified directions remain present but dynamically suppressed. This redistribution is governed by the dual stability gradients: the vacuum-energy–driven dimensional stability gradient, which falls as Casimir stresses weaken, and the matter-driven metric stability gradient, which rises as gravitational coupling strengthens. Their interplay determines how the manifold behaves at different scales and why certain theoretical frameworks report apparently contradictory dimensional behavior.

In the high-vacuum S10 regime, dimensional stability is maximal. Casimir-like stresses strongly repel curvature directions, maintaining a rigid and sharply defined dimensional scaffold. At the same time, metric stability is minimal. The metric is stiff, curvature fluctuations are large, and geodesics diverge rapidly. However, this metrical instability does not destabilize the S10 bubble because the sector contains almost no organized matter. The gravitational constant is extremely small, matter density is negligible, and the excitations present are high-energy, collisionless particle-waves that do not bind or aggregate. With no structures to tear apart, metrical instability has no macroscopic consequences. The S10 bubble is therefore dynamically wild but structurally safe: dimensionally rigid, metrically unstable, and matter-free.

This behavior provides a natural explanation for why some theoretical frameworks predict that spacetime becomes effectively one-dimensional at extremely small scales. These include approaches such as causal dynamical triangulations, asymptotic safety, and certain interpretations attributed to Feynman report that the manifold behaves as if it collapses to a single effective dimension in the ultraviolet. In the BB multiverse, this "1D limit" is not a literal reduction of dimensionality. It is the signature of collapsing metric stability in a regime where the light cone narrows, the metric signature approaches Euclidean form, and geodesics lose coherence. The manifold behaves effectively one-dimensional because the causal structure cannot support a full Lorentzian geometry when metric stability is minimal. This is a metrical effect, not a dimensional one.

By contrast, theories such as M-theory predict that spacetime becomes higher-dimensional at small scales. These theories are detecting the opposite gradient: the high dimensional stability of the S10 regime, where vacuum energy is large, Casimir stresses are strong, and the full curvature manifold is dynamically available. In this view, the ultraviolet is high-dimensional because the dimensional scaffold is rigid and fully extended. Both perspectives are correct once the distinction between dimensional and metric stability is made explicit. Theories that see many dimensions are detecting the rigidity of the dimensional scaffold; theories that see one dimension are detecting the collapse of metric stability.

Dimensional transmutation reconciles these observations. As a bubble descends from S10 toward E3 (our 3D universe), the dimensional stability gradient falls and the metric stability gradient rises. The manifold transitions from a regime where dimensional identity is rigid, but the metric is unstable, to a regime where dimensional identity is fluid, but the metric is classical and smooth. The apparent 1D behavior arises only in the transitional zone where dimensional stability remains high but metric stability is minimal. It is the shadow cast by the reorganization of curvature directions as the bubble moves through vacua with decreasing vacuum energy.

In this framework, the "1D limit" is not a fundamental property of spacetime but a transient expression of the instability that accompanies dimensional transmutation. It marks the point where the manifold can no longer sustain a coherent Lorentzian structure but has not yet entered the gravity-dominated regime where classical curvature emerges. *The BB multiverse therefore provides a unified interpretation of the ultraviolet behavior reported across disparate theoretical approaches*: the manifold appears high-dimensional when dimensional stability dominates, appears one-dimensional when metric stability collapses, and becomes three-dimensional when gravitational coupling becomes strong enough to stabilize curvature and define classical causal structure.

- *Sector Creation*

The first bubble emerges as an eleven-dimensional Euclidean spatial manifold with maximal symmetry Spin(11). At this stage, the geometry is purely spatial and fully coherent: all eleven curvature directions are dynamically supported by the vacuum, and the relational substrate is capable of sustaining a maximally symmetric configuration. Within this manifold, a single real direction becomes distinguished, leaving a ten-dimensional orthogonal complement. This decomposition does not break the geometry but prepares it for the emergence of additional structure.

On the ten-dimensional orthogonal sector, an almost-complex structure J arises, satisfying $J^2 = -\mathbb{1}$. This endows the 10-D subspace with the structure of a complex 5-space $\mathbb{C}^5$, while the full 11-D manifold remains real and Euclidean. The presence of J refines the effective symmetry from Spin(11) to Spin(10), and then to a unitary structure acting complex-linearly on $\mathbb{C}^5$. This SU(5)-like stage is not a gauge symmetry but a geometric coherence condition: it expresses the fact that the vacuum now organizes its ten spatial directions into five complex pairs. This almost-complex structure will later seed the internal complex representation space on which E6 acts.

As rotation increases and vacuum energy falls, the bubble enters a regime in which dimensionality becomes dynamical. Dimensionality is not a fixed attribute but a measure of how many independent curvature directions the vacuum can stably support. As the bubble spins faster, one spatial direction at a time becomes dynamically unstable and is pulled out of the geometric sector. The effective symmetry correspondingly reduces from Spin(10,1) to Spin(9,1), then to Spin(8,1), and finally to Spin(7,1). These transitions do not represent new bubbles or new induced domains. They are successive vacuum phases of the same bubble, each characterized by a reduced number of effective spatial directions.

The 9D, 8D, and 7D phases are not subgroup embeddings inside Spin(11) but the residual symmetries that remain after rotational shear and geometric stabilization eliminate one curvature direction at a time. Each reduction corresponds to the loss of a geometric degree of freedom, not the loss of relational content. Throughout this process, the underlying relational substrate retains its full capacity, including the latent structure associated with the higher-dimensional phases. What changes is the base manifold: it contracts as independent curvature directions collapse, while the relational fiber remains intact. The connection adapts continuously to the reduced symmetry group, so the transitions from Spin(10,1) to Spin(9,1), Spin(8,1), and Spin(7,1) appear as smooth deformations of the same induced geometric architecture.

The seven-dimensional phase is special. It is the final high-dimensional, high-coherence regime before the internal E6 symmetry begins to dominate the vacuum structure. This 7D phase lies within the S10 sector and exhibits a transitional geometry: the entanglement network is still coherent enough to support a large symmetry group yet sufficiently stabilized to allow the vacuum manifold to reorganize. The almost-complex structure on the earlier 10-D sector now plays a crucial role. As the geometric manifold contracts, the complex pairing encoded by J does not disappear; instead, it migrates from geometry into the internal relational (Q: Hilbert) fibers. The 10-D complex structure $\mathbb{C}^5$ focusses into a 6+4 split, with the 4-D internal complex sector $\mathbb{C}^2$ becoming part of the internal representation space of the fields.

As rotation continues and vacuum energy falls further, the bubble undergoes a final geometric contraction, producing a six-dimensional spacetime whose internal structure is governed by E6. This 6D bubble is not a new factorization; it is the next phase of the same bubble, now with symmetry Spin(6,1) × E6. Its emergence marks the shift from geometric contraction to algebraic differentiation: the geometry has reached its stable six-dimensional form, and the internal complex structure inherited from the earlier almost-complex geometry now manifests as the algebraic degrees of freedom on which E6 acts.

In the six-dimensional phase, the internal E6 symmetry acts on the relational fibers of the induced geometry, organizing their internal degrees of freedom and determining how the vacuum manifold branches into multiple minima. These minima correspond to distinct induced sectors—ordinary, dark, CP-offset, and dimensionally shifted—that coexist within the same bubble as different stabilized configurations of a single relational substrate. The base manifold now reflects the six-dimensional geometry of the dominant vacuum, but the relational fiber retains the full E6 structure, including latent higher-dimensional remnants and the lower-dimensional vacua that will emerge as symmetry breaking proceeds. As the symmetry reduces, the induced connection reorganizes accordingly, decomposing into components associated with the unbroken subgroups of E6 and acquiring new curvature terms that encode the evolving structure of the vacuum manifold.

As the bubble descends from six to five, four, and finally three spatial dimensions, the base manifold continues to contract, and the internal connection reorganizes at each stage. Every reduction corresponds to a refinement of the connection, which encodes the surviving gauge structure and the relational pathways permitted by the new geometric constraints. The underlying relational substrate remains unchanged, but its internal articulation becomes increasingly elaborate as the vacuum manifold develops additional minima. The sectors that emerge during this process are not new bundles or new ontological layers; they are distinct configurations of the same relational content, distinguished by stabilization and anchored by the geometry of the contracting base manifold. The connection thus becomes the dynamical record of the bubble's internal evolution, encoding the sequence of symmetry breakings and the relationships among the resulting sectors.

E6 is not merely an internal gauge symmetry; it is the geometric organizer of the bubble's relational degrees of freedom. It determines how the vacuum can branch, how dimensionality can reduce, and how CP-related sectors can coexist within the same induced domain. The E6 vacuum manifold contains multiple degenerate minima, including

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

CP-reversed partners that arise naturally because E6 contains complex representations whose conjugate sectors define mirrored vacua with reversed chirality, parity, or charge assignments.

In the six-dimensional phase, these CP-reversed vacua coexist with the primary vacuum. They share the same stabilization partition and the same geometric embedding, and therefore remain capable of limited interaction through gravitational, scalar, or kinetic-mixing channels. Their coexistence is not an artifact of branching but a structural feature of the E6 manifold itself, preserved until further dimensional descent isolates the sectors into distinct geometric domains.

In this model, increasing rotation and decreasing vacuum-energy density naturally initiate a continuous sequence of symmetry-reducing transitions that produce smaller geometric bubbles within the original bubble. These "smaller bubbles" are not new relational factors and not new fibers in the relational fiber bundle. They are internal geometric domains—lower-dimensional, symmetry-reduced vacua such as 6D, 5D, 4D, 3D, and their CP-reversed partners—formed as successive phases of the same relational lineage.

Rotation plays the geometric role: as it increases, anisotropies are amplified and higher-symmetry configurations become unstable. Certain relational directions become progressively suppressed, causing extended dimensions to collapse and driving the system toward vacua with fewer effective geometric directions. This enhances stabilization. Falling vacuum energy plays the structural role: as it decreases, the E6 vacuum manifold is reshaped from a broad, shallow landscape into one with multiple distinct minima. This restructuring makes vacuum branching and sector formation dynamically possible. Rotation prepares the geometry; falling vacuum energy prepares the vacuum manifold. Together, they trigger continuous symmetry breaking into smaller internal geometric bubbles, each representing a new induced geometric phase of the same underlying relational structure.

Within the six-dimensional E6 bubble, the internal symmetry begins to differentiate. The E6 manifold contains multiple branches—including CP-reversed partners—and these branches correspond to distinct lower-dimensional vacua. As the symmetry breaks, the bubble's geometry reorganizes into a family of coexisting sectors: a 6D vacuum and its CP-reversed counterpart, a 5D vacuum and its CP-reversed counterpart, a 4D vacuum and its CP-reversed counterpart, and finally a 3D vacuum and its CP-reversed counterpart. This produces a hierarchical suite of sectors, all descending from the same E6-structured bubble.

These sectors are not separate bubbles and do not arise from new factorizations. They are internal phases of a single induced domain, stabilized by the same partition and embedded within the same relational substrate. Because they share a common geometric origin, they retain the possibility of limited interaction through gravitational coupling, scalar mixing, gauge-kinetic channels, or string-level interactions. These interactions are typically suppressed but not eliminated, providing the physical basis for the ordinary–dark interplay observed in the lower-dimensional universes. As dimensionality decreases and stabilization strengthens, the interactions become progressively weaker, eventually leaving the sectors effectively isolated while still sharing a common ancestry within the original E6 bubble.

Dimensional descent continues until the bubble reaches its minimum stable dimensionality. In this framework, the lowest dimensionality capable of supporting a stable vacuum manifold is three spatial dimensions. Below this threshold, the vacuum cannot sustain curvature directions, and the entanglement network collapses due to the depletion of the vacuum energy budget (refer to the sub-section on vacuum energy budget below). Thus, the 3D universe is the final stage of dimensional descent, the endpoint of the symmetry-breaking cascade that began in the eleven-dimensional spatial bubble. All lower-dimensional universes, including the 3D one, are internal phases of the same original bubble, not separate bubbles produced by further factorizations.

The multiverse therefore begins with a single structural factorization. Everything that follows—dimensional descent, vacuum branching, sector formation, and the emergence of internal geometric bubbles—arises from the internal relational dynamics of symmetry breaking within the bubble. When the final geometric partition collapses, the entire lineage returns to the pre-geometric vacuum, completing the cycle from mathematical possibility to geometric instantiation and back to relational coherence (refer to the section on multiverse dissolution below for more details).

- *Limited Interactions Between Bubbles*

The ten-dimensional, nine-dimensional, eight-dimensional, and seven-dimensional vacua are fully active macroscopic universes that coexist with the 3D sector inside the same bubble. Their spatial dimensions remain large and extended, and they contain the majority of matter in the multiverse—approximately seventy percent of the total matter budget in the observable "universe." Dimensional descent does not collapse or erase these higher-dimensional universes. Instead, it determines which vacua are dynamically accessible to a given sector. The fact that our sector has descended into a 3D-dominant configuration does not imply that the higher-dimensional vacua have ceased to exist; it only implies that our relational access to them has become suppressed.

All vacua in the BB multiverse share the same full-dimensional relational substrate inherited from the 11D ancestor bubble. The difference between a "3D vacuum" and a "10D vacuum" is not the number of dimensions that exist, but the number of dimensions that are dynamically active within that sector. The remaining directions are compactified or flattened only from the perspective of the lower-dimensional vacuum. From the perspective of the higher-dimensional vacua themselves, these directions

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

remain fully extended. Thus, the S10-S7 vacua are not latent structures within an E6 manifold; they are physical universes with their own macroscopic geometry, matter content, and dynamical evolution.

The E6 manifold emerges only at the 6D phase and organizes the 6D (Delta), 5D (Gamma), 4D (Beta), and 3D (Alpha) vacua into CP-reversed pairs with specific gauge structures, chirality assignments, and symmetry-breaking pathways. The higher-dimensional vacua (10D–7D) do not share the E6 manifold; they precede it. What they share with the E6-organized vacua is the deeper relational substrate from which E6 emerges. This substrate includes the full dimensional stack, the induced connection inherited from the 11D ancestor, and the stabilization partition that governs relational coherence across all vacua. In this sense, the dark sector is not limited to the CP-reversed partner of the 3D vacuum but includes the entire family of coexisting vacua that descend from the relational substrate, including the fully active 10D, 9D, 8D, and 7D universes.

Within a single bubble, the coexistence of multiple vacua allows for limited but physically meaningful interactions between sectors that might otherwise appear isolated. These interactions are possible because all vacua share the same relational fiber, the same stabilization partition, and the same induced geometric embedding. As long as the bubble remains a single coherent relational entity, its internal vacua are not separated by factorization boundaries. There is therefore no fundamental prohibition against cross-vacuum couplings.

The degree of interaction is determined by three factors: the structure of the symmetry governing the vacuum (Spin(10) to Spin(7) for the higher-dimensional vacua, E6 for the 6D to 3D vacua), the geometry of the vacuum manifold, and the progressive action of stabilization as the effective dimensionality decreases. Stabilization gradually restricts which relational configurations can remain mutually coherent. As the bubble descends into vacua with fewer dynamically active dimensions, the relational adjacency network becomes increasingly constrained, and cross-vacuum couplings become progressively suppressed. Yet they never vanish entirely as long as all vacua remain embedded within the same relational fiber and share the same geometric induction.

Ordinary–dark interactions originate in the fact that the relational substrate contains multiple degenerate minima, each corresponding to a distinct vacuum with its own gauge structure, chirality, and CP orientation. Because these minima coexist within the same bubble, fields associated with one vacuum can mix with fields associated with another, provided the relevant operators are allowed by the unbroken symmetries. In the early stages of the bubble's evolution, when many dimensions are dynamically active and stabilization is weak, the entanglement network is sufficiently coherent to permit a wide range of portal mechanisms. These include gravitational couplings mediated by the shared metric, gauge kinetic mixing between U(1) factors inherited from the symmetry chain, scalar portals arising from shared components of the symmetry-breaking fields, and string-level interactions reflecting the common geometric origin of all vacua. In this regime, ordinary matter and its dark counterparts are not sharply separated; they are different excitations of the same underlying geometric and algebraic structure.

As dimensional descent proceeds, the situation changes. Each reduction in effective dimensionality corresponds to a strengthening of stabilization, a narrowing of the vacuum manifold, and a loss of coherence in the entanglement network. The higher-dimensional vacua remain fully active universes, but their interactions with the 3D sector become increasingly suppressed. Portal interactions that were once unsuppressed become progressively weaker, not because the vacua have become separate bubbles, but because stabilization has reduced the overlap of their relational structures.

Stabilization (Q: decoherence) acts as a dynamical filter. As the bubble descends through vacua with fewer active dimensions, the stabilization partition becomes increasingly selective about which relational configurations can remain mutually coherent. Higher-dimensional, CP-reversed, and dark-sector configurations become progressively isolated, not because they are removed from the relational fiber, but because the induced geometry can no longer support strong relational overlap between them. Despite this suppression, cross-vacuum interactions never vanish entirely as long as the bubble remains a single relational fiber.

Gravity remains the most universal portal, since all vacua couple to the same underlying geometry. Gauge kinetic mixing persists wherever U(1) factors survive the symmetry-breaking chain, though the mixing parameters become increasingly small as stabilization strengthens. Scalar portals remain possible through shared components of the symmetry-breaking fields, though their influence diminishes as the vacuum manifold narrows. Even string-level interactions, though heavily suppressed, remain possible in principle because the vacua share a common geometric ancestry.

In the BB model, the dark sector is not a separate universe but a family of coexisting vacua whose interactions with the ordinary matter 3D universe are governed by the interplay of symmetry, geometry, and stabilization. The higher-dimensional universes, the CP-reversed partners of the lower-dimensional vacua, and the intermediate sectors produced during dimensional descent all contribute to the dark sector's structure. Their influence is modulated by stabilization, which gradually suppresses cross-vacuum couplings as the bubble evolves, but never eliminates them entirely. The result is a multiverse contained within a single bubble, unified by a common relational substrate, differentiated by dimensional descent, and interconnected by a network of portal mechanisms whose strength reflects the bubble's internal coherence. Ordinary matter and dark matter are therefore not fundamentally separate; they are different expressions of the same underlying entanglement

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

geometry, linked by the residual interactions that survive the long descent from eleven spatial dimensions to the three-dimensional universe we observe.

* *The Role of the Relational-Fiber Bundle*

In the BB ontology, the structure that unifies the entire multiverse is an induced relational-fiber architecture (Q: Hilbert fiber bundle architecture) that emerges at the moment the first bubble becomes geometrically possible. This structure is not tied to the number of bubbles, nor does it depend on repeated factorizations. Instead, it expresses how local relational degrees of freedom are organized over an induced geometric manifold. Because the entire multiverse resides inside a single, continuously evolving bubble, the relational-fiber framework becomes the natural language for describing how internal degrees of freedom are distributed across the bubble's geometry as it undergoes dimensional descent. The base manifold expresses the currently realized geometry. The relational fiber encodes the full internal structure inherited from Domain 2. The connection records the evolving gauge structure as symmetries break.

Dimensional descent reshapes the base; symmetry breaking reorganizes the fiber; stabilization modulates the connection. Yet the underlying relational-fiber architecture persists unchanged. It is the single mathematical object that contains the entire bubble-in-bubble multiverse, binding all geometric phases and all vacuum sectors into a coherent whole. The evolution of the bubble is therefore the evolution of its induced relational structure—a continuous deformation of its base, fiber, and connection that preserves the unity of the underlying substrate while allowing a rich internal multiverse to unfold.

Dimensional descent does not alter the fundamental role of the relational fiber. When the bubble contracts from ten to nine, eight, and seven spatial dimensions, the base manifold shrinks accordingly, but the fiber remains the same: each point in the reduced-dimensional manifold still carries the full relational content of the bubble. The higher-dimensional phases do not disappear; they become latent structures encoded in the fiber, preserved as internal degrees of freedom even after their geometric directions collapse. In this sense, the relational-fiber architecture provides the mechanism by which the bubble "remembers" its higher-dimensional ancestry. The 10D, 9D, 8D, and 7D universes persist as internal sectors of the fiber, even though they no longer appear as extended geometric directions in the base.

The emergence of the six-dimensional E6 vacuum marks a transition not in the fiber itself but in the internal symmetry acting on the fiber. The E6 symmetry organizes the internal degrees of freedom and determines how the vacuum manifold branches into multiple minima—ordinary, dark, CP-offset, and dimensionally shifted sectors. These sectors correspond to distinct stable configurations of the same relational fiber, not to separate base manifolds. The relational-fiber architecture therefore becomes the framework in which all universes—ordinary, dark, CP-offset, and higher-dimensional remnants—coexist as different excitations of a single underlying structure. The base manifold provides the geometric stage; the fiber encodes the full multiverse of internal vacua.

Stabilization (Q: decoherence) plays a central role in determining how strongly different sectors of the fiber can interact. In the early, high-dimensional phases, stabilization is weak, and the relational fibers retain significant coherence across the base manifold. This allows degrees of freedom associated with different E6 vacua to mix, producing the portal-like interactions that link ordinary matter to its dark counterparts. As dimensional descent proceeds and stabilization strengthens, the fibers become more sharply localized within their respective vacuum minima, and cross-sector couplings become increasingly suppressed. Yet the relational-fiber architecture ensures that these couplings never vanish entirely, because all sectors remain embedded in the same underlying structure. Stabilization therefore modulates the strength of interactions without altering the unity of the relational substrate.

The relational-fiber framework is thus the mathematical structure that allows a single bubble to contain an entire hierarchy of universes, each with its own dimensionality, symmetry, and CP orientation, without requiring additional pre-geometric instantiation events. It encodes the latent higher-dimensional phases, the E6 vacuum branching, the CP-offset sectors, and the dark universes as different configurations of the same fiber. It ensures that all sectors share a common geometric origin and remain capable of limited interaction, even as stabilization suppresses their couplings. The relational-fiber architecture is therefore the unifying framework that binds the multiverse into a single coherent whole, preserving its internal diversity while maintaining its fundamental unity.

Sector creation after the nucleation of the first bubble is a symmetry-induced internal process, not a new pre-geometric instantiation. Dimensional descent reduces the dimensional stability of the vacuum manifold; E6 symmetry breaking reorganizes the internal degrees of freedom; and the vacuum manifold branches into multiple minima. Each minimum defines a sector—6D, 5D, 4D, 3D, and their CP-offset partners. All sectors coexist inside the same bubble, sharing the same geometry, the same relational substrate, and the same stabilization environment. Sector creation is therefore continuous, symmetry-driven, and internal to the first bubble. It is not a pre-geometric factorization and not a nucleation.

Only the first bubble undergoes true instantiation, because instantiation is defined as the creation of a new geometric domain from the pre-geometric substrate. All subsequent universes arise internally through symmetry breaking and dimensional descent within the same bubble. These universes are not nucleated; they bud inside the parent bubble as the E6 manifold reorganizes under rotation and decreasing vacuum energy. Sector creation is therefore not a creation of new worlds but a reorganization of the bubble's internal degrees of freedom, producing coexisting vacua that

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

share the same relational substrate, the same stabilization partition, and the same geometric origin.

- *Emergence of Space*

Space emerges in the first bubble when the bubble wall forces the pre-geometric relational substrate of Domain 2 into a structured pattern of relational alignment—a process analogous, in the quantum-mechanical literature, to the emergence of geometry from structured entanglement. Prior to this transition, the substrate contains no distances, no directions, no locality, and no dimensional axes. It consists only of non-metric relations whose coherence and adjacency have no geometric interpretation.

The bubble wall changes this. It imposes a stable vacuum configuration that organizes these relations into a network with persistent structure. In this transition, adjacency becomes spatial proximity, connectivity becomes topology, gradients in relational alignment become curvature, and coherent directional biases become spatial axes. Geometry is therefore not fundamental; it is the organized expression of relational structure. The bubble wall does not create space; it induces it by stabilizing a pattern of relations capable of supporting metric interpretation.

This mechanism provides a concrete realization of the idea—articulated in different forms by Witten, Rovelli, and others [24–37]—that spacetime is not a primitive entity but an emergent structure arising from deeper degrees of freedom. In the BB ontology, these deeper degrees of freedom belong to Domain 2, the pre-geometric substrate. Space appears only when these degrees of freedom undergo a symmetry-breaking transition that produces a metric structure (interpretable distances), dimensional axes (stable relational directions), locality (persistent adjacency relations), curvature (the response of relational structure to internal stresses), and causal order (a distinguished relational axis that becomes time-like).

The emergence of space is therefore the emergence of structured relational alignment. The ancestor bubble selects a vacuum configuration whose internal relational organization determines which dimensions become dynamically active, how spatial axes are oriented, and how curvature is distributed across the resulting geometry. As the bubble evolves, rotates, and undergoes dimensional descent, this relational alignment reorganizes, generating a sequence of geometric phases: first the U11 phase, the Euclidean 11-dimensional ancestor bubble; then the Lorentzian S10 family of descendant bubbles, spanning the 10D, 9D, 8D, and 7D universes; and finally, the Lorentzian E6-organized bubbles: the 6D (Delta), 5D (Gamma), 4D (Beta), and down to the 3D (Alpha) universes.

Space is not a background into which the bubble expands; it is the structured relational expression of the bubble itself. The multiverse is therefore not embedded in space. Rather, space is embedded within it and is continuously regenerated by the multiverse's relational architecture.

- *Emergence of Time*

Time does not exist at the moment the first bubble is induced. All eleven directions are purely spatial because the entanglement structure of the vacuum is initially isotropic: no direction is privileged, and the relational network supports a fully Euclidean Spin(11) geometry. Time emerges only when the bubble begins to rotate. Rotation introduces anisotropy into the relational network, selecting a preferred direction and gradually pulling that direction out of the spatial sector. As rotational shear increases, one axis undergoes a signature shift: it ceases to behave as a spatial direction and aligns with the rotational axis, becoming timelike. In group-theoretic terms, the symmetry of the bubble transitions from Spin(11) to the Lorentzian group Spin(10,1). This is the geometric expression of time's emergence.

However, the emergence of time does not occur in an undifferentiated 10-dimensional space. Before rotation begins, the ten-dimensional spatial subspace already carries an almost-complex structure J, which pairs the ten spatial directions into five complex planes. This structure constrains how anisotropy can develop. Rotation cannot act arbitrarily; it must act compatibly with J. As a result, the direction that becomes timelike is not chosen at random. It is selected from within one of the complex pairs, and the signature shift corresponds to the breaking of that pair. The emergent time direction is therefore the first dimension that cannot be complexified. The transition from Spin(11) to Spin(10,1) is simultaneously a transition from a fully complex-paired 10-D spatial sector to a 9-D sector that remains compatible with J. Time appears as the geometric residue of a broken complex pairing.

The internal E6 symmetry remains intact during this transition because the appearance of time is not a gauge-theoretic event but a geometric one. The relational substrate reorganizes its alignment structure, but the internal symmetry governing the vacuum manifold is unchanged. The bubble becomes a 10+1-dimensional spacetime, yet it remains a single coherent induced domain. No new sector is created, no new relational bundle is instantiated, and no new degrees of freedom are introduced. Only the signature of one direction changes.

The architecture of the relational fiber bundle accommodates this transition without modification. The fibers retain their full relational content, and the induced connection continues to encode the internal symmetry, now adapted to the Lorentzian structure Spin(10,1). The emergence of time is therefore not the creation of a new ontological layer but a reorientation of the existing geometric substrate. Time is the ordered relational expression of rotation: it emerges when one spatial direction, previously part of a complex pair, is dynamically reclassified by the bubble's rotational dynamics. The fundamental architecture of the bubble remains the same; only the way one direction participates in that architecture has changed.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

- *Emergence of Matter*

Matter emerges only after the ancestor bubble induces a stable geometric manifold. Prior to this induction, the pre-geometric substrate of Domain 2 contains no particles, no fields, and no energy—only relational degrees of freedom without geometric interpretation. When the ancestor bubble forms, these relational degrees of freedom become organized into a relational fiber bundle whose fibers encode the full internal structure inherited from Domain 2, while the base manifold expresses the induced geometry selected by the bubble wall.

In this framework, matter is not fundamental. It is the appearance, within Domain 3, of dynamically stable excitation modes of the relational fibers. A “matter field” at a point in the induced geometry is simply a localized excitation pattern within the fiber over that point. What earlier language called “particles” correspond to persistent, sector-stable excitation modes of the fiber. What earlier language called “gauge fields” correspond to features of the induced connection—the rules governing how relational degrees of freedom transform as one moves across the base manifold. Geometry and matter are therefore two expressions of the same underlying structure: geometry is the organization of relational alignment across fibers, while matter is the excitation of relational content within fibers.

Matter is created only once—at the formation of the ancestor bubble. This is the moment when the pre-geometric substrate becomes capable of supporting geometry, and the relational fiber bundle is induced over the newly selected vacuum configuration. The fibers contain the full spectrum of internal relational degrees of freedom that will later manifest as geometry, gauge structure, and matter-like excitations. All descendant bubbles—those formed through dimensional descent and symmetry breaking—inherit their matter content from this original relational reservoir. No new matter is created when internal bubbles form; instead, matter emerges as different excitation patterns of the same underlying relational fiber.

Descendant bubbles are not new instantiations. They are new vacua—new geometric phases—within the same relational substrate. When the E6 vacuum manifold branches, each minimum defines a distinct sector with its own effective geometry, gauge structure, and excitation spectrum. But the underlying relational degrees of freedom are the same across all sectors. A matter field in any descendant bubble is simply an excitation of the relational fiber at that point in the base manifold. The appearance of matter in a newly formed sector is therefore not the creation of new particles ex nihilo, but the reorganization of pre-existing relational content into a new vacuum configuration.

This resolves the apparent puzzle of how matter originates in universes formed through symmetry breaking. There is no need for matter to “leak” from one bubble to another, nor for any cross-sector transfer mechanism. The sectors are not separated by boundaries in the relational substrate; they are separated only by stabilization and by the structure of the vacuum manifold. When a new sector forms in E6—whether a 6D bubble, a 4D CP-offset partner, or the final 3D universe—its matter content arises from the same relational fiber that supplied matter to all earlier phases. The excitations that appear as particles in the new sector are simply the modes that are stable and dynamically accessible in that vacuum.

The “Big Bang” of each descendant bubble is therefore not a creation event but a reheating event: a rapid reorganization of the relational fiber as the sector becomes dynamically isolated by increasing stabilization. The energy that appears as radiation and matter in the new sector is drawn from the bubble’s global relational reservoir, not from an external source. No cross-sector leakage is required because all sectors share the same underlying relational fiber. Stabilization suppresses interactions between sectors, but it does not prevent them from drawing on the same substrate.

In this way, matter and geometry remain two aspects of the same relational-fiber structure throughout the ancestor bubble’s evolution. Geometry is the organization of relational alignment across fibers, while matter is excitation within fibers. Symmetry breaking reorganizes the relational structure, producing new geometric phases and new effective excitation spectra, but it does not alter the underlying substrate. All descendant bubbles inherit their matter content from the ancestor bubble, and their “Big Bangs” are expressions of the same relational dynamics that governed the original induction event. The multiverse is therefore unified at the deepest level: all matter, all geometry, and all sectors arise from a single induced relational substrate, expressed through the evolving structure of its relational fiber bundle.

Finally, as earlier discussed, what we call “particles” are truncated, sector-specific expressions of multiversal excitations. Each sector sees only the excitation modes that remain stable under its own vacuum geometry; the full multiversal excitation is never visible within any single bubble. *Each bubble therefore functions as a screen or receiver for the multiversal excitation. The excitation itself is pre-geometric and non-factorized; it cannot be represented in full within any vacuum geometry. A bubble displays only the projection of the excitation that its own vacuum manifold, stabilization level, and active dimensional structure allow it to resolve.*

Even the 11D ancestor bubble contains the excitation without fully resolving it. The observers here do not “see” the full multiversal excitation in resolved form. It contains the excitation in its entirety, but without a vacuum manifold, without sectoral geometry, and without stabilization, the excitation is not decomposed into the modes that later appear as particles, fields, or dark-sector excitations across the entirety of the multiverse. Every bubble, including the ancestor, perceives only the projection of the multiversal excitation permitted by its own geometric and relational structure. No bubble ever accesses the excitation in its full multiversal resolution.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

A hypothetical observer in the 11D ancestor bubble cannot perceive a 3D universe or its particles and forces. The 3D vacuum manifold, stabilization partition, and sectoral excitation modes do not exist within the 11D geometry. To perceive a 3D reality, the observer must undergo dimensional transmutation and incarnate into the 3D bubble, adopting its relational basis. Hence, each bubble functions as a screen that displays only the projection of the multiversal excitation compatible with its own vacuum geometry; no bubble can perceive the excitations of another without first transforming into that bubble's dimensional phase.

- *Monotonic Dimensional Descent*

The ancestor bubble begins in a state of extremely low stabilization, maximal relational coherence, and maximal effective dimensionality. Its geometry is not imposed from outside but emerges from the organization of relational degrees of freedom within the induced fiber bundle. The dimensionality that the bubble can sustain at any moment is determined by the degree of coherence across its relational adjacency network, which is dynamically modulated by rotation. Rotation introduces anisotropy and shear into the relational structure, suppressing coherence in specific directions and thereby reducing the number of extended curvature directions that can remain stable.

The effective dimensionality is governed by the rotation-dependent relation:
$$D_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = D_{\min} + (D_{\text{tot}} - D_{\min})\,\frac{1}{1+(\omega/\omega_c)^p}.$$

Here $D_{\text{eff}}(\omega)$ is the dimensionality that remains geometrically stable at angular velocity ω. It is not the full dimensionality encoded in the relational fiber; it is the dimensionality of the geometric sector that can maintain coherence under the current rotational state. High relational coherence corresponds to high D_{eff}. As rotation increases, coherence in certain relational directions is suppressed, and the bubble can sustain fewer extended curvature directions.

This reduction in dimensionality is not a catastrophic collapse. In the BB framework, dimensions are never destroyed; they are gradually compactified as coherence in specific directions falls below the threshold required for geometric expression. Several mechanisms ensure that this compactification is smooth, continuous, and dynamically stable.

First, as the bubble contracts—driven by the falling vacuum-energy density—its angular velocity increases. Because angular momentum is conserved while the moment of inertia decreases, descendant bubbles rotate faster:
$$\omega_{\text{child}} \propto \frac{1}{R_{\text{child}}^2}.$$

This increase in rotational speed strengthens gyroscopic stabilization, making the remaining geometric directions more rigid and resistant to perturbation. Rotation therefore has a dual role: it suppresses high-dimensional coherence through shear, while simultaneously stabilizing the lower-dimensional geometry that emerges from the descent.

Second, the metrical stabilization gradient itself becomes stronger at lower dimensionality. However, the dimensional stabilization gradient becomes weaker. This forces extended higher dimensions to collapse and compactify. Once certain directions begin to compactify, the remaining geometry becomes easier to stabilize. Lower-dimensional bubbles are inherently more robust because fewer relational directions must remain coherent. Third, the falling vacuum-energy density makes spacetime "softer." The energetic cost of compactification decreases as the bubble evolves, preventing any abrupt geometric failure.

The relational substrate remains intact throughout the descent; only the geometric expression of certain directions changes. Hence, the process remains continuous and monotonic. The underlying relational substrate experiences no discontinuity.

Vacuum energy decreases monotonically along the cascade because lower-energy sectors exhibit greater metrical stabilization and correspondingly smaller spatial extent. As the bubble contracts, angular momentum conservation forces the rotation rate to rise, and the resulting shear accelerates the compactification of higher-dimensional modes, reducing the effective dimensionality. Nested bubbles therefore form a natural hierarchical cascade: progressively falling vacuum energy, increasing metrical stabilization, rising rotational velocity, and a corresponding descent in effective dimensionality.

Dimensional reduction is driven by the coupled effects of increasing rotational speed and the weakening Casimir force, both consequences of the declining vacuum energy density. As the Casimir contribution to the stabilizing stresses diminishes, coherence in the higher-dimensional mode spectrum is suppressed. The extra dimensions lose the rigidity, that previously maintained their independence, fold and compactify, producing a lower-dimensional effective geometry.

The cascade terminates when rotation becomes maximal. As vacuum energy approaches zero, rotation saturates, the Casimir force becomes too weak to drive further compactification. At this point, the effective dimensionality reaches its minimum: $D_{\text{eff}} \to D_{\min} = 3$.

A three-dimensional classical universe is the endpoint of this dynamical descent within our local multiverse. In other multiverses within Domain 2, the descent may terminate at different dimensionalities, depending on their entanglement structure and stabilization thresholds. For the local lineage, however, the descent naturally concludes at three spatial dimensions.

- *Bubble Dynamics*

As each descendant bubble buds in the parent bubble, it experiences several motions and transformation. Firstly,

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

each bubble buds inside a parent bubble with a characteristic angular momentum, forming a nested hierarchical bubble-in-bubble (BB) structure, with a lower-dimensional child inside a higher-dimensional parent. When a new bubble buds inside its parent, it inherits angular momentum from the parent's rotating interior. The child bubble therefore rotates about its own center.

Secondly, this rotation is not isolated: it occurs within the rotating frame of the parent bubble, so the child's center experiences a transverse inertial response. Even if the child was perfectly concentric at the moment of nucleation, its rotation within a rotating medium produces a lateral drift of its center. This drift is the first deviation that moves the child's center away from the parent's center. The larger bubble's rotation imposes a drag field on the smaller bubble. This drag is not uniform: it varies with radius and angular velocity. As a result, the smaller bubble experiences a torque that causes its center to precess around the parent's rotation axis. This precession is systematic: the second bubble (the first child)'s center undergoes the largest displacement from the center of the parent's bubble, each subsequent bubble experiences a smaller precessional radius, and the centers trace a curved path around the parent's axis. The precession of the bubble centers is the primary generator of a spiral geometry and an equation of motion which traces a vortical filament.

Thirdly, the bubbles are born smaller on symmetry breaking as the vacuum energy decreases. Fourthly, after symmetry breaking, the bubble starts to expand inside the expanding bubble of the parent. Hence, rotation and precession motions, contraction of the bubble on budding and subsequent expansion, occur as each new smaller bubble universe buds during dimensional descent.

- *Vacuum Energy Budget*

In the BB model, only the primordial eleven-dimensional bubble draws directly on the finite relational capacity of Domain 2. This first induction event is the sole moment at which the pre-geometric substrate allocates the relational resources required to support a geometric manifold. Once this initial bubble stabilizes, no further instantiation occurs at the boundary between Domain 2 and the emergent multiverse. All subsequent universes arise *internally*, as reorganizations of the vacuum manifold within the first bubble. These internal branches do not require additional resources from Domain 2; they redistribute what the primordial bubble already inherited.

The vacuum energy density inside the first bubble is therefore not arbitrary. It is fixed by the amount of relational capacity consumed during the initial induction. As the internal vacuum reorganizes, branching events partition the remaining relational resources across progressively smaller and increasingly stabilized sectors. Each new sector inherits only a fraction of the parent's relational flexibility. *Because no new capacity flows in from Domain 2, the effective vacuum energy density available to each successive branch decreases monotonically.*

This decline in vacuum energy is inseparable from a corresponding decline in dimensionality. In the geometric-induction ontology, dimensionality is the number of independent curvature directions the vacuum can sustain. Each curvature direction requires its own family of relational modes, its own cutoff structure, and its own channel of induced alignment. As the available relational capacity thins, the vacuum can no longer support the full set of modes required for higher-dimensional geometry. The number of stable curvature directions decreases accordingly with the decreasing vacuum energy budget.

Dimensional descent is therefore not a sequence of independent creation events drawing repeatedly from an external reservoir. It is an internal exhaustion process: the gradual depletion of the relational resources inherited from the primordial bubble. Because the induction budget is finite and no replenishment occurs after the first bubble forms, the vacuum's ability to sustain higher-dimensional phases diminishes with each branching and budding. The multiverse evolves by spending its initial relational endowment.

The process terminates in three spatial dimensions, the lowest dimension that can still maintain a nonzero—though arbitrarily small—vacuum energy density. Below three dimensions, the remaining relational capacity is insufficient to stabilize a coherent geometric phase. Further dimensional reduction becomes dynamically impossible. In this view, the three-dimensional structure of our universe is not the result of anthropic selection or fine-tuned symmetry breaking. It is the natural endpoint of a resource-limited induction cascade, the final stable configuration that can be supported by the residual relational capacity of the primordial bubble.

- *Entanglement Modes*

In the BB ontology, entanglement is a property of the relational fiber bundle induced at the formation of the first bubble. Only this primordial 11-dimensional bubble is a true geometric induction event. All subsequent bubbles—whether 10D, 8D, 6D, or 3D—are not independent creations but partitions of the same induced vacuum manifold. They arise through symmetry breaking, dimensional descent, and vacuum branching and budding within a single relational substrate. Because of this genealogical structure, entanglement modes behave differently from the way they are typically described in quantum theory.

Dynamical entanglement modes exist only within a single induced bubble. They cannot span induction boundaries, because an induction boundary marks the transition where the pre-geometric substrate first stabilizes into a coherent geometric manifold with its own relational fiber bundle and stabilization partition. Once such a bubble is induced, its internal relational degrees of freedom are aligned in a way that cannot be coherently compared with those of any other induced bubble. Distinct induced bubbles—whether across cosmic history or across different branches of the vacuum manifold—are separated not by spatial distance but by incompatible relational alignments.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

No dynamical entanglement mode can bridge such a discontinuity.

However, because all descendant bubbles are partitions of the same induced vacuum, they inherit the same relational fiber structure. This inheritance creates a weaker but still meaningful form of correlation: structural entanglement. Structural entanglement is not quantum entanglement in the Hilbert-space sense. It does not involve nonlocal correlations, phase coherence, or dynamical coupling. Instead, it reflects the fact that all descendant vacua share the same ancestral fiber bundle, the same primordial gauge connection, and the same curvature ancestry. These inherited structures encode correlations that persist through dimensional descent even though the descendant bubbles are dynamically isolated.

Structural entanglement explains why descendant bubbles cannot causally influence one another, yet they can exhibit correlated classicality oscillations, correlated symmetry-breaking patterns, and correlated resonance structures. These correlations do not arise from interaction but from shared geometric lineage. The bubbles are partitioned vacua, not independent universes. The BB multiverse is therefore genealogical rather than parallel: a hierarchy of vacua nested within a single induced geometry, not a collection of unrelated domains.

Once the first bubble is induced, it becomes a self-contained relational fiber bundle with its own stabilization gradient, its own vacuum manifold, and its own internal sector structure. Inside this bubble, all "worlds" live as vacua, sectors, and stabilized branches of the same relational substrate, organized by the S10 and E6 symmetry groups and shaped by dimensional descent. The many-worlds structure in the BB multiverse is therefore internal, not a proliferation of new bubbles. Stabilization dynamically selects quasi-classical sectors within the same relational fiber bundle, suppresses interference between them, and makes measurement outcomes appear definite to observers embedded within these sectors.

There is no need to postulate new bubbles for each outcome, because all outcomes correspond to different stable configurations of the same relational fiber. There is no duplication of energy across branches, because all branches draw from the same limited and finite relational reservoir. And there is no cross-bubble *dynamical* entanglement, because the induction boundary that created the first bubble prevents any coherent relational alignment with other induced domains. Structural entanglement persists across descendant bubbles, but it does not permit dynamical coupling or cross-sector coherence.

In this way, the BB multiverse remains unified at the deepest level. All entanglement modes, all sector structures, and all effective "worlds" arise from a single induced relational substrate. The bubble-in-bubble hierarchy is real, but it is a hierarchy of vacua within a single induced geometry, not a hierarchy of independent universes. Entanglement is therefore a local property of the induced bubble's relational fiber bundle, while structural correlations across descendant bubbles reflect their shared geometric ancestry rather than any form of dynamical connection.

- *Resolution of Many-Worlds Tensions*

The BB ontology resolves the conceptual tensions traditionally associated with the Many Worlds Interpretation (MWI) by reframing multiplicity as an internal geometric property of a single induced bubble rather than as a proliferation of independent universes. In naïve readings of MWI, each measurement is imagined generating a new universe containing a complete duplicate of all matter, fields, and energy. This picture leads to the troubling implication that energy is endlessly replicated across an ever-growing ensemble of parallel worlds. Nothing of this sort occurs in the BB framework. Branches are not separate universes with independent energy budgets. They are stabilized sectors of a single induced relational substrate, all drawing from the same finite reservoir of relational capacity inherited from the primordial bubble. No energy is duplicated, replicated, or created. What appears as "multiple classical outcomes" is simply the stabilization of different regions of the same relational fiber bundle, not the spawning of new universes.

This reinterpretation clarifies the relationship between quantum behavior and geometry. Quantum mechanics describes the motion of relational excitations, but the topology of the induced bubble describes the terrain through which these excitations move. Without the terrain, the dynamics are incomplete. The "hidden variables" Einstein sought are not particles or additional fields but the fixed geometric-topological structure of the multiverse itself. In this sense, the BB model is a *topologically constrained* many-sectors interpretation, where the multiplicity of outcomes arises from the internal structure of a single bubble rather than from an unbounded proliferation of worlds.

This same structural insight dissolves the *measure problem* in eternal inflation. Standard eternal inflation posits an uncontrolled infinity of causally disconnected bubbles, with no canonical way to assign probabilities across them. In the BB model, the physically relevant multiplicity is not an infinite ensemble of bubbles but a finite, resource-limited set of sectors inside a single induced bubble. Probabilities are defined over the sectoral structure of one relational fiber bundle, shaped by stabilization and geometric resonance, rather than over an ill-defined ensemble of infinitely many universes.

The BB multiverse also resolves the *measurement problem* by replacing the MWI's proliferation of independent classical worlds with a single induced bubble whose internal sectors arise through symmetry breaking, dimensional descent, and stabilization. In the MWI picture, measurement produces a branching structure in which each outcome corresponds to a separate classical world, and the observer's identity fragments into mutually inaccessible copies. The puzzle then becomes: why does an observer experience only one branch? In the BB framework,

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

measurement is not a branching into new universes but a geometric stabilization process. The observer's geodesic through the cosmological polytope becomes confined to a classical vertex. Stabilization constrains relational exchange between sectors, pinning the observer's trajectory to a classical region without creating new worlds. This process is called "sectorization" (Q: classicalization).

A stabilized measuring apparatus functions as a dimensional bottleneck: it resonates only with the low-energy components of the system's relational excitation. Because the apparatus is already anchored at a classical vertex, its internal degrees of freedom oscillate within a narrow, low-dimensional subspace of the cosmological polytope (Domain 1). When a higher-dimensional excitation interacts with it, only those components whose effective frequencies match the apparatus's stabilized resonance band can sustain relational exchange. This resonance condition forces the higher-dimensional excitation to express itself in the same classical basis, producing a Midas-like propagation of classicality through interaction. The observer's global identity remains the full standing-wave configuration of the relational fiber, but their classical experience corresponds to the region where their geodesic has stabilized.

An observation event forms a closed relational exchange circuit: the geodesics of the observer and the system intersect within a shared facet of the polytope, and *resonance* determines which components of the system's excitation can couple to the observer's stabilized degrees of freedom. The coupled geodesics then co-stabilize, with oscillatory exchange damped until the circuit settles into a single classical vertex. The Born rule emerges naturally from the geometry of the polytope: the squared amplitudes correspond to the relative facet volumes through which the resonant geodesic can pass during stabilization. This is encoded in the geometric wavefunction.

There is no duplication of energy, no creation of new induced domains, and no need to interpret "other outcomes" as counterfactual worlds. They remain higher-energy or higher-dimensional excitations of the same relational fiber that fail to resonate with the stabilized apparatus and therefore cannot enter the closed circuit. In the BB multiverse, dimensionality, stabilization, and geometric induction are not independent physical processes. They are different expressions of a single structural gradient that runs from the highly coherent, high-dimensional relational substrate of Domain 2 to the fully stabilized, low-dimensional geometric phases of Domain 3.

Once this gradient is recognized, the familiar distinction between quantum and classical dissolves. What we call quantum behavior is simply the appearance, in a low-dimensional observational frame, of relational structures whose natural mode of existence is high-dimensional and highly coherent. Conversely, what we call classical behavior is the stabilized limit of that same structure after dimensional reduction has compressed and localized its degrees of freedom – i.e., after sectorization occurs. Stabilization—decoherence in the language of quantum physics—is not an additional process layered on top of dimensional reduction; it is the experiential signature of dimensional reduction itself. When a high-dimensional relational configuration is projected into a lower-dimensional geometric phase, it loses some degrees of freedom, stabilizing it. The resulting excitations are forced into increasingly localized, curvature-stabilized configurations. The apparent loss of quantum coherence in a 3D classical apparatus is simply the inability of a low-dimensional slice to represent the full structure of a higher-dimensional excitation.

Entanglement modes are therefore rich and essential within a single induced bubble, generating the internal many-sectors structure that resolves the measurement problem without energy duplication. But entanglement does not extend between distinct induced bubbles, because induction boundaries prevent coherent relational alignment. The multiplicity of "worlds" is entirely internal: sectors inside a single bubble, expressed through the relational fiber structure of the local multiverse.

The BB multiverse is therefore neither a branching wavefunction nor a collapsing one. It is a geometric-topological cosmology in which the relational substrate forms a stratified fiber bundle, the topology is encoded in a nucleation simplicial complex, the geometry is assigned by the cosmological polytope, the dynamics are flows of relational excitation across polytope volumes, the temporal order is a combinatorial time crystal, and the measuring instrument or observer is a geodesic threading through this structure, stabilizing into sectorization (i.e., classicality) through resonance and relational alignment.

- *Substrate-Relative Life*

In most cosmological frameworks—eternal inflation, the string landscape, or anthropic selection arguments—the existence of observers is used to explain why our universe possesses the parameters it does. The anthropic principle is invoked because the underlying ensemble is assumed to be random, unstructured, or overwhelmingly vast. In contrast, the BB multiverse is neither random nor unstructured. It is a finite, geometrically ordered nested bubble universes descending from a pre-geometric vacuum, with each universe arising from the orientation structure of the cosmological polytope, speed of rotation and vacuum energy density. This structure explicitly dismantles the traditional anthropic principle. The current view is: "The constants of physics (like the strength of gravity or electromagnetism) seem impossibly tuned to allow carbon life. Therefore, we must be lucky or selected." This paper's view (geometric determinism) is: "The sector constants are not dials set by a creator or random chance; they are outputs of the universe's geometric transformations."

It is well-known in ecology that at each elevation on a mountain, different types of lifeforms thrive. Similarly, at every depth in the ocean, different lifeforms thrive. Each lifeform is suited and thrives in its own layer. Similarly, the multiverse is alive at every level, each bubble universe hosting its own class of lifeforms, each adapted to the geometry that gave rise to it. In conventional cosmology, the anthropic principle is often invoked to explain why the physical constants of our universe appear fine-tuned for the existence of life. However, in the stratified multiverse, fine-tuning is not required. Instead, the existence of life is a consequence of the position of Alpha-2 (our ordinary matter 3D universe) in the multiverse.

In the BB model, Alpha-2 has a small effective Planck constant and a wide causal cone. The smaller and faster rotating bubble intensifies curvature. These parameters force the universe to be "clunky" and stable (i.e., classical). Atoms stay put, molecules form, and biology evolves. We are not "fine-tuned" for the universe; we are "substrate-relative." We are the lifeforms that can survive the physics at the bottom rung – which has its own unique expression of life. While the 3D bubble universe is at the bottom of the energy hierarchy, it has certain advantages over higher dimensional sectors. Since the speed of causality is fastest here, evolution takes place at a much faster pace. This means there will be a greater diversity of species. Furthermore, this is where sectorization (Q: classicality) has the greatest stability. This is where complex molecules can form.

On the other hand, higher energy sectors have their own merits. Since Planck scales are larger, lifeforms can access higher dimensional meta-classical modes for cognitive processing and sensory systems. The S10 sectors are also composed of relatively non-collisional particles. This means there are less catastrophic events and destructive collisions. This makes the S10 sectors extremely peaceful. These higher energy sectors have much greater degrees of freedom, more spatial dimensions as well as spatialized time. Even higher energy E6 sectors would be much more peaceful than the clunky 3D sectors.

The self-interacting dark matter particles in the E6 sectors interact through weaker electromagnetism (dark electromagnetism could be a hundred times or more weaker than ordinary electromagnetism) and there are more neutral particles buffering interactions. This would dramatically reduce recombination rates. With lower density, interparticle density would be greater, reducing recombination rates even further. With increasingly weaker dark electromagnetism at higher energy levels, their plasma regimes are less chaotic and explosive, compared to ordinary plasma environments. Even if there are collisions, these are much gentler and the flow of time is slowed down due to time dilation and temporal parallax (relative to our frame of reference). This provides a more conducive environment for life.

Hence, we may start with carbon-water based lifeforms in the ordinary sector, then low-photon plasma (i.e., plasma formations with fiery appearances) as the next higher energy substrate in the dark sectors, then plasmonic (which would have an intermediate mixture of photons in the plasma), then macroscopic photonic lifeforms. At even higher energy levels, in the S10 sectors, they will peter out to isolated photons or photonic crystals and fluids and become increasingly quantum-like (i.e., fuzzy). Hence, different sectors offer different challenges and opportunities for substrate-relative life.

This perspective replaces the anthropic principle with a multiversal Copernican principle. Our form of life is not privileged; it is simply adapted to the conditions of the lowest-energy primary universe. The multiverse is not a random ensemble requiring anthropic filtering; it is a structured hierarchy in which each rung supports its own mode of complexity and substrate for life. In this sense, the model restores the Copernican insight at the deepest level: not only is Earth not the center of the cosmos and our universe is not the center of the multiverse, but our form of life is not the center of life's possibilities.

The biggest obstacle in current astrobiology research is the assumption that all intelligent life shares Alpha-2's (our universe's) substrate—carbon and water in three-dimensional spacetime. But intelligence can arise in radically different substrates across the multiverse, each shaped by the type of substrate: whether macroscopic plasma, plasmonic, photonic or microscopic particulate-wave (fuzzy) or any other substrate relevant to that sector, with its relevant fundamental "constants." These substrates are not merely different; they are incommensurable. They cannot be detected by Alpha-2 instruments, nor would they perceive Alpha-2's matter as meaningful. Even the strongest portal interface, that between Alpha-2 (our bubble universe) and Alpha-1 (our parent universe), permits only minimal kinetic mixing, possible weak collisional ionization, and possible portal mediation. However, higher energy portals are exponentially suppressed, and the S10 sectors are effectively generally isolated. No substrate of intelligence can cross these interfaces in any macroscopic sense. Within Alpha-2, stellar systems are so far apart they would not make any intentional travels by intelligent extraterrestrials to a tiny speck of dust (i.e., earth), revolving around a small star, economically viable. Thus, the Fermi paradox dissolves.

The multiverse is full of intelligent life, but none of it is detectable, reachable, or commensurable within Alpha-2 (our universe). The silence of the sky is not evidence of cosmic loneliness but a reflection of the profound diversity of substrates across the multiverse. Each universe hosts its own class of lifeforms, each adapted to its geometry, each evolving in its own temporal frame, and none are capable of interacting with our universe in the restricted ways the paradox assumes. *The Fermi paradox appears to arise only when Alpha-2's substrate is mistaken for a universal template.* Once the local multiverse existence is acknowledged, the question "Where is everybody?" is replaced by a deeper understanding: intelligence is abundant, but its forms, substrates, and geometries differ so radically that contact is neither possible nor meaningful using ordinary matter scientific instruments and sector-specific biological brains.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

IV. MMULTIVERSE CREATION - DIMENSIONAL DESCENT

➢ *Overview*

We begin with an eleven-dimensional all-spatial manifold, then follow the dimensional descent as rotation increases and vacuum energy decreases in each lower energy bubble. The result is a fully dynamical explanation for the emergence of the familiar 3+1-dimensional classical universe and all other universes in the local multiverse. It will demonstrate that the entire structure of our observable universe, including its dimensionality, sector constants, forces, matter, why the vacuum energy density and the electron's mass is practically zero and the dominance of classicality at macroscopic scales in lower dimensions, can be derived from the coupled evolution of only two master variables during dimensional descent:

- Increasing rotational speed of the bubble universe (ω) – the geometric driver
- Decreasing vacuum energy density (ρ_{vac}) – the physical driver

This is a radical simplification: instead of requiring dozens of independent assumptions, fields, Calabi-Yau manifolds, or symmetry-breaking events, the model shows that all emergent structure is dynamical and inevitable once these two variables evolve monotonically during dimensional descent.

As symmetry breaks, after the first bubble is nucleated, progressively smaller bubble universes are formed within the first bubble. The coupled evolution of the two master variables, during dimensional descent, drives the following to happen:

Table 1 Dimensional Descent Milestones

1.	Bubble Contracts, Rotational Speed Increases	Each descendant bubble universe's radius decreases due to decreasing vacuum energy density. Hence, rotation speed and curvature increases. This makes the dimensional descent largely irreversible, monotonic and dynamically stable, like a spinning top.
2.	Casimir Force Decreases	The Casimir force decreases as vacuum energy density decreases.
3.	Dimensions Reduce through Compactification	Spatial dimensions reduce due to compactification as the bubble descends through its continuous symmetry-breaking sequence. The effective number of large dimensions decreases because the vacuum no longer possesses sufficient relational capacity (i.e., sufficient "measure" within the relational fiber) and vacuum energy budget, to sustain the coherence structure required for higher-dimensional geometry.
4.	Time Emerges from Rotating Space	Time emerges when one spatial dimension warps and is pulled vertically towards the rotational axis of the bubble which stabilizes it and sets the arrow of time. As vacuum energy density falls, time dilation (relative to our 3D universe) decreases.
5.	Chirality and Parity Offsets and Charge Reversals Occur	The set of spatial dimensions of the next (smaller) universe rotates faster than its parent universe, resulting in parity displacements and offsets between the two sets. At higher dimensions, where rotations are slow, this offset would be small. However, as rotation speeds up on dimensional descent, the differences or offsets will get larger and continuously change (as all the bubbles are continuously rotating simultaneously), resulting in CP-offset and CP-reversed universes over cosmological timescales.
6.	Speed of Light and Causal Depth Increases	The speed of light and causal depth (and causal speed) increases as the time-like axis fans out from the spatial bundle, increasing causal depth and space (as can be visualized from a standard Minkowski diagram). The decrease in vacuum energy density stabilizes the values of these multiversal variables to make them persist as near-constants over cosmological time scales.
7.	Entropy Increases	Entropy increases during dimensional descent due to the increase in the speed of causality (as noted above) and the number of micro-states. This further stabilizes the arrow of time which emerged due to the alignment with the rotational axis (as discussed above).
8.	Gravitational Constant and Curvature Increases	Rotating universes inflate and expand as the centrifugal force pushes it outwards in the co-moving frame. The centripetal force determines G (gravitational constant) which increases as the speed of rotation increases in the embedding frame. The gravitational constant increases as the vacuum becomes more deformable (as the vacuum energy density decreases on dimensional descent), causing curvature and structure formation to begin.
9.	Classicality Increases	Planck scales ($L_p, t_p, \hbar_{\text{eff}}$) decrease to give rise to sectoral (Q: classical) physics at lower energies.
0.	Mass Scale Downshifts	As the vacuum energy collapses, the Higgs potential stabilizes, and the

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

		effective mass scale of fermions diminishes accordingly.
1.	Matter Density Increases	The matter density increases on dimensional descent while the vacuum energy density decreases.
2.	Fine Structure Constant Increases	The fine-structure constant increases to 1/137 in our 3D universe.
3.	Bohr Radius Increases	As a result of the above, the Bohr radius decreases, allowing compact atoms to form.

The 3+1D structure of spacetime is the endpoint of this geometric evolution in the local multiverse. Thus, rotation alone explains why we have one time dimension and why the universe has a preferred temporal direction, why we have three large spatial dimensions, why chirality exists, and why CP-offset universes could exist. Falling vacuum energy density explains the evolution of the fundamental constants in each sector.

Now, in more detail, we describe what happens during dimensional descent.

➢ *Bubble Contracts, Rotational Speed Increases*

When each bubble universe is treated as possessing a conserved angular momentum L, the simplest relation between rotation and geometry is the standard expression $L = I\,\omega,$ where I is the moment of inertia and ω is the intrinsic angular velocity of the bubble universe. For a roughly spherical shell of mass M and radius R, the moment of inertia takes the approximate form $I \approx k\,MR^2,$ with k a dimensionless shape factor determined by the bubble universe's internal structure. If the angular momentum L remains approximately conserved while the bubble universe undergoes dimensional descent, the effective radius R decreases. Because L is fixed, the angular velocity must increase to compensate for the shrinking moment of inertia. This leads to the scaling $\omega \sim \frac{1}{R^2}$. In physical terms, a reduction in the equilibrium radius corresponds to a reduction in the vacuum-energy density of the bubble universe. As the vacuum energy decreases, the preferred radius contracts, and the contraction naturally produces an increase in angular velocity. This is the geometric analogue of the familiar "spin-up during contraction" seen in rotating astrophysical systems.

This behavior creates a strong bias toward monotonic dimensional descent. Once the bubble universe begins to contract and spin up, reversing the process becomes dynamically expensive. Although reversal is not forbidden in principle, it requires overcoming the steep energy gradient. Lower-dimensional or smaller-radius configurations correspond to lower vacuum-energy states, so the system naturally evolves toward them. *The combination of an energy gradient and angular-momentum constraints therefore make dimensional descent effectively one-way for almost all trajectories.* Spin-up during contraction does not impose a logical prohibition on reversal; it simply makes the forward descent dynamically sticky and strongly biased toward monotonic progression.

Rotation coupled to contraction naturally produces a self-stabilizing configuration with nontrivial structure. For any fixed angular momentum L, there exists a characteristic radius (or a narrow band of radii) at which inward forces, arising from the vacuum-energy gradient, bubble universe tension, or analogous terms, balance the outward centrifugal contribution from rotation. Perturbations around this equilibrium radius tend to self-correct: a slight contraction increases ω, strengthens centrifugal support, and pushes the system outward; a slight expansion decreases ω, weakens centrifugal support, and allows the system to fall back inward. This is the classic signature of a dynamically stable equilibrium.

If dimensional descent is radius-linked, then each "step down" corresponds to a new equilibrium radius and vacuum-energy density. This results in each dimensional layer becoming a metastable attractor. Once the system occupies a given layer with fixed L, the coupled radius–spin configuration resists small perturbations. Spin-up during contraction therefore stabilizes each stage of descent, allowing the overall process to unfold as a sequence of dynamically stable attractors separated by energetic or structural thresholds. If the bubble has a well-defined rotation axis, then all the usual gyroscopic phenomena appear, but now embedded in the multiversal geometry.

A spinning bubble resists changes to the direction of its rotation axis. That means external torques (from neighboring bubbles, filaments, or anisotropies in the vacuum field) will cause precession rather than simple reorientation. The rotation axis becomes a dynamically privileged direction in the local geometry. If the bubble has multiple nested dimensional shells, each with its own effective moment of inertia and possibly slightly different angular velocities, then torques on outer layers can induce precession modes that couple to inner layers. Misalignment between axes of different layers can generate internal shear, leading to energy dissipation, mode locking (axes aligning over time), or the emergence of preferred filamentary structures (vortical filaments along the net angular momentum vector).

A spinning bubble moving through a background field (or along a higher-dimensional trajectory) will have resistance to tumbling and constrained ways in which its orientation can evolve (precession cones rather than arbitrary wandering). In the BB model, that means the rotation axis can function as a *memory vector*—a persistent geometric feature that survives dimensional descent and constrains how the bubble can interact, merge, or align with others.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

➤ *Casimir Force Decreases*

As the BB multiverse undergoes dimensional descent, the vacuum-energy density falls, and with it the Casimir contribution to the stress–energy tensor weakens. This weakening is not a minor correction but a structural shift that alters the geometry, stability, and interaction of bubble universes at every level of the hierarchy. The weakening of Casimir energy also affects the spacing and interaction of bubble universes. In the early multiverse, Casimir repulsion between bubble walls creates a short-range exclusion zone that prevents collisions even when rotational or precessional motion brings bubbles close together. As the vacuum energy falls, this repulsive barrier shrinks, the effective potential separating bubbles becomes shallower. The multiverse becomes a colder, more weakly repulsive environment in which bubble spacing is governed primarily by their inertial and rotational dynamics rather than by vacuum-driven Casimir pressure. This shift increases the likelihood of inter-bubble encounters and makes Cold-Spot-type signatures in universes like ours more probable.

The consequences extend to exotic spacetime structures. Wormholes, closed timelike curves, and other non-classical geometries require negative energy densities to remain open or even to form. The Casimir effect is the only experimentally verified source of such negative energy in quantum field theory. As the vacuum energy falls, the magnitude of Casimir negative energy diminishes, and the multiverse loses its capacity to support traversable wormholes or chronology-violating structures. Wormhole throats collapse, CTCs cannot be sustained, and the spacetime fabric becomes causally rigid. Chronology protection becomes automatic, not because of a fundamental prohibition, but because the vacuum no longer supplies the exotic stress–energy required to violate it. The late-time multiverse therefore becomes increasingly classical, with exotic geometries fading out as the vacuum energy approaches zero.

In higher-dimensional S10 sectors, Casimir energy densities can be enormous, scaling as the inverse of the radius raised to a high power, as follows: $\rho_{\text{Casimir}} \sim \frac{1}{R^{D+1}}$. In such settings, Casimir stresses can dominate over gravity and can either attract or repel depending on the boundary conditions and topology. They do not behave like gravity in a universal sense, since their sign and magnitude depend on field content and geometric configuration, but they can overshadow gravitational effects and shape large-scale structure in the early multiverse, especially since the gravitational constant in higher-dimensional sectors, like the S10 sectors, is much weaker in the BB multiverse model. As dimensional descent proceeds and vacuum energy falls, this dominance fades, and ordinary gravity becomes the only long-range geometric force that survives into the late-time 3+1D regime.

By the time the multiverse reaches the stage in which our universe exists, Casimir stabilization is extremely weak, compact dimensions (if any remain) are frozen by symmetry breaking rather than by vacuum pressure, inter-bubble Casimir repulsion is negligible, and exotic spacetime structures cannot be sustained. The universe becomes causally conservative, topologically stable, and governed almost entirely by classical gravitational dynamics. In this sense, our 3D universe is a late-epoch structure living in a low-vacuum environment where Casimir forces no longer sculpt geometry strongly, where bubble interactions are governed by inertial motion rather than vacuum repulsion, and where wormholes and time-travel structures are impossible because the vacuum cannot support the negative energy that they require. This is the actual physical basis for Hawking's Chronology Protection, discussed in more detail, below.

➤ *Reduction in the Number of Dimensions*

In the BB multiverse, dimensionality is not a fixed geometric attribute but an emergent expression of the vacuum's entanglement structure. Each spatial dimension corresponds to an independent entanglement direction that the vacuum can sustain. The number of such directions depends on the vacuum's energetic capacity: high vacuum energy density (and the supporting Casimir forces) supports many independent curvature directions, while low vacuum energy density supports only a few. Dimensional descent therefore reflects a loss of the vacuum's ability to maintain distinct entanglement directions as its energy density falls.

The descent is driven by two coupled gradients. As the vacuum energy density decreases, the bubble contracts and its rotation rate increases. At the same time, the Casimir force, which stabilizes compact or semi-compact directions, weakens. In high-energy phases, each compact direction supports a dense tower of vacuum modes, and the associated Casimir stresses generate sharp minima in the moduli space. These minima act as restoring forces that keep the dimensions distinct. When the vacuum energy density falls, the density of available vacuum modes decreases, the Casimir contribution to the stress–energy tensor weakens, and the stabilizing minima flatten. The energetic barriers separating adjacent entanglement directions diminish, and the vacuum loses the rigidity required to maintain a high-dimensional configuration.

Rotation amplifies this process. As the bubble's angular velocity increases, rotational shear stretches the vacuum along some directions and compresses it along others. In a high-energy regime, the Casimir force is strong enough to resist this deformation. In a low-energy regime, the weakened Casimir pressure cannot counteract the rotational shear, and the entanglement directions begin to align. Formerly independent spatial axes are forced into tighter configurations, and the geometry can no longer express the full dimensional spectrum supported at earlier epochs. The relational structure remains intact in the fiber, but the induced geometry collapses into a lower-dimensional effective form.

The combined effect of increasing rotation and weakening Casimir stabilization produces a monotonic sequence of forced dimensional compactifications. Each step of the descent corresponds to the loss of one

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

independent entanglement direction and the collapse of its associated vacuum-mode spectrum. The process continues until the vacuum reaches a configuration that remains stable even with arbitrarily small vacuum energy. In the BB multiverse, this occurs at three spatial dimensions. Once the vacuum energy density approaches near zero in the 3D bubble universe, the Casimir force becomes too weak to drive further compression, and dimensional descent naturally terminates.

This framework provides a dynamical mechanism for compactification that is absent in conventional higher-dimensional theories. Whereas M-theory specifies the existence of compact dimensions but does not explain why they compactify, the BB model identifies the physical drivers: falling vacuum energy weakens the Casimir stabilization of entanglement directions, while increasing rotation supplies the mechanical pressure that forces those directions to compactify. Dimensional reduction is therefore the macroscopic manifestation of a microscopic reorganization of vacuum entanglement, governed by the coupled evolution of rotation, curvature, and vacuum energy.

➢ *Time Emerges from Rotating Space*

- *Role of Casimir Force*

The rotation of the timelike axis in the BB multiverse is not a purely geometric effect but a dynamical reorganization of the vacuum's relational-mode structure. The Casimir force plays a central role in this process because it is the only mechanism capable of exerting differential pressure on the vacuum's entanglement directions. In a high-dimensional bubble, each spatial direction corresponds to a distinct set of boundary conditions on the vacuum's relational modes, and each direction supports its own tower of allowed excitations. These mode towers generate Casimir stresses that keep the entanglement directions independent and maintain the dimensional structure.

When the bubble rotates, the vacuum ceases to be isotropic. Rotation introduces shear, anisotropy, and a preferred axis. The entanglement directions begin to experience different effective boundary conditions depending on their orientation relative to the rotational axis. The Casimir force responds to this anisotropy by redistributing vacuum pressure. Directions aligned with the axis of rotation experience a different suppression of relational modes than those orthogonal to it.

As long as the vacuum energy remains high, the Casimir force is strong enough to preserve the independence of all spatial directions despite the anisotropy introduced by rotation. But as the vacuum energy density falls during dimensional descent, the Casimir contribution weakens, and the stabilizing barriers between entanglement directions begin to erode. The vacuum becomes increasingly susceptible to rotational shear. The direction whose mode spectrum is most strongly suppressed by rotation is the first to lose its stabilizing Casimir pressure. This is the direction that will eventually rotate into a timelike signature. The mechanism is therefore a competition between rotational shear and Casimir stabilization.

Rotation attempts to align one spatial direction with the axis of rotation, effectively pulling it out of the spatial bundle. The Casimir force resists this alignment by maintaining the independence of the direction's mode spectrum. When the vacuum energy is high, Casimir stabilization dominates and prevents any dimension from collapsing into a timelike role. As the vacuum energy falls, the Casimir force weakens, and rotational shear becomes the dominant influence. Once the stabilizing pressure on a particular direction becomes too weak to counteract the rotational anisotropy, the vacuum can no longer sustain that direction as an independent spatial axis. It begins to align with the rotational axis, and its metric signature gradually shifts from spacelike to timelike.

This transition is not abrupt. It proceeds through an intermediate phase in which the direction's mode spectrum becomes increasingly asymmetric. The Casimir energy associated with that direction decreases relative to the others, and the differential pressure that once kept it orthogonal to the rotational axis fades. As this pressure fades, the direction begins to fuse with the rotational axis. The vacuum's entanglement structure reorients itself, and the direction's signature transitions smoothly into a timelike configuration. The emergence of a fully time-like axis is therefore the endpoint of a dynamical process in which the Casimir force first stabilizes the dimensional structure and then, as it weakens, allows rotation to reorganize the vacuum into a lower-dimensional, anisotropic state.

In this sense, the Casimir force facilitates the rotation of the timelike axis by providing the stabilizing barrier that must weaken before rotational alignment can occur. Without the Casimir force, the vacuum would not possess distinct entanglement directions to begin with, and dimensional descent would not proceed in discrete steps. Without the weakening of the Casimir force, rotation would never be able to collapse a spatial direction into a timelike one. The emergence of time is therefore a cooperative phenomenon: the Casimir force defines the initial dimensional structure, rotation introduces anisotropy, and the weakening of the Casimir force during vacuum decay allows that anisotropy to reorganize the vacuum into a state with a single timelike direction aligned with the bubble's axis of rotation.

- *Spatialization of Time*

Hence, as dimensional descent proceeds, one spatial axis undergoes a qualitative transformation. What begins as a Euclidean direction gradually acquires the properties of a timelike axis—directionality, causality, and irreversible ordering. This transition is not imposed; it is geometric. Let θ_v be the vertical rotation angle that mixes a spatial axis with the timelike direction. Start with a purely spatial basis vector e_x. Under vertical rotation, it transforms as: $e_x' = \cos\theta_v \, e_x + \sin\theta_v \, e_t$. For small θ_v, the axis remains effectively spatial in the higher-dimensional bubble

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

universes. But as θ_v increases, the component along e_t grows. At a critical angle: $\theta_v = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the axis becomes fully timelike, where $e_x' = e_t$. This is the moment when "time" becomes a distinct dimension in our 3D universe, representing the end of the transformation and rotation.

The metric signature changes continuously during this rotation: $ds^2 = +dx^2 \longrightarrow ds^2 = -dt^2$. The sign flip is not arbitrary—it is the geometric consequence of the axis crossing the null boundary: $\cos\theta_v = \sin\theta_v$. Beyond this point, the rotated axis supports causal ordering, light-cone structure, irreversibility, temporal separation rather than spatial separation. Time becomes directional because the rotated axis inherits the orientation of the timelike generator e_t. The arrow of time is simply the orientation of the rotated axis.

As θ_v increases, the timelike component strengthens, the spatial component weakens, causal relations sharpen, simultaneity becomes frame-dependent, and the universe transitions from a Euclidean to a Lorentzian regime. In the early stages ($\theta_v \ll 1$), "time" is weak, diffuse, and symmetric. Near $\theta_v = \pi/2$, time becomes fully real, causal, and directional. The speed of light and causal space increases during the rotation due to a geometric transformation in a twisted Minkowski's spacetime diagram (refer to Appendix 1).

A smoothly rotating time axis does far more than produce ordinary relativistic time dilation. It generates a suite of geometric, dynamical, and causal effects that Einstein's framework does not contain, because General Relativity (GR) assumes a fixed Lorentzian signature. This opens an entire class of effects that GR cannot describe. In the BB model, the signature itself is dynamical. This produces new physical phenomena: variable causal depth, anisotropic inertia, rotation-induced stabilization gradients, direction-dependent light cones, and cross-sector "temporal shear" between bubbles. If two bubble universes have different θ_v, then their time axes are not parallel, their causal structures are not commensurate and the mapping of events between them produces "temporal parallax." This is analogous to spatial parallax, but in the time dimension. It predicts *observers in different bubble universes will disagree not only on rates of time but on the direction of time and on the ordering of events*.

In GR, curvature of time is curvature of spacetime. In the BB model, the *rotation* of the time axis produces an additional effect. *Even in a flat metric, a rotating time axis produces effective temporal curvature*. This curvature affects clocks, causal structure, and geodesics and it is not sourced by mass-energy, but by θ_v. This is a new geometric degree of freedom absent in GR.

- *Rotation as the Origin of Time*

The insight that space emerges from the pre-geometric vacuum, while time emerges from the rotation of one spatial dimension into a time-like axis that stabilizes each bubble-universe is not only consistent with emergent-spacetime theories (Barbour, Rovelli, Verlinde, Witten and others [24-37]), but actually simplifies them by giving a single, physically intelligible mechanism for both space and time. Time does not preexist the bubble. It emerges only when the newly formed bubble acquires rotation. Rotation breaks the isotropy of the entanglement network and selects a preferred axis. Then, one spatial dimension undergoes a rotation-induced signature shift, becoming timelike. As bubbles become smaller, their rotational frequency increases, incrementally strengthening their timelike signatures. Thus, each bubble possesses its own emergent spacetime, with geometry and temporality arising from entanglement structure and rotational dynamics.

Most emergent-time proposals struggle with what selects the direction of time, why time has an arrow, why time is one-dimensional, and why time is different from space. The BB model addresses these through one mechanism. Why does one dimension become time? This is because the bubble's rotation singles out an axis - only one axis aligns with the rotation axis. Why does time have an arrow? This is because rotation has direction (clockwise vs counterclockwise). The arrow of time emerges from the handedness of the bubble's rotation. Furthermore, time is different from space because it is the only axis that undergoes signature change.

In the BB framework, "degrees of freedom (DOF)" do not refer to spatial coordinates, geometric directions, or field-theoretic variables. Before the first bubble is induced, none of these structures exist. What the model calls degrees of freedom are the primitive relational modes of Domain 2: the pre-geometric units of variation that can participate in alignment, correlation, and eventual geometric induction. They have no location, no metric, and no spatial interpretation. They are simply the elemental relational capacities from which geometry, fields, and spacetime will later be constructed.

These degrees of freedom include the modes that carry relational alignment, the non-geometric variables that encode possible correlation patterns, and the fundamental units of relational capacity that can be allocated to a bubble when a new induced domain becomes dynamically stable. They form the raw substrate that Domain 3 reorganizes into an entanglement network when the first bubble nucleates. In this sense, degrees of freedom are the pre-geometric relational elements that become structured into geometry only after induction. They are not spatial ingredients but the underlying relational content from which spatial structure eventually emerges.

When bubble nucleation forces vacuum DOF into an entanglement network, space emerges in the ancestor bubble. When bubble rotation selects one axis and gradually rotates it into a timelike dimension in descendent bubble universes, time emerges. Bubble size influences rotational speed, and hence, the strength of the time signature. Each

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

bubble has its own spacetime because each bubble has its own entanglement pattern and rotation axis. This gives a multiverse where spacetime is not fundamental, each bubble has its own emergent geometry, and time is not universal. So, dimensionality is dynamic, not fixed.

Time appears only because the bubble acquires rotation. The bubble's rotation selects one spatial axis and gradually pushes it through a signature transition. This is a physical Wick rotation, not a mathematical trick. Rotation forces a time dimension because a rotating bubble has a preferred axis, a preferred orientation, and a preferred direction (handedness). Smaller bubbles rotate faster resulting in a stronger time signature. This gives a continuous, tunable emergence of time: large bubbles with slow rotation have weak time signatures and near-Euclidean geometry; small bubbles have fast rotation, strong time signatures and fully Lorentzian spacetime. This is a natural, physical explanation for why time is one-dimensional, why time is different from space, why time has an arrow, why different bubbles can have different temporal properties. Thus, each bubble possesses its own emergent spacetime, with geometry and temporality arising from entanglement structure and rotational dynamics. This approach yields a compact and mechanistic formulation of emergent spacetime in the BB ontology.

- *Decreasing Vacuum Energy Density*

Additionally, as vacuum energy decreases on dimensional descent and matter becomes dynamically dominant, gravitational instability and structure formation generate large entropy increases [42–44], reinforcing the macroscopic arrow of time established earlier by faster rotation and the falling Casimir forces, as discussed above.

➢ *Chirality, Parity Offsets, and Charge Reversals*

The emergence of chirality shifts, parity offsets, and ultimately charge reversals during dimensional descent follows from the fact that the multiverse's geometry is not static but rotating in multiple planes simultaneously. Both the spatial triad and the time axis participate in the global helical motion. This motion cannot be captured by a single angular velocity vector; instead, it requires a bivector-valued angular velocity—the natural descriptor of rotations in higher-dimensional frame bundles.

A rotation is specified not by a single direction but by the plane in which the rotation occurs. For a descending bubble universe, the angular velocity therefore cannot be represented by a vector; it must be encoded in a bivector, the geometric object that identifies a rotation plane. In this context, the full angular velocity consists of two distinct components: the spatial bivectors, which generate the horizontal twisting of the bubble's spatial frame, and the temporal–spatial bivectors, which generate the rotation of the time axis as it tilts toward vertical during dimensional descent.

In this setting, the full angular velocity decomposes into six distinct bivector components. The spatial bivectors are: $e_x \wedge e_y$, $e_y \wedge e_z$, $e_z \wedge e_x$. These three planes generate the horizontal twisting of the bubble's spatial triad and are responsible for the parity offsets that accumulate during descent. The temporal–spatial bivectors are: $e_x \wedge e_t$, $e_y \wedge e_t$, $e_z \wedge e_t$. These three planes generate the rotation of the time axis, tilting it toward vertical and inducing the monodromic charge-conjugation behavior associated with the twisted E6 bundle. The table below gives the physical interpretation of each bivector in more detail.

Table 2 Role and Interpretation of Each Bivector

Bivector Sector	***Physical Role***	***Physical Interpretation***
$e_x \wedge e_y$	Spatial parity-twist	Generates shear in the xy-plane, contributing to chirality accumulation as the bubble's horizontal frame twists during descent.
$e_y \wedge e_z$	Spatial parity-twist	Produces rotational bias in the yz-plane, shaping how spatial axes misalign and feed into parity offsets.
$e_z \wedge e_x$	Spatial parity-twist	Induces torsion in the zx-plane, completing the triad of horizontal twists that determine the bubble's emergent chirality signature.
$e_x \wedge e_t$	Time-axis rotation	Tilts the time axis within the xt-plane, initiating the verticalization that drives monodromic charge-conjugation behavior.
$e_y \wedge e_t$	Time-axis rotation	Rotates the temporal axis through the yt-plane, modulating how temporal flow couples to spatial curvature during descent.
$e_z \wedge e_t$	Time-axis rotation	Bends the time axis in the zt-plane, completing the temporal-spatial triad responsible for full time-axis reorientation.

Together, these six bivector sectors form the complete angular-velocity bivector: $\Omega = \omega_{xy}\, e_x \wedge e_y + \omega_{yz}\, e_y \wedge e_z + \omega_{zx}\, e_z \wedge e_x + \omega_{xt}\, e_x \wedge e_t + \omega_{yt}\, e_y \wedge e_t + \omega_{zt}\, e_z \wedge e_t$. These simultaneously encode the bubble's horizontal frame twist and the vertical rotation of its emergent time axis. This object generates the full *helical motion* through the *rotor* $R(\chi) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\Omega\,\chi\right)$, which acts simultaneously on the spatial frame and on the internal gauge fiber.

- *Spatial Bivectors and Parity Offsets*

In the higher-dimensional S10 sectors, the entanglement network is nearly isotropic, and the spatial components of Ω are small. Parent and child universes differ only by an infinitesimal orientation angle. However, once the system enters the E6-dominated descent (6D → 5D → 4D → 3D), rotational anisotropy increases sharply. The spatial bivectors $e_x \wedge e_y$, $e_y \wedge e_z$, and $e_z \wedge e_x$ acquire significant magnitude, producing a misalignment $\Delta\theta_P(\omega)$ between the spatial frames of adjacent bubbles. This misalignment generates a *parity offset*: the handedness of spatial geodesics and the orientation of the coordinate triad no longer coincide between vacua. Since each bubble is itself rotating and precessing, this relative parity is not fixed; over cosmological timescales, a neighboring universe may alternate between mirror-parity and same-parity relative to ours.

- *Temporal–Spatial Bivectors and the Rotation of the Time Axis*

We discussed the rotation of the time-like axis towards the rotational axis above. The temporal–spatial bivectors $e_i \wedge e_t$ encode the rotation of this time axis. A spatial basis vector transforms as $e_x' = \cos\theta_v\, e_x + \sin\theta_v\, e_t$, where θ_v is the tilt angle of the time axis during descent. As $\theta_v \to \pi/2$, the time axis becomes fully vertical, marking the emergence of a stable causal direction in the terminal 3D bubble.

This rotation does more than reorient the causal structure. Because the E6 gauge bundle is fibered over the geometric base, any rotation of the base induces a corresponding *holonomy* in the internal fiber. The internal fields transform as $\Psi \longrightarrow U(\theta_v, \omega)\,\Psi$, where U is generated by the same bivector-valued angular velocity that twists the spatial frame.

Holonomy is the net change produced when a geometric object is transported around a closed loop in a curved space or in a bundle equipped with a connection. The essential mechanism behind this effect is *parallel transport*: the rule that determines how a vector (or internal degree of freedom) is carried along a path while remaining tangent to the underlying surface or fiber and changing as little as the geometry allows. Parallel transport does not mean keeping the vector aligned with an external reference such as "north" or "east." Instead, the vector is allowed to slide along the surface without twisting it by hand, so that its covariant derivative along the path vanishes. The connection dictates how the vector evolves, and curvature determines how much it fails to return to its original orientation after completing a loop.

A classic example on the surface of a sphere makes this concrete. Begin at a point on the equator with an arrow lying flat on the surface and pointing north. Walk along a meridian toward the North Pole, keeping the arrow tangent to the sphere and refraining from rotating it. Because the meridian is a geodesic, the arrow maintains its orientation relative to the path and arrives at the pole unchanged. Now descend along a different meridian—say, one 90 degrees east of the first—again without twisting the arrow. Although you do nothing to it, the arrow's orientation relative to the new path is different: it now points along what was originally the east–west direction. When you reach the equator, the arrow is pointing east. Finally, walk along the equator back to your starting point, still keeping the arrow tangent and unrotated. The arrow arrives pointing east even though it began pointing north. This mismatch is the holonomy of the loop, and it arises solely from the curvature of the sphere.

Holonomy is therefore the accumulated transformation produced by going around a closed loop. In general relativity, this transformation reflects spacetime curvature: transporting a vector around a loop in spacetime reveals how the gravitational field twists local inertial frames. In gauge theory, the same idea applies to internal degrees of freedom: moving around the geometric structure of a fiber bundle twists the internal gauge variables by a net group transformation. In all cases, holonomy expresses how curvature—geometric or gauge—imprints itself on transported quantities.

- *The Twisted E6 Bundle and Scherk–Schwarz Monodromy*

In the BB multiverse model, the generalized equation of motion governing the budding of each descendant bubble universe forces the center of each bubble to trace a helical trajectory (i.e., a vortical filament) through the bulk embedding space. Only the primordial ancestor bubble nucleates; all subsequent vacua arise through budding, and the locus of bubble-center motion forms a helically wound path. The natural parameter that tracks this combined axial progression and angular winding is the helical coordinate χ. Thus χ is the intrinsic parameter of the helical trajectory defined by the bubble-center dynamics, not an imposed or auxiliary coordinate.

Because this trajectory is helical, motion along χ is not a simple translation but a geometric twist. Parallel transport along $d\chi$ — meaning transport that keeps internal degrees of freedom tangent to the bundle structure and allows them to change only as required by the connection—acts nontrivially on the internal symmetry. Advancing by one helical pitch corresponds to traversing a closed loop in the internal symmetry bundle, and the holonomy accumulated along this loop is determined by the curvature and topology induced by the helical embedding.

With this geometric structure in place, the role of χ becomes clear. The helical coordinate χ acts as a Scherk–Schwarz reduction direction: transport along $d\chi$ imposes a nontrivial, group-valued boundary condition on the internal symmetry. As a result, the symmetry is not a rigid E6 x E6 product but a twisted E6 bundle whose monodromy is an $\mathbb{Z}_2$ outer automorphism of E6. A full traversal of the helical pitch implements this automorphism, exchanging each representation with its complex conjugate and producing the

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

characteristic pairing of CP-reversed sectors. Locally the symmetry still appears as E6 x E6, but globally it is twisted by the monodromy induced by the helical descent.

When the accumulated holonomy crosses the conjugation boundary, the transformation becomes $U(\theta_v, \omega) \in \mathrm{Aut}(E_6) \Rightarrow \Psi \longrightarrow \Psi^*$. This is the geometric origin of charge reversal. It is not an independent or arbitrary flip but the inevitable consequence of the same bivector-driven rotational shear that produces the parity offset. Spatial bivectors generate P (parity) reversals by twisting the spatial frame; temporal–spatial bivectors generate C reversals by inducing holonomy in the internal E6 fiber as the time axis rotates. Together, these geometric effects produce CP-reversed vacua—that is, CP-reversed descendant bubbles arising naturally from the helical descent through the E6-dominated sector.

- *Conjugate Pairs and Möbius Topology*

The twisted E6 bundle admits two holonomy classes: one preserving Ψ, the other mapping it to Ψ^*. These correspond to two vacua differing in both spatial orientation and internal charge structure. The pairing arises naturally from the *Möbius-type topology* of the twisted bundle: a half-turn of the helix ($\Delta\chi = \pi$) maps the fundamental representation to its complex conjugate: $27 \longrightarrow \overline{27}$. Thus, the antimatter mirror universe is not a separate construction but the conjugate face of the same twisted internal symmetry.

- *Why CP Reversal Does Not Occur in the S10 sector*

In the S10 sector rotational speeds are low, the entanglement network is isotropic, the time axis is not yet significantly separated, and the E6 fiber is not sufficiently differentiated. The holonomy cannot cross the conjugation boundary. Only in the E6-dominated descent, where the bivector components of Ω become large, does charge conjugation become dynamically accessible.

- *Summary*

The full helical motion of the bubble universe is encoded in a bivector-valued angular velocity. Its spatial components generate parity offsets; its temporal–spatial components generate the holonomy responsible for charge conjugation. Together they produce CP-reversed universes as the natural conjugate branches of a Möbius-twisted E6 bundle. No additional symmetry-flipping mechanism is required.

➢ *Speed of Light and Causal Depth Increases*

- *Geometric Transformations*

As the time-like axis (evolving from a spatial axis) rotates counter-clockwise in a Minkowski diagram during dimensional descent, it drags the null line with it, causing the causal wedge to open. This widening of the causal space is the geometric signature of the transition from a high-symmetry, weakly ordered regime to a low-symmetry, strongly ordered one. When the time-like axis is shallow, the null line lies close to the horizontal spatial axis, and the space in the causal wedge is narrow. Only a small angular sector of directions supports genuine causal propagation, and the distinction between timelike and spacelike separations is weak.

As the time axis rotates to become more vertical, the null line must rotate with it to preserve orthogonality and maintain the structure of lightlike intervals. This rotation widens the causal wedge and increases the maximum causal propagation speed along the emerging temporal direction. Therefore, as θ_v increases, the null boundary rotates upward, admitting a larger set of events into the domain of causal influence. The causal space then expands like a fan opening. This directional expansion is what makes causal reach anisotropic: causal influence becomes deeper along the direction of the rotating axis, while remaining comparatively shallow in directions orthogonal to it.

The rotation of the null line has a direct physical interpretation: the effective speed of light increases along the direction of the emerging time axis. In Minkowski geometry, the slope of the null line encodes the ratio between spatial and temporal intervals that define lightlike propagation. When the null line rotates toward vertical, its slope increases, meaning that a larger spatial separation can be traversed per unit of proper time without leaving the null boundary. This progressive geometric realignment increases the effective speed of light during dimensional descent. The geometry gradually permits faster causal propagation along that direction. The speed of light here is not a dynamical parameter but a geometric one: it is the slope of the null boundary in the local causal structure. This is the *primary driver* for the increase in the speed of light and the expansion of causal space.

The opening of the causal wedge and the increase in the effective speed of light are two expressions of the same geometric transformation. As the wedge widens, the sector acquires greater causal depth. When the wedge is narrow, the manifold cannot sharply distinguish successive causal steps; events smear together because the geometry does not provide sufficient separation between them. In such a regime, causal depth is shallow. The universe cannot resolve fine distinctions between histories, and many microstates collapse into equivalence classes because the causal structure lacks the resolution to differentiate them. Cross-sector interference (Q: persistent superposition) persists because the geometry has not yet imposed the distinctions required for sectorization (Q: classical behavior). A shallow causal wedge corresponds to weak ordering, high reversibility, and minimal stabilization (Q: high coherence, reversible unitary evolution).

As the wedge opens and the null boundary rotates upward, the situation changes qualitatively. A wider causal region allows more causal intervals to fit within a unit of proper time. The manifold gains the ability to discriminate between trajectories that were previously indistinguishable. Slight differences in configuration, alignment, or path become resolvable because the causal network now has the depth to separate them. This increase in causal depth is the geometric precondition for stabilization (Q: the onset of

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

environment-induced decoherence). Stabilization requires the ability to maintain distinctions between histories and prevent their re-merging (Q: suppression of off-diagonal density-matrix terms). When the causal wedge is narrow, the geometry cannot enforce this separation; once the wedge opens, the geometry begins to impose it automatically. The rotation of the time axis sharpens causal ordering, and this sharpening breaks the symmetry that previously allowed cross-sector blending (Q: breaking of phase coherence).

Stabilization becomes unavoidable once the causal wedge is sufficiently open. The manifold now supports long, irreversible chains of causal influence along the emerging time axis (Q: emergence of classical trajectories via decoherent histories). Environmental interactions accumulate more effectively because the geometry provides more opportunities for relational distinctions to propagate (Q: increased system–environment entanglement leading to decoherence). Phase-like information disperses more rapidly because the causal network can now differentiate the paths along which it evolves (Q: rapid phase randomization). Sectorization (Q: Classicality) emerges not because the system is measured or because matter changes its behavior, but because the geometry has become deep enough to enforce irreversible ordering within the lifetime of the multiverse. The opening of the causal wedge is the geometric mechanism that converts cross-sector instabilities (Q: superpositions) into sector-confined, stable classical trajectories (Q: decohered pointer states).

Entropy follows the same geometric logic. In high-energy S10 sectors, where the time axis is shallow and the causal wedge is narrow, the accessible microstate space is large, but the number of distinguishable microstates is small. The geometry cannot resolve fine differences between states, so many microstates are effectively merged. Entropy is low because the causal structure does not yet impose the distinctions that would make microstates count as separate. As θ_v increases and the causal wedge opens, the accessible microstate space becomes anisotropic: deep along the emerging time axis and shallow orthogonally. This anisotropy reduces the symmetric microstate volume inherited from the parent manifold. At the same time, the increase in causal depth increases the number of microstates that are distinguishable. Both effects push entropy upward. The shrinking of the symmetric microstate space and the increasing resolution of the causal network together ensure that entropy grows monotonically with θ_v.

In the BB framework, the increasing speed of light, the growth of causal depth, the strengthening of stabilization (Q: increase in decoherence), and the rise of entropy are not separate phenomena. They are different expressions of the same geometric transition: the opening of the causal wedge as the time axis rotates toward vertical. When the angle θ_v is small, the wedge is narrow, the null line is shallow, causal depth is low, stabilization (Q: decoherence) is weak, and cross-sector instability in the transitional phase (Q: weird quantum behavior) dominates. As θ_v approaches $\pi/2$, the wedge becomes fully open, the null line becomes vertical, the effective speed of light reaches its maximum, causal depth reaches its maximum, stabilization becomes structurally enforced, and sectorization (Q: classicality) emerges as the natural mode of evolution. The arrow of time, the growth of entropy, and the suppression of cross-sector instability in the transitional phase, evidenced by contracting Planck scales, all arise from the same geometric process: the gradual verticalization of the time axis and the corresponding expansion of the causal region that defines what it means for one event to influence another.

In the above analysis, we ignored the rotation of spatial axes. The combined rotation of the spatial dimensions and the time-like dimension will generate a twist or topological torsion. Hence, to analyze the effects of the combined rotation of the space and time-like dimensions on the speed of light and causal space, strictly speaking, we will need to visualize tilted time axes, non-orthogonal coordinates, different causal cone opening angles, different effective speeds of light, and nested bubble embeddings. This can be done with what the author introduces as an "Einstein–Cartan–Minkowski diagram" (see Appendix 1 for details).

- *Vacuum Energy Transformations*

Additionally, varying-speed-of-light (VSL) theories [39-41] provide additional insight to why the speed of light increases. In such theories, the limiting speed c is controlled by a scalar field that also influences cosmological evolution. In regimes with high vacuum-energy density, strong curvature and intense quantum fluctuations suppress the effective causal speed. As the vacuum-energy density decreases, the fabric of spacetime softens, and cross-sector instabilities (Q: quantum fluctuations) diminish, allowing the effective causal speed to increase. The model adopts the monotonic branch in which decreasing vacuum-energy density corresponds to an increasing effective causal speed, interpreted as the stabilization of causal structure. The effective refractive index of the vacuum satisfies $n(\rho_{\text{vac}}) \propto \rho_{\text{vac}}$, which implies that the effective speed of light is $c_{\text{eff}} = \frac{c}{n(\rho_{\text{vac}})} \propto \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{vac}}}$. Thus, as the vacuum-energy density decreases, the effective speed of light increases. This is a *secondary driver* that stabilizes the increase in the speed of light.

➢ *Decrease in Time Dilation*

- *Kinematic Time Dilation*

A central dynamical consequence of falling vacuum energy is the monotonic reduction of relativistic time dilation. This reduction follows from the coupled evolution of the effective speed of light, the curvature of the manifold, and the relevant Planck scales. Because the refractive index of the vacuum scales with vacuum energy, the effective speed of light increases as vacuum energy falls. A higher effective speed of light reduces the Lorentz factor, $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v^2/c_{\text{eff}}^2}}$, so kinematic time dilation becomes progressively less extreme.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

This reduction in kinematic dilation reflects the rising metric stability gradient: as vacuum energy decreases, the manifold becomes more deformable, curvature becomes smoother, and the causal structure becomes increasingly sectorized (Q: classical). The opening of the light cone is therefore a direct expression of increasing metric stability during dimensional descent.

- *Gravitational Time Dilation*

The gravitational contribution to time dilation evolves in parallel but is governed by the interplay between two opposing stability gradients: the dimensional stability gradient, which is Casimir-dominated and decreases during descent, and the metric stability gradient, which is gravity-dominated and increases during descent.

In the high-vacuum regime, the Casimir force is strong and produces high dimensional stability by maintaining the separation and identity of curvature directions. However, this does not stabilize geodesic behavior. Because the metric is extremely stiff in this regime, curvature fluctuations are large, geodesics diverge rapidly, and gravitational time dilation is extreme and unstable. High dimensional stability therefore coexists with low metric stability.

As vacuum energy decreases, the Casimir force weakens and dimensional stability falls. At the same time, the effective gravitational coupling increases, the manifold becomes softer, and curvature becomes classical and smooth. Geodesics stabilize, gravitational time dilation becomes bounded, and the causal structure becomes predictable. This marks the rise of metric stability, which eventually dominates over the diminishing dimensional stability.

- *Planck-Scale Contributions and Cross-Sector Stability*

The Planck time, $t_p = \sqrt{\hbar G / c^5}$, also evolves during dimensional descent. The effective Planck constant decreases, the effective speed of light increases, and the gravitational coupling increases. The dominant effects — the decrease in the effective Planck constant and the increase in the effective speed of light — reduce the Planck time. A smaller Planck time corresponds to finer temporal resolution, reduced cross-sector instability during the transitional phase (Q: reduced quantum jitter), and more sharply defined causal intervals. Cross-sector contributions to time dilation therefore diminish as the Planck time shrinks. This reduction in cross-sector dilation reflects the strengthening of metric stability and the weakening of what is perceived as quantum-dominated instability, characteristic of the high-vacuum S10 meta-classical sectors.

- *Light-Cone Structure and Sectorization (Q: Emergence of Classicality)*

Time dilation is amplified in regimes where the light cone is narrow, the metric signature approaches Euclidean form, and stabilization is weak. These conditions characterize the S10 meta-classical sectors (Q: quantum-dominated sectors as perceived in our frame during the transitional phase). As vacuum energy decreases, the light cone opens, the metric becomes fully Lorentzian, and stabilization strengthens. Classical trajectories become well defined as metric stability overtakes the diminishing dimensional stability. Sectorization (Q: classicality) therefore emerges not from the disappearance of instability but from the shift in the dominant stabilizing mechanism: from Casimir-dominated dimensional stability at high vacuum energy to gravity-dominated metric stability at low vacuum energy.

- *Synthesis: Monotonic Decrease in Time Dilation*

When all contributions are combined, the overall effect is a monotonic decrease in time dilation as the vacuum energy density falls. Kinematic dilation decreases because the effective speed of light increases. Gravitational dilation decreases because metric stability rises and curvature becomes smooth. Cross-sector (Q: quantum) dilation decreases because the Planck time shrinks and causal intervals sharpen. The causal structure stabilizes as the metric stability gradient rises and the dimensional stability gradient falls. Classicality emerges as the dominant mode of organization in the low-vacuum regime.

➢ *Entropy Increases*

- *Geometric Causes*

When the time axis is not yet vertical, the light cone is not symmetric. Its opening angle depends on direction. Along the emerging time axis, causal reach is deep. However, orthogonal to it, causal reach is shallow. This means the set of microstates that can be causally distinguished is *direction-dependent*. In the ancestor manifold, causal reach is isotropic; all directions are equivalent. But during dimensional descent: $\Omega_d(\theta_v) < \Omega_D$ because anisotropy removes access to microstates that require symmetric causal propagation, anisotropic causal reach *shrinks* the effective microstate space. The more tilted the time axis, the more the light cone elongates in one direction and compresses in others, reducing the number of microstates that can be causally separated. Thus, small θ_v implies nearly Euclidean, which in turn implies large accessible microstate space that results in low entropy. Large θ_v implies strongly anisotropic, which in turn implies reduced accessible microstate space that results in higher entropy. This is consistent with the formula: $S_d = k_B \ln\left(\frac{\Omega_D}{\Omega_d(\theta_v)}\right)$. As θ_v increases, Ω_d decreases, so S_d increases.

Causal depth determines how finely microstates can be distinguished. Causal depth is the number of distinct causal steps per unit proper time. When the time axis is shallow (small θ_v), causal ordering is weak, stabilization is weak and minimal and many microstates are indistinguishable. This means the *effective* microstate count is low because microstates that cannot be causally distinguished do not contribute to entropy. As θ_v increases, causal depth increases, stabilization becomes stronger, more microstates become distinguishable and entropy increases. Thus, causal depth acts as a *resolution* function on the microstate space.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

Formally: $\Omega_d(\theta_v) = \Omega_{geom}(\theta_v)\,\Omega_{resolved}(\theta_v)$, where: Ω_{geom} decreases due to anisotropic causal reach, $\Omega_{resolved}$ increases due to deeper causal ordering. The combined effect of both increases entropy monotonically with θ_v.

Even though anisotropic causal reach reduces the geometric microstate space, the increase in causal depth increases the number of microstates that are distinguishable. Both effects push entropy in the same direction: anisotropy reduces accessible microstates, and depth increases distinguishable microstates. Both reduce Ω_d relative to Ω_D, so both increase entropy. Thus, $\frac{dS}{d\theta_v} > 0$. *Entropy grows as the time axis rotates toward vertical. This is the geometric origin of the arrow of time in the BB model.*

Hence, S10 sectors (small θ_v) are nearly Euclidean, with shallow causal depth, isotropic causal reach, and has minimal stabilization and low entropy. E6 and 3D bubble (large θ_v) would be fully Lorentzian, with deep causal ordering, strong stabilization and maximal entropy. S10 sectors are near the symmetry-saturated parent state and have minimal entropy, while deeply descended E6 sectors have maximal entropy.

Thus, entropy arises from the loss of access to parent microstates, increased distinguishability of remaining microstates, anisotropic causal structure and deepening causal ordering. As the time axis rotates, the "depth" of causal ordering changes. Causal depth can be defined as the number of distinguishable causal steps per unit of proper time, the resolution of temporal ordering and the "granularity" of cause-effect structure.

Furthermore, as the speed of light (i.e., causality) increases, the maximum momentum increases, the number of accessible microstates increases, and the phase space volume expands, thus increasing entropy. This is a direct, mechanical consequence. Increasing the speed of light increases causal connectivity. Entropy is fundamentally about how many states can influence each other. Hence, when the speed of light increases, light cones widen, more regions become causally connected, more degrees of freedom can interact, more correlations can form, and more classical trajectories become available. This is a massive entropy boost.

- *Physical Causes*

Entropy requires the presence of time, causal structure, and effectively classical microstates. These conditions emerge only when the vacuum-energy density drops below a critical threshold (ρ_c), i.e., when $\rho_{vac} < \rho_c$. In this regime, entropy production increases as the vacuum-energy density decreases. Lower ρ_{vac} stabilizes sector (Q: classical) trajectories, strengthens causal ordering, and enlarges the accessible phase-space volume, allowing entropy to grow. In the BB model, why entropy increases when vacuum energy density decreases is not accidental – it is structural.

High vacuum energy generates small causal horizons and low entropy, and low vacuum energy results in large causal horizons and high entropy. Increasing "c" increases the number of classical trajectories. Strong sectorization (Q: classicality) in the BB model emerges only after the 7th dimension (when we enter the E6 sectors) because causal propagation becomes fast enough, stabilization becomes efficient, matter becomes light (i.e., not heavy), interactions become strong, phase space becomes large. All of these are entropy-increasing processes. Thus, as the effective speed of light increases, the system becomes increasingly classical, and entropy correspondingly grows. This yields a complete monotonic sequence: decreasing vacuum-energy density reduces effective masses, increases the effective electromagnetic coupling, strengthens the effective gravitational interaction, increases the effective speed of light, enlarges the accessible state space, and thereby increases entropy.

- *Combined and Other Causes*

The coupled evolution of the two key variables—rotation and vacuum-energy density—drives the onset of symmetry breaking. As discussed earlier, rotation prepares the geometry by destabilizing and compactifying higher-dimensional configurations, while falling vacuum energy prepares the vacuum manifold by reshaping the landscape of admissible minima. Together, they initiate a continuous cascade of symmetry-reducing transitions that produce progressively smaller, lower-dimensional internal bubbles. At the level of the global relational fiber of the bubble, the evolution remains fully coherent and fine-grained relational information is conserved. Nothing is lost from the underlying relational structure; the full content of the bubble persists in the fiber regardless of how many geometric phases emerge or collapse.

However, within each induced geometric sector, the situation is different. Symmetry breaking and stabilization (Q: decoherence) produce an increase in coarse-grained entropy. As stabilization strengthens, relational configurations that were once mutually coherent become partitioned into distinct geometric phases. This partitioning generates classical, irreversible behavior within each sector and establishes an internal arrow of time tied to dimensional descent and reheating. The arrow of time is therefore not fundamental but induced: it emerges from the progressive restriction of relational coherence as the bubble moves through its hierarchy of vacua.

Each new internal bubble—or sector—emerges in a highly excited, out-of-equilibrium configuration, the relational analogue of a "Big Bang." As its induced geometry stabilizes, the sector relaxes toward equilibrium, and its coarse-grained entropy increases along its internally induced time axis. This entropy gradient is genuine from the perspective of observers within the sector: symmetry breaking, reheating, and dimensional descent all contribute to the progressive loss of accessible relational configurations.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

Globally, however, nothing is lost or created. The full relational content of the bubble remains encoded in the relational fiber bundle, where fine-grained relational information is conserved. What appears locally as entropy increase is simply the consequence of stabilization (Q: decoherence) partitioning the relational degrees of freedom into increasingly autonomous geometric phases. Each step of symmetry breaking and dimensional descent therefore corresponds to an increase in coarse-grained entropy within the emergent bubbles, even though the total fine-grained relational structure of the bubble remains intact and unchanged.

High vacuum energy suppresses entropy. In the high-dimensional S10 sectors, vacuum energy density is enormous, curvature is large, spacetime is rigid and inflating, classical structures in matter cannot form, degrees of freedom are suppressed, sectorization (Q: classicality) almost does not exist. These universes are photon-dominated, there are no bound states, no structure, and no complexity. This is a low-entropy regime.

During dimensional descent vacuum energy density decreases, curvature relaxes, spacetime becomes deformable, matter becomes light, the Higgs VEV (vacuum expectation value) stabilizes, fermions acquire mass, atoms form, chemistry becomes possible, stars ignite, galaxies assemble. Every one of these steps increases the number of accessible microstates. Entropy is simply counting the number of possible configurations. Low vacuum energy allows vastly more configurations.

When vacuum energy density falls, the gravitational constant increases (as discussed below). Stronger gravity means matter clumps, stars form, black holes form, galaxies form, and large-scale structure emerges. Black holes alone dominate the entropy budget of the universe. Thus, the increase in entropy is a direct consequence of the gravitational softening that occurs when vacuum energy collapses. Vacuum energy suppresses phase space. Entropy is defined as the logarithm of the number of accessible microstates, $S = k \ln \Omega$. High vacuum energy corresponds to fewer accessible microstates, fewer classical trajectories, fewer stable excitations, and fewer degrees of freedom. Low vacuum energy corresponds to more accessible microstates, more classical trajectories, more stable excitations, and more degrees of freedom. Thus, the arrow of entropy is not an initial condition but an emergent property of dimensional descent and the geometric relaxation of the vacuum.

- *Dark Matter*

In the higher-dimensional S10 sectors, the interaction cross-section for particle-waves collapses toward zero, rendering the matter effectively collisionless. This is perceived by us as *collisionless fuzzy dark matter*, making up *70 percent* of all matter in the observable universe (this is the bulk of the 85 percent of dark matter estimated to be in the observable universe). This matter is seen (through gravitational lensing and other methods) to form halos around galaxies, clusters of galaxies and shapes the cosmic dark matter web. The matter in the E6 sector bubble universes present themselves to us as *self-interacting dark matter*, making up *15 percent* of all matter in the observable universe. These are found mainly around sub-galactic scales, proximate with ordinary matter. (Additionally, self-interacting ordinary matter makes up 15 percent of all matter in the observable universe.) Self-interacting dark matter can have limited interactions with ordinary matter via kinetic mixing, collisional ionization and mediation by exotic fundamental forces currently being explored.

With collisions suppressed in the S10 sectors, the channel that normally generates disorder is shut down, and the thermal degrees of freedom freeze out. Across the 7D–10D range, the system carries enormous energy yet remains extremely low-entropy. Its structure is closer to a laser than to a thermal gas: a laser can store vast energy, but because its photons are phase-aligned and coherent, its entropy is far lower than that of a lightbulb radiating the same power. The sharp entropy drop at the seventh dimension—the "cliff"—marks a genuine phase transition.

Below this threshold, in the 3D–6D sectors, particles reacquire thermal degrees of freedom: they vibrate, rotate, scatter, and collide. Each collision opens new microstates, and this continual production of information drives entropy up to the characteristic 10^{80}-scale associated with low-dimensional classical sectors. (10^{80} is the order-of-magnitude estimate for the number of microstates (or equivalently, the entropy scale) associated with ordinary matter in a 3D classical universe. It is a long-standing benchmark used in cosmology and statistical mechanics to characterize the entropy stored in baryons, photons, and thermal degrees of freedom in a low-dimensional sector.)

This picture accords with the standard semiclassical relationship between vacuum energy and de Sitter entropy. In de Sitter space, increasing the vacuum energy—or equivalently the cosmological constant—reduces the horizon entropy because the horizon area contracts as Λ grows. A universe dominated by a large positive Λ possesses a cosmological horizon of area A, and the associated Gibbons–Hawking entropy is $S = A/4G$. In our 3D sector this implies $S \propto 1/\Lambda$. A larger cosmological constant therefore corresponds to a smaller horizon and a lower entropy bound.

The suppression of entropy extends beyond the horizon contribution. When Λ is large, accelerated expansion prevents gravitational collapse, inhibiting the formation of stars, galaxies, and black holes. The entropy stored in matter and gravitational structures is consequently far lower in a high-Λ universe than in one with a small cosmological constant. Rapid expansion freezes out thermal degrees of freedom, eliminates collisions, and halts the growth of complexity. The universe remains smooth, structureless, and dynamically simple.

Taken together, these considerations reinforce the same conclusion reached in the BB multiverse framework: high-dimensional, high-Λ sectors can contain enormous energy while remaining low-entropy, whereas lower-dimensional sectors, in which vacuum energy has relaxed, acquire thermal degrees of freedom, collisions, gravitational instability, structure formation, and the vast entropy budgets characteristic of classical universes.

➢ *Gravitational Constant and Curvature Increases*

- *Spacetime Fabric Softens*

High vacuum-energy density suppresses curvature, and in a semiclassical regime, where the spacetime metric remains classical, the curvature response is governed by the expectation value of the stress–energy operator. In this setting the Einstein consistency condition takes the schematic form $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G_{\text{eff}}\langle T_{\mu\nu}\rangle$, so the scalar curvature R, which measures the local focusing or defocusing of geodesic congruences, scales proportionally to the product of the effective gravitational coupling and the matter density. This makes the inverse relation $G_{\text{eff}} \propto 1/\rho_{\text{vac}}$ immediately consequential: as dimensional descent reduces the accessible mode spectrum and thereby lowers the vacuum-energy density, the effective gravitational coupling strengthens, and the Ricci scalar curvature generated by a fixed matter density correspondingly increases. The semiclassical framework thus provides the cleanest language for expressing this proportionality, because it treats curvature as the classical geometric response to quantum-averaged energy content. Within the BB multiverse architecture, this strengthened curvature response is not an incidental feature but a structural consequence of dimensional compression, ensuring that each descendant sector inherits a geometry whose curvature faithfully encodes its reduced vacuum-energy budget.

In the BB model, the gravitational constant is not a fixed parameter but an emergent measure of the deformability of spacetime. High-dimensional S10 sectors possess large vacuum energy densities that makes geometry more rigid and stiff, suppressing curvature and yielding a small effective gravitational coupling. As the universe descends the dimensional ladder, the vacuum energy density collapses, the geometric mass scale diminishes, and spacetime becomes increasingly deformable. This softening of the vacuum amplifies the response of geometry to stress–energy, manifesting as an increase in the effective gravitational constant. Thus, the observed strength of gravity in our low-vacuum-energy sector is a natural geometric consequence of dimensional descent rather than a fundamental input. A more deformable spacetime corresponds to a larger gravitational constant. When the vacuum energy density is high, spacetime is rigid and dominated by inflationary expansion. When the vacuum energy density decreases, spacetime becomes soft, allowing matter to curve it more easily.

The behavior of gravity during dimensional descent is not an incidental parameter shift but a structural consequence of how curvature, vacuum energy, and entanglement-geometry co-evolve as the cosmological polytope contracts toward the three-dimensional sector. As the dimensionality decreases, the vacuum energy density falls, the entanglement-defined metric becomes more sharply localized, and the observer's geodesic becomes increasingly confined. The effective gravitational coupling therefore rises monotonically as one approaches the 3D domain. In the BB framework, *gravity is not a force*, but a measure of how strongly the geodesic structure responds to energy–momentum; its "strength" is the curvature per unit energy density, not a force-law parameter. Thus, the increase of the gravitational constant during dimensional descent reflects a deepening of geometric responsiveness rather than an amplification of any force-like interaction.

This stands in apparent contrast to the familiar claim from M-theory and brane-world models that gravity is "weak" on the 3D brane. However, the two statements refer to different ontological comparisons. In the Randall–Sundrum picture, gravity is fundamentally higher-dimensional: the graviton wavefunction extends into the bulk, while Standard Model fields are confined to the brane. The effective four-dimensional Newtonian constant is therefore suppressed because the Einstein–Hilbert action is diluted across the higher-dimensional volume. What is weak is not gravity itself but the projection of a higher-dimensional geometric field onto a lower-dimensional submanifold. The dilution mechanism is a statement about how the gravitational field distributes across the bulk, not about any intrinsic weakness of the gravitational interaction. In this sense, M-theory compares the 3D brane to its own higher-dimensional origin, whereas the BB multiverse compares different dimensional sectors along a dynamical vacuum-energy gradient. The two claims are therefore not contradictory; they operate on different layers of ontology and measure different aspects of gravitational behavior.

The widespread assertion that gravity is "weaker than electromagnetism" introduces a third, conceptually distinct comparison that is often conflated with the previous two. This comparison treats gravity and electromagnetism as forces acting between point particles, quantified by coupling constants that can be placed on the same numerical scale. Yet in general relativity, and even more explicitly in the BB multiverse, gravity is not a force at all. It is the curvature of the entanglement-defined metric, and its "strength" is the degree to which geodesics converge or diverge in response to energy–momentum. Electromagnetism, by contrast, is a gauge interaction with a well-defined coupling constant. To compare the two directly is to compare a geometric response parameter with a gauge-force parameter, a category error that obscures the underlying structure. The apparent weakness of gravity relative to electromagnetism is therefore a statement about the behavior of test particles under two different ontological mechanisms, not a statement about the intrinsic magnitude of gravitational curvature.

When these distinctions are made explicit, the three perspectives align cleanly. In M-theory, gravity appears

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

weak on the brane because its higher-dimensional field lines extend into the bulk, diluting the effective coupling. In the BB multiverse, gravity becomes stronger as dimensionality decreases because the vacuum energy falls and the entanglement-geometry sharpens, increasing the curvature response. And in conventional particle-physics comparisons, gravity appears weak relative to electromagnetism only because the latter is a gauge force while the former is a geometric constraint. The BB multiverse therefore provides a unifying ontological frame in which these seemingly contradictory statements become different projections of a single underlying principle: gravitational "strength" is not a universal scalar but a context-dependent measure of how geometry responds to energy, how dimensionality structures that response, and how observers interpret it when comparing fundamentally different interaction types.

Gravity in this framework arises as the geometric bookkeeping rule that enforces consistency after dimensional compression. When a sector loses access to higher-dimensional degrees of freedom, the remaining manifold must redistribute curvature so that the reduced geometry correctly encodes the new informational constraints. In this sense, the Einstein tensor in any descendant sector is not a fundamental dynamical entity but a consistency condition: it guarantees that the geometry faithfully represents the compression pattern inherited from its parent manifold.

A direct consequence is that the effective gravitational coupling is not universal. It is a sector-indexed response coefficient set by the local vacuum energy density. To prevent runaway curvature in high-energy sectors and to preserve the stability of the multiverse architecture, the model requires an inverse scaling between gravitational strength and vacuum energy density. This ensures that S10 sectors—those retaining extremely large vacuum energy—exhibit an exceptionally weak gravitational coupling. Without this suppression, the high-energy bulk would collapse into a black-hole-like configuration, destroying the lower-energy bubbles nested within it. Gravitational dilution during dimensional descent is therefore not optional; it is a structural requirement for a stable, stratified multiverse.

The resulting hierarchy is organized by the depth of dimensional descent. S10 sectors, having shed only a small fraction of their accessible modes, maintain high vacuum energy, and thus require extremely diluted gravity to remain stable. Intermediate sectors display progressively lower vacuum energy, stronger gravitational coupling, and rising entropy. Deeply descended E6-sectors—those that have lost the greatest share of higher-dimensional modes—possess the lowest vacuum energy density, the strongest effective gravitational coupling, and the largest entropy budget. This ordering is not anthropic; it follows directly from the geometric and informational consequences of dimensional descent.

- *Gravity is Emergent Elastodynamic Phenomenon*

Gravity within the BB multiverse is not a fundamental interaction but an emergent property of the spacetime membrane. Its behavior arises from the interplay between global rotational dynamics, vacuum-energy distribution, and the local elastodynamic response of the membrane to matter. The gravitational sector is therefore composite: one part originates from rotation and vacuum structure, while the other arises from the membrane's deformation under matter. This section develops the full framework, beginning with the dual mechanisms that generate gravitational effects and culminating in the geometric transition that activates gravity during dimensional descent.

Two distinct mechanisms contribute to the gravitational behavior observed in the BB multiverse. The first is rotational–vacuum gravity, a global effect produced by the conserved angular momentum of the bubble and the distribution of vacuum energy across its membrane. The effective gravitational constant associated with this mechanism scales as $G_{\text{rot}} \propto \omega/\rho_\Lambda$, reflecting the fact that rotational–vacuum gravity depends on the ratio of the bubble's angular velocity to its vacuum-energy density. Although this expression suggests a possible compensation between the two quantities—high vacuum energy with slow rotation in young, large bubbles, and low vacuum energy with fast rotation in old, small bubbles—such compensation does not occur. Vacuum-energy density falls super-exponentially with dimensional descent, while rotational velocity increases only algebraically as the bubble contracts. The exponential collapse of ρ_Λ overwhelms the power-law rise of ω, so the ratio ω/ρ_Λ changes dramatically rather than remaining constant.

The dimensional-descent cliff between the S10 (seven-dimensional bubble) and E6 (six-dimensional bubble) sectors is not merely a change in dimensionality; it is a geometric bottleneck in which several dynamical quantities undergo abrupt, nonlinear transitions. This bottleneck is responsible for the geometric contraction of the bubble's radius and for the peak in rotational–vacuum gravity. In the S10 regime, vacuum-energy density is enormous and spacetime is extremely rigid. Rotation exists but is slow, and the ratio ω/ρ_Λ is extremely small. Rotational–vacuum gravity is therefore negligible. The bubble behaves like a high-Λ de Sitter equilibrium state with minimal entropy production and no gravitational structure formation.

When the bubble crosses the dimensional-descent cliff, the situation changes abruptly. The transition from seven effective dimensions to six is accompanied by a sharp collapse in vacuum-energy density. This collapse is super-exponential and far exceeds the algebraic increase in rotational velocity. At the same time, angular-momentum conservation forces the bubble to spin faster as its effective radius decreases. The combined effect of these two processes produces a spike in the ratio ω/ρ_Λ, causing rotational–vacuum gravity to reach its maximum strength.

The geometric contraction of the bubble's radius is therefore not caused by rotational–vacuum gravity itself.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

Instead, both the contraction and the peak in rotational–vacuum gravity are consequences of the same underlying geometric bottleneck. The drop from 7D to 6D reduces the bubble's moment of inertia, forcing an increase in rotational velocity. Simultaneously, the collapse of vacuum-energy density reduces the rigidity of spacetime, allowing the bubble to contract. The contraction is thus a geometric response to dimensional descent, not a direct effect of rotational–vacuum gravity.

This bottleneck marks the gravitational activation point of the BB multiverse. It is the moment when gravity transitions from a vacuum-dominated, structureless regime to one in which matter curvature, collisions, and entropy production become possible. Sectorization strengthens, degrees of freedom proliferate, and gravitational instability begins to operate. The bubble universe becomes capable of forming bound structures, generating entropy, and developing the macroscopic arrow of time.

As dimensional descent continues beyond the cliff, vacuum-energy density falls further, rotational velocity increases more slowly, and matter becomes dynamically dominant. The rotational–vacuum contribution to gravity rapidly diminishes. By the time the bubble reaches the 3D Alpha-2 sector, rotational–vacuum gravity is negligible compared to matter-curvature gravity. The gravitational activation point is therefore confined to the narrow region around the S10 to E6 transition, where the competing geometric and dynamical effects briefly align to produce the peak in rotational–vacuum gravitational response.

This structure is essential to the BB multiverse. It explains why gravity is suppressed in the highest-dimensional sectors, why it becomes dynamically relevant only after dimensional descent, and why the emergence of classicality and entropy production is tied to a specific geometric transition. The dimensional-descent cliff is the multiversal threshold at which gravity becomes active, matter becomes meaningful, and the universe begins its evolution toward the richly structured, low-Λ, high-entropy state characteristic of the 3D sector.

There is no contradiction between the monotonic decrease of the fundamental gravitational constant and the non-monotonic behavior of rotational–vacuum gravity. They arise from different physical mechanisms. The intermediate peak of rotational–vacuum gravity occurs at the dimensional-descent cliff, specifically during the transition from the S10 (7D) sector to the E6 (6D) sector. This peak is transient, disappearing both in the earliest and latest sectors, and is essential for the emergence of classicality, entropy production, and gravitational structure formation.

The second mechanism is matter-induced curvature, which arises when material bodies deform the spacetime membrane. In this geometric-relational framework, the Einstein field equation becomes an elastic constitutive relation, $\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu} = \kappa_{\text{eff}} T_{\mu\nu}$, where $\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu}$ is the strain tensor of the membrane and κ_{eff} is the compliance coefficient proportional to the local gravitational constant. Curvature is therefore a mechanical response of the membrane rather than a fundamental geometric field.

The total gravitational effect in any sector is the sum of these two contributions, $G_{\text{eff}} = G_{\text{rot}} + G_{\text{matter}}$, with their relative magnitudes varying systematically across dimensional strata. High-dimensional S10 sectors, characterized by large ρ_Λ and high membrane stiffness, exhibit negligible curvature, whereas lower-dimensional E6 sectors support significant deformation and thus observable gravitational dynamics.

The spacetime membrane behaves as an elastic medium whose stiffness is determined by vacuum energy density and rotational velocity. Let $\phi(x)$ denote small normal displacements of the membrane. The effective elastic Lagrangian is $\mathcal{L}_{\text{el}} = \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\text{eff}}(\partial_0\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\text{eff}}\ \partial_i\phi\ \partial^i\phi - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_\Lambda\ \phi^2$, leading to the wave equation $\partial_0^2\phi - c_{\text{gw}}^2\nabla^2\phi + \omega_0^2\phi = 0$. This equation governs the propagation of gravitational waves, which in this framework are elastodynamic shear waves traveling across the membrane at $c_{\text{gw}} = \sqrt{\frac{\mu_{\text{eff}}}{\rho_{\text{eff}}}}$. In sufficiently soft sectors (as in Alpha-2, our universe), these waves propagate at the invariant speed of light (within the universe), consistent with observation.

The membrane supports a discrete spectrum of curvature modes, but this discreteness does not arise from quantum mechanics or particle quantization. Instead, it is a purely geometric consequence of the membrane's structure. Only certain vibrational patterns can be sustained, just as a drumhead or a tensioned surface supports only specific standing-wave modes. The geometry, stiffness, and boundary conditions of the membrane select a finite set of allowed excitations, while all other patterns destructively interfere or cannot be maintained.

These curvature modes are not particles, nor are they 3D slices of higher-dimensional particles. They have no independent existence, no worldlines, and no particle-like identity. They are patterns of deformation of the membrane itself, inseparable from the underlying geometry. Their observable properties—masslessness, spin-2 behavior, and propagation at the speed of light—arise from the symmetry and tensorial character of the membrane's shear modes, not from a quantum field. They are not fundamental gauge bosons. They cannot be isolated, emitted, or absorbed as free particles. They are geometric-relational quasi-particles, inseparable from the mechanical bending of spacetime. Their dispersion relation, $\omega^2 = c_{\text{gw}}^2 k^2 + \omega_0^2$, encodes the elastic properties of the membrane and varies across dimensional sectors.

As bubbles descend into lower-dimensional domains, the membrane's stiffness decreases, enabling stronger curvature, lower-frequency gravitational waves, and a richer spectrum of quasi-particle excitations. In high-dimensional

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

S10 sectors, where the membrane is too rigid to support shear disturbances, neither gravitational waves nor graviton-like modes can exist.

- *Why Gravitons Cannot Be Detected in Particle Colliders*

If graviton-like excitations are quasi-particles of membrane curvature rather than fundamental gauge bosons, their detectability differs categorically from the expectations of quantum-gravity models. These excitations do not exist as independent entities within spacetime; they are inseparable from the elastodynamic behavior of the membrane itself. Their existence is conditional on the membrane being capable of supporting shear disturbances, and their propagation is simply the local expression of curvature waves. Consequently, they cannot be produced, scattered, or absorbed as discrete particles in any experimental apparatus.

Particle colliders such as CERN operate by accelerating material particles and probing their interactions within spacetime. Their detectors register particle trajectories, decay products, resonances, and missing-energy signatures. None of these channels apply to graviton-like quasi-particles in the BB ontology. Because these excitations are not particles *in* spacetime but modes *of* spacetime, they cannot detach from the membrane, cannot propagate as free quanta, and cannot couple to Standard Model fields. There is no interaction vertex, no exchange channel, and no decay pathway through which a collider could register their presence. *(In quantum language, there is no graviton field to quantize and therefore no particle to produce.)*

The only observable manifestation of these quasi-particles is the macroscopic curvature wave itself—what we identify as a gravitational wave. Instruments such as LIGO, Virgo, and KAGRA detect these collective membrane modes through interferometric strain measurements, not through particle-level interactions. In this sense, gravitational-wave detection already constitutes the only possible "graviton detection" within the BB framework, though it is the detection of the wave, not of a particle.

In high-dimensional S10 sectors, where the membrane is extremely stiff, the spacetime medium cannot support shear modes at all. In such regions, neither gravitational waves nor graviton-like excitations exist in any form. This reinforces the conclusion that collider-based detection is not merely technologically infeasible but conceptually impossible: the ontology of the BB multiverse does not permit graviton-like excitations to appear as isolated, particle-like entities.

Thus, under the BB multiverse ontology, graviton detection through particle colliders is ruled out in principle. The graviton-like modes are geometric-relational excitations of curvature, not fundamental particles. Their only empirical signature is the propagation of curvature waves across the membrane, detectable through macroscopic interferometry rather than microscopic scattering.

➢ *Sectorization (Classicality) Increases*

Sectorization (Q: classicality increases for a number of reasons during dimensional descent.

- *Metrical Stabilization*

A classical region is one in which the metric has become rigidly defined, so that distances, locations, trajectories, and causal order acquire persistent meaning and matter-like excitations behave in a stable and predictable manner. Classicality marks the collapse of relational flexibility and the emergence of fixed geometric constraints; once this metrical stabilization occurs, the relational degrees of freedom can no longer reorganize, and the system cannot revert to Domain 2 behavior.

- *Weak Casimir Force*

In the lower-dimensional sector, this metrical rigidity coexists with a monotonic dimensional descent in which the Casimir force is too weak to sustain additional extended directions, and any higher-dimensional axes are dynamically driven to collapse. The resulting dimensionality is therefore fixed by enforced reduction.

- *Structural Rigidity*

A further source of rigidity arises from the structural role of the E6 sectors themselves: these sectors lie beneath the higher-dimensional S10 regions and must bear their geometric weight. They can do so only because their internal symmetry is twisted, as described by the Scherk–Schwarz monodromy of the E6 bundle (discussed below), which locks the internal degrees of freedom and prevents dimensional re-extension.

Classicality thus corresponds to the regime in which the vacuum manifold has settled into a local minimum and ceased to fluctuate, freezing gauge groups and symmetry-breaking patterns, while the dimensional frame is held rigid by both the irreversible dynamics of descent and the load-bearing constraints imposed by the twisted E6 structure.

- *Planck Scales Decrease*

During dimensional descent, Planck scales decrease in lower-dimensional sectors due to the decreasing vacuum energy and through the increasing curvature of the bubble, as a result of the increasing gravitational "constant." This strengthens the classicality of the geometric manifold at lower dimensions and energy.

We can obtain the scaling relation $\rho_{\text{vac}} \propto \hbar_{\text{eff}}$ as follows. Begin with the Lorentz-invariant zero-point spectral energy density for a massless field, $u(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\,\hbar_{\text{eff}}\,\omega\, g(\omega)$, where $g(\omega)$ is the density of modes per unit volume per unit angular frequency. For the electromagnetic field in flat space, $g(\omega) = \frac{\omega^2}{\pi^2 c^3}$, which gives $u(\omega) = \frac{\hbar_{\text{eff}}}{2\pi^2 c^3}\,\omega^3$. Define the vacuum energy density by integrating up to a sector-dependent cutoff Λ, which encodes the dimensionality, curvature, or mode structure of the sector:

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

$\rho_{\text{vac}} = \int_0^\Lambda u(\omega)\, d\omega = \frac{\hbar_{\text{eff}}}{2\pi^2 c^3} \int_0^\Lambda \omega^3 \, d\omega = \frac{\hbar_{\text{eff}}\Lambda^4}{8\pi^2 c^3}$. Solving for $\hbar_{\text{eff}}$ yields the clean proportionality, $\hbar_{\text{eff}} = \frac{8\pi^2 c^3}{\Lambda^4}\, \rho_{\text{vac}}$.

Λ (in the denominator) is the sector-dependent frequency cutoff in the zero-point spectrum:

$$\rho_{\text{vac}} = \int_0^\Lambda u(\omega)\, d\omega = \frac{\hbar_{\text{eff}}\Lambda^4}{8\pi^2 c^3}, \Rightarrow \hbar_{\text{eff}} = \frac{8\pi^2 c^3}{\Lambda^4}\rho_{\text{vac}}.$$

It is a sector-dependent spectral cutoff encoding dimensionality, curvature, and mode structure. ρ_{vac} is the vacuum-energy density of that sector. $\hbar_{\text{eff}}$ is the effective Planck constant of that sector. In this context, Λ is a UV cutoff (not the cosmological constant). For fixed cutoff Λ, $\hbar_{\text{eff}} \propto \rho_{\text{vac}}$. As ρ_{vac} collapses during dimensional descent, $\hbar_{\text{eff}}$, ℓ_P, and t_P all decrease. The Planck scales are tied to ρ_{vac} and the cutoff Λ.

Although both the vacuum energy density and the sector cut-off Λ decrease during dimensional descent in the BB multiverse, the collapse of ρ_{vac} is far steeper, ensuring that the effective Planck constant, the Planck length, and the Planck time all decrease as the bubble moves toward the lower-dimensional basin. During dimensional descent, therefore, as ρ_{vac} decreases, the Planck length $L_p = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$, the Planck time $t_p = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^5}$, and the effective Planck constant $\hbar_{\text{eff}} \propto \rho_{\text{vac}}$, all decrease.

Independent theoretical frameworks converge on the same monotonic relationship between vacuum energy density, the amplitude of vacuum fluctuations, and the effective values of the Planck scales. In stochastic electrodynamics, the zero-point field is treated as a real Lorentz-invariant background with spectral energy density proportional to $\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega^3$, so the amplitude of vacuum fluctuations is directly measured by $\hbar$. Analyses of vacuum fluctuations as the origin of vacuum permittivity and permeability reinforce the idea that vacuum energy density controls the intensity of the underlying fluctuation field. Induced-gravity models, beginning with Sakharov's proposal that the Einstein–Hilbert term arises from integrating out quantum fields up to a UV cutoff, likewise show that the effective Newton constant depends on the same fluctuation spectrum that determines the zero-point energy density, linking G, $\hbar$, and the vacuum energy scale.

Black hole thermodynamics and holography provide a further line of support. The Bekenstein–Hawking entropy $S = A/(4l_P^2)$, together with its derivations in quantum field theory on curved backgrounds, identifies the Planck length as a measure of the density of vacuum degrees of freedom localized near horizons. Holographic formulations fix the number of degrees of freedom per unit area by l_P, which in turn depends on $\hbar$. Any mechanism that alters the amplitude of vacuum fluctuations therefore shifts l_P. Emergent-quantum frameworks such as Adler's trace dynamics and 't Hooft's deterministic models similarly interpret $\hbar$ as encoding the underlying stochasticity or information granularity of the vacuum. Although the details differ, these approaches share a structural feature: modifying the strength of vacuum fluctuations modifies the effective value of $\hbar$.

Taken together, these literatures converge on the same monotonic relationship: sectors with higher vacuum energy density support larger vacuum fluctuations and therefore larger effective Planck scales, while sectors with lower vacuum energy density exhibit correspondingly reduced Planck scales.

- *Sectorization and the Geometric Resolution of the Measurement Problem in the BB Multiverse*

The BB multiverse resolves the measurement problem not by modifying quantum mechanics, nor by introducing collapse postulates or branching universes, but by altering the *geometric conditions under which quantum coherence can exist*. Measurement becomes a structural consequence of dimensional descent, membrane elasticity, and the collapse of the Planck scales. Classicality is not imposed; it emerges from the geometry of the bubble itself.

As the bubble descends from higher-dimensional S10 sectors into the lower-dimensional E6 and 3D sectors, the vacuum-energy density collapses super-exponentially. Because the effective Planck constant scales as $\hbar_{\text{eff}} \propto \frac{\rho_{\text{vac}}}{\Lambda^4}$, the collapse of ρ_{vac} forces $\hbar_{\text{eff}}$, the Planck length, and the Planck time to shrink. This reduction in the fundamental discreteness scale has a decisive effect on the membrane's dynamical behavior. Quantum fluctuations become confined to increasingly microscopic domains, while classical geometry expands. The bubble's manifold becomes sharply partitioned into regions where quantum coherence cannot propagate. These regions are the sectors of the BB multiverse.

Sectorization (Q: decoherence) arises because the collapse of $\hbar_{\text{eff}}$ suppresses quantum superposition at macroscopic scales. The membrane's quantum jitter diminishes, and the uncertainty in curvature modes falls below the threshold required for large-scale interference. *The collapse of the Planck length enlarges classical space: the quantum grain size becomes smaller, classical trajectories become sharply defined, and quantum overlap between distant regions becomes impossible. The collapse of the Planck time accelerates temporal decoherence, preventing long-range phase coherence and confining quantum behavior to microscopic intervals.* Together, these effects produce a manifold in which quantum coherence is restricted to tiny domains, while classical geometry dominates everywhere else.

In this environment, measurement is not a special dynamical event. It is the stabilization of the observer's geodesic within a classical sector. The observer's global identity remains the full standing-wave configuration of the relational fiber, but their classical experience corresponds to the sector in which their geodesic becomes pinned. The apparent "collapse" of the wavefunction is simply the geometric fact that quantum coherence cannot propagate across sector boundaries. The observer's interaction with a measuring apparatus—already stabilized at a classical vertex—forces the system's excitation to resonate only within the narrow, low-dimensional subspace accessible to that apparatus. Higher-dimensional components fail to couple and therefore become inaccessible. The Born rule emerges from the geometry of the polytope: the squared amplitudes correspond to the relative facet volumes through which the resonant geodesic can pass during stabilization.

The measurement problem is therefore resolved because the BB multiverse provides a natural mechanism for classicality. Sectorization eliminates macroscopic superposition, geometric decoherence replaces collapse, and the observer's classical experience arises from the stabilization of their geodesic within a low-dimensional sector. No branching universes are required, no hidden variables are invoked, and no special measurement axioms are needed. *Classicality is the inevitable consequence of dimensional descent, vacuum-energy fall, and the membrane's elastodynamic response.*

- *Time Signature Strengthens*

As the time axis becomes more vertical (as discussed above), the entanglement network becomes more anisotropic, stabilization (Q: decoherence) becomes directionally biased and classicality emerges preferentially along the emerging time axis. This predicts that stabilization is not uniform. It is strongest along the axis that is becoming timelike. Quantum coherence persists longer in directions orthogonal to the emerging time axis. This is an indirect mechanism that results in a quantum-to-classical transition.

- *Observerhood Strengthens*

Neither observers nor classical universes exist as distinct entities before dimensional descent reaches the classicality threshold that lies between the 7D and 6D universes. This threshold is the near-quantum cliff within Domain 3, where the high-dimensional near-quantum universes (11D down to 7D) undergo a phase transition into the semi-classical and ultimately classical E6-stabilized sectors. Although these 11D–7D universes belong to Domain 3, they retain the ontology of Domain 2: coherence is high, curvature is weak, sectoral identity is unstable, and decoherence is insufficient to localize degrees of freedom. Only after dimensional descent passes the 7D–6D cliff does the geometry acquire the curvature strength and decoherence gradient necessary for classical stabilization. *It is therefore only in the E6 sectors that observerhood arises, and only there that the observer and the universe become distinct entities.*

A quantum excitation arriving from a higher-dimensional vacuum enters the 3D sector as a multiversal projection rather than a classical particle. Its identity is not yet separable from the observer's identity hypersurface. Both are embedded within a shared relational structure whose dimensionality exceeds that of the emergent three-dimensional manifold. In this pre-transmutation phase, the excitation retains access to curvature directions that the 3D sector cannot stabilize. These directions manifest as nonlocality, superposition, and interference. The excitation is not a particle in the classical sense; it is a higher-dimensional relational object whose projection into the 3D sector is incomplete.

A measurement apparatus is a curvature-stabilizing device. Its function is not to reveal a property of the excitation but to impose the relational constraints of the 3D sector upon it. The apparatus enforces a local decoherence gradient that suppresses higher-dimensional curvature modes and forces the excitation to re-embed itself within the lower-dimensional relational fiber bundle. This re-embedding is the geometric essence of dimensional transmutation. The excitation must contract telescopically, enfolding its higher-dimensional relational redundancies into a structure compatible with the 3D sector's limited curvature capacity. The measurement outcome is the stabilized identity trajectory that results from this contraction.

The observer's identity hypersurface undergoes a complementary transformation. *Before transmutation, the observer and the excitation share a partially overlapping relational domain. Their identity trajectories are not fully separable. During strong measurement, the observer's hypersurface becomes sectorally rigid, enforcing separability by absorbing the decoherence flux generated by the apparatus. The observer's trajectory bifurcates into distinct relational branches, each corresponding to a different stabilized embedding of the excitation.* This bifurcation resembles the Everettian branching of worlds, but in the BB ontology it is not a branching of universes; it is a geometric separation of identity trajectories within a single multiversal standing geometry. The observer does not split into multiple selves; the relational fiber bundle differentiates the observer's hypersurface into distinct curvature-consistent embeddings.

The measurement outcome is therefore the stabilized relational configuration produced by the mutual dimensional transmutation of the excitation and the observer. The excitation becomes a classical particle only because the observer's sector imposes the curvature constraints required to collapse its higher-dimensional structure. The observer becomes a classical witness only because the excitation's transmutation forces the observer's identity hypersurface to adopt a sectorally rigid embedding. Classicality is not a property of either entity in isolation; it is the relational consequence of their joint descent into a lower-dimensional vacuum. This geometric account resolves the paradoxes of quantum measurement.

- *Gravitational Stabilization and Curvature Intensification*

As the bubble universes contract, rotate more rapidly, and experience increasingly steep curvature during dimensional descent classicality intensifies. The resulting

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

increase in curvature sensitivity—driven by the rising effective gravitational coupling—accelerates stabilization (Q: decoherence), allowing classical behavior to appear as a unitary consequence of geometry rather than as an alteration of fundamental theory.

This geometric shift becomes especially pronounced in smaller bubbles, where rapid rotation and stronger curvature generate local Rindler-like horizons even for modest accelerations. Relational modes are naturally correlated across such horizons (Q: quantum fields are entangled across horizons), and when one side becomes inaccessible, the reduced description of the accessible region becomes mixed. This horizon-induced stabilization and sectorization (Q: horizon-induced decoherence) is not a dynamical collapse but a kinematic effect of horizon formation. Within the BB model, the intensification of rotation and curvature during the Domain 2 to Domain 3 transition ensures that horizon-driven stabilization becomes an intrinsic feature of the lower-energy E6 bubble hierarchy.

A second geometric mechanism arises from gravitational dephasing. Phase-like information evolves according to the proper time along each trajectory ($\phi = Et/\hbar$), and a delocalized configuration spanning regions of differing gravitational potential accumulates phase according to each region's local clock. Even minute curvature differences generate persistent mismatches in proper time, producing cumulative phase divergence. In large bubbles, where curvature is shallow and the effective gravitational coupling is small, these divergences remain negligible. As bubbles contract, curvature steepens and the increasing value of the gravitational coupling magnifies proper-time differentials. The relational cross-terms decay because the relative phases between spatially separated components become effectively untrackable (Q: off-diagonal density-matrix elements decay). This gravitational dephasing requires no external environment; geometry alone suffices.

A third contribution comes from tidal dispersion. Curvature, encoded in the Riemann tensor $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$, governs the relative acceleration of nearby geodesics. A relational wavepacket extended across a region of non-uniform curvature experiences differential stretching and squeezing, so that its leading and trailing edges accumulate phase at different rates. The resulting shear in the phase front shortens the coherence length and accelerates stabilization and sectorization (Q: accelerates decoherence). As bubbles shrink and spacetime becomes less stiff, tidal curvature increases and this mechanism becomes progressively more dominant.

Together, these processes generate a continuous metrical stabilization (Q: decoherence) gradient across the bubble hierarchy. Large bubbles retain long coherence lengths and strongly exhibit weak sectorization (Q: non-classical) behavior, while smaller bubbles stabilize rapidly and appear increasingly classical. In the BB model, gravitational stabilization is not a special interaction but a geometric inevitability: curvature gradients couple different parts of a relational state to different local geometries, scrambling relative phases and suppressing interference without invoking any non-unitary dynamics. Hence, sectorization (Q: classicality) arises naturally from the dynamics of dimensional descent.

The BB multiverse therefore differs fundamentally from branching interpretations such as Many-Worlds. It preserves coherence across the full relational substrate but does not generate new universes or duplicate observers. Instead of proliferating branches, the relational content of the system is organized into a fixed set of sectors determined by bubble topology and the sequence of symmetry-breaking events. What appears as classical behavior arises not from branching but from stabilization-driven localization within a particular sector. Classicality is therefore a property of confinement within a selected relational frame, not the outcome of a universe-splitting process.

- ✓ *Why Gravitational Stabilization Does Not Imply Collapse*

Although the stabilization mechanisms described above may superficially resemble Penrose's proposal of gravitationally induced collapse, the underlying physics in the BB multiverse is fundamentally different. Penrose's framework [45, 46] assumes that superpositions of distinct spacetime geometries possess a gravitational self-energy that renders them objectively unstable, leading to a non-unitary collapse at a characteristic timescale. The BB model requires no such postulate. Nothing in the multiversal state becomes unstable, and no non-unitary process is introduced. Stabilization arises entirely from the unitary evolution of quantum states in a rotating, curved spacetime whose vacuum energy density decreases as the bubble rotates faster as it descends the dimensional ladder. The global geometric wavefunction remains pure throughout.

What appears, from the perspective of a low-dimensional observer, as a suppression of interference is not a collapse of alternatives but a redistribution of relational phases across the local multiverse and entanglement across degrees of freedom that the observer's bubble cannot resolve. Stabilization does not select an outcome; it simply restricts which relational modes can be instantiated within a bubble whose curvature gradient imposes a strict resolution limit.

In the BB multiverse, there is no gravitational collapse in the Penrose sense. Instead, increasing curvature (due to the increasing gravitational "constant") reshapes the cosmological polytope so that amplitude flow between macroscopically distinct configurations becomes dynamically negligible. The confinement of the observer's geodesic to a single classical region is therefore a stabilization-driven effect, not a collapse process, and it does not rely on Penrose's predicted timescale for collapse. This timescale has not been observed experimentally, and the BB framework does not require it. Instead, the BB model produces an emergent, Penrose-like phenomenology

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

inside the 3D classical sector due to curvature-driven stabilization. Superpositions persist indefinitely unless a curvature-stabilized classical object interacts with the quantum system, at which point stabilization (not collapse) confines the observer's geodesic to a single classical region.

The classicality perceived by observers in smaller bubbles is therefore an emergent, relational property. Embedded within a highly curved, rapidly rotating bubble, an observer experiences rapid stabilization and thus perceives classical outcomes, even though the underlying meta-classical state remains fully coherent in higher-dimensional sectors and at the global level. This is the essence of the multiversal stabilization (or decoherence) gradient. Classicality emerges smoothly from the geometric structure of Domain 3 as it condenses from Domain 2. Increasing G and steepening curvature gradients naturally shorten coherence lengths and accelerate stabilization, producing a continuous transition from quantum-dominated behavior in large bubbles to classical behavior in small ones without invoking collapse at any stage.

✓ *Classicality Basin as a Consequence of the Stabilization (or Decoherence) Gradient*

The metrical stabilization gradient is not an auxiliary feature of the BB multiverse but a central structural element. It explains why classicality increases as bubbles shrink, why Planck scales decrease (as discussed above) even as the gravitational constant increases, and why Domain 3 exhibits a hierarchy of classical behavior across its nested bubble structure. *Classicality is not imposed from outside; it is built by geometry.*

Causal depth is the geometric quantity that determines how finely the universe can separate one causal step from the next. It measures the number of distinguishable causal intervals available per unit proper time and therefore expresses the "resolution" of the causal network. When the time axis is still shallow—when its rotation angle θ_v is small and the axis remains partially embedded in the spatial bundle—the causal network cannot sharply distinguish successive events. Causal steps blur into one another, ordering is weak, and many microstates collapse into equivalence classes because the geometry lacks the capacity to separate their histories. In such a regime, interference persists naturally: amplitudes remain coherent because the manifold does not provide enough causal resolution to force incompatible histories apart. Quantum behavior is therefore not a dynamical mystery but a geometric consequence of insufficient causal depth.

As the time axis rotates toward vertical, the situation changes qualitatively. A more vertical time axis increases the number of distinguishable causal steps per unit proper time, which means the universe can "sample" the state more frequently. This increased sampling produces more opportunities for environmental entanglement, phase dispersion, and the loss of coherence. At the same time, deeper causal depth allows the geometry to discriminate between trajectories that were previously indistinguishable. Slight differences in phase, configuration, or path become causally resolvable. Quantum superpositions rely on the inability of the causal structure to tell histories apart; once the geometry can distinguish them, coherence cannot be maintained. The rotation of the time axis therefore sharpens causal ordering, and this sharpening breaks the symmetry that quantum evolution depends on.

The emergence of classicality follows directly from this geometric transformation. Stabilization is the dynamical process that suppresses interference between incompatible histories, but stabilization can only operate effectively when the causal network has enough depth to stabilize outcomes and prevent re-interference. In shallow-depth regimes, stabilization is weak because the geometry itself cannot enforce the separation of histories. In deep-depth regimes, stabilization becomes unavoidable because the manifold provides a fine-grained causal scaffold that forces histories to diverge irreversibly. *Classical behavior is therefore not imposed by matter or by measurement; it arises when the causal structure becomes sufficiently deep that histories become distinguishable, ordering becomes strict, and the manifold no longer permits coherent superposition across incompatible paths.*

In this sense, classicality is the endpoint of a geometric process: the verticalization of the time axis. As θ_v approaches $\pi/2$, the causal network reaches maximal depth, stabilization becomes structurally enforced, and the universe acquires the irreversible ordering characteristic of classical physics. Conversely, when θ_v is small, causal depth collapses, stabilization weakens, and the so-called "weird quantum behavior" dominates. Classicality is therefore not a property of matter but a property of the causal geometry that matter inhabits. It emerges precisely when the time axis becomes vertical enough that the manifold can distinguish histories, stabilize outcomes, and enforce the irreversible ordering that defines the classical world.

High-energy S10 sectors (small θ_v) would have shallow causal depth, weak ordering, high reversibility and low stabilization. Low-energy E6 and 3D sectors (large θ_v) would have deep causal depth, strong ordering, irreversible processes and high stabilization. This explains why quantum behavior dominates in high-energy sectors, classical behavior dominates in low-energy sectors and stabilization increases as θ_v approaches $\pi/2$.

➢ *Mass Scale Downshifts*

- *Higgs Field is Dependent on Vacuum Energy Landscape*

The BB Model reframes mass not as a fundamental input but as a geometric response to the vacuum structure of the sector. The observed lightness of the electron, the stability of classical matter, and the strength of electromagnetism all emerge from the same underlying mechanism: the collapse of vacuum energy density during dimensional descent.

In the Standard Model, the Higgs field is governed by the potential $V(H) = -\mu^2 \mid H \mid^2 + \lambda \mid H \mid^4$. Its VEV (vacuum expectation value) is itself a vacuum-energy configuration: the Higgs lowers the vacuum energy by condensing into the minimum of this potential. Thus, even within the Standard Model, the Higgs is fundamentally a *vacuum field*; its VEV is a property of the vacuum, not of particles, and its mass and couplings are determined by the structure of the vacuum energy landscape. The vacuum energy is therefore not arbitrary—it is shaped by the Higgs potential—and electroweak symmetry breaking is, in this precise sense, a vacuum phase transition.

The BB model simply extends this logic across all sectors of the multiverse: vacuum fields define vacuum structure, vacuum structure determines vacuum energy, and vacuum energy sets the effective constants and scales within each sector.

During dimensional descent, high-dimensional sectors have high vacuum energy density, low-dimensional sectors have collapsed vacuum energy density, classicality emerges rapidly only after the 7th dimension, in the first E6 sector (Delta-1). This is the first classical, matter-supporting regime that gives us a natural place for the Higgs to "turn on." In S10 sectors (pre-classical), vacuum energy is high and matter is suppressed, the Higgs field cannot form a stable VEV, electroweak symmetry is unbroken, no classical masses exist. In Delta-1 (first classical E6 sector), vacuum energy collapses sharply, curvature drops, the Higgs potential stabilizes, the Higgs VEV emerges, fermion masses appear, and the electric charge becomes a localized property. So, in the BB model, the Higgs field is not a fundamental input but a vacuum-emergent condensate that forms only when the vacuum energy density falls below a critical threshold during dimensional descent.

- *Why the Electron Mass is Tiny in Our 3D Universe*

In our 3D bubble universe, the electron mass is tiny, proton mass is mostly QCD binding energy, neutrino masses are nearly zero, and the Higgs VEV is small compared to Planck scale. This is because of the extremely low vacuum energy density. In the BB model, during dimensional descent in the multiverse, the smallness of the Higgs mass and the electron mass is not a fine-tuning problem but a geometric consequence of the near-vanishing vacuum energy density in our sector. As the universe descends through the dimensional ladder, the vacuum energy collapses, the Higgs potential stabilizes, and the effective mass scale of fermions diminishes accordingly. The hierarchy between the electroweak and Planck scales is therefore not a puzzle requiring stabilization but an emergent property of our position deep within the low-vacuum-energy classical sectors. In this framework, the hierarchy problem is dissolved rather than solved.

In the dimensional-descent architecture electron mass is not a fundamental parameter. It is a *sector-dependent emergent quantity* tied to vacuum energy density. This means: The electron is light because our vacuum energy density is tiny. This is not a coincidence — it is a structural consequence of where our universe sits in the multiverse. So, the electron is not "mysteriously light." It is light *because* we are deep in the dimensional descent, where vacuum energy has collapsed to near zero. This removes the fine-tuning problem entirely. The electron is light because the vacuum energy density in our sector is nearly zero. There is no need for fine-tuning or unnatural cancellations. This is just geometry. The Higgs VEV is small because the vacuum is nearly empty.

- *Matter Density Increases*

Dimensional descent in the BB multiverse corresponds to a coordinated shift in the vacuum's geometric, causal, and energetic structure. As the vacuum energy density ρ_{vac} decreases, the effective gravitational constant G_{eff} increases, the speed of light c increases, and the number of available entanglement directions D decreases. These gradients jointly determine how energy is partitioned between delocalized vacuum modes and localized rest-mass excitations. The result is a monotonic increase in matter density, driven simultaneously by geometric compression, energetic reallocation, and the collapse of high-dimensional field degrees of freedom.

The increase in G_{eff} follows from the inverse relation between vacuum energy density and the stiffness of the background geometry. In the BB multiverse, the effective coupling satisfies $G_{\text{eff}} \propto \rho_{\text{vac}}^{-1}$, so that a decrease in ρ_{vac} steepens curvature gradients and deepens gravitational wells. For a fixed mass distribution, the curvature scalar scales approximately as $R \sim G_{\text{eff}}\,\rho_{\text{m}}$, which implies that an increasing G_{eff} compresses matter into smaller volumes. Even without any conversion of energy into matter, the matter density ρ_{m} must increase because the equilibrium radius of gravitationally bound structures decreases as G_{eff} rises. This geometric contraction is a direct consequence of the vacuum's reduced resistance to curvature.

The causal structure shifts in parallel. As the speed of light increases, the causal cone widens and the characteristic interaction time between field excitations decreases. The relation $E = mc^2$ implies that the rest-mass channel becomes increasingly energetically favorable as c grows, because the vacuum can no longer sustain the same spectrum of high-frequency delocalized modes. In the BB multiverse, the vacuum's polarization amplitude Π_{vac} depends on ρ_{vac}, and its decline suppresses the stability of delocalized field excitations. The energy previously stored in these modes must reappear in the only remaining stable configuration: localized rest-mass excitations. This process is not a collapse but a reallocation of energy as the vacuum's mode structure changes.

The dimensionality gradient provides the deepest constraint. High-dimensional vacua support a large number of entanglement directions, allowing energy to remain distributed across many independent axes. As the dimensionality D decreases, the number of available

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

delocalization channels shrinks. The energy stored in the eliminated degrees of freedom must be redistributed. In the BB multiverse, the energy cost of delocalization scales with dimensionality as $E_{\text{deloc}} \propto D^{-1}$, so that lower-dimensional vacua make delocalization energetically expensive. Matter becomes the lowest-energy configuration because it minimizes the vacuum's curvature and entanglement strain. The Higgs field condenses once ρ_{vac} falls below a critical threshold, giving rest mass to previously massless excitations and further increasing the matter fraction. The Higgs condensate itself contributes to the matter-like energy density, reinforcing the trend.

These effects combine into a single monotonic drift. As ρ_{vac} decreases, the vacuum loses the ability to sustain high-dimensional, high-frequency, or strongly polarized field modes. The energy stored in these modes is forced into rest-mass excitations, while the simultaneous increase in G_{eff} compresses those excitations into higher-density configurations. The matter density therefore increases according to $\frac{d\rho_{\text{m}}}{d\rho_{\text{vac}}} < 0,$ with the inequality arising from both geometric and energetic contributions. Dimensional descent thus drives a universal increase in matter density, not as a contingent dynamical outcome but as a structural consequence of the multiverse's coupled gradients in curvature, causality, vacuum polarization, and dimensionality.

➢ *Fine Structure Constant Increases*

- *Vacuum Polarization and Decoupling*

In quantum field theory, a charged particle contributes to the electromagnetic interaction through vacuum polarization. But this only happens if the particle is *light enough* to be excited at the relevant energy scale. When a particle becomes very heavy in higher dimensional bubble universes it cannot be pair-produced, it cannot polarize the vacuum, it cannot screen electric fields, and it effectively disappears from low-energy physics. Hence, it undergoes decoupling. Lighter electrons polarize the vacuum more efficiently, strengthening the effective electric charge and driving the fine-structure constant toward its observed value of approximately (1/137). Thus, the strength of electromagnetism in our universe is a direct consequence of our position deep within the low-vacuum-energy classical sectors.

A charged particle contributes to electromagnetism only if it can be excited from the vacuum. That requires low inertial mass, high causal speed limit, and low vacuum energy. Therefore, the Higgs VEV is small, the electron Yukawa coupling produces a tiny mass, and the effective electric charge is large (because the electron is light), electromagnetism is strong, and classical matter is stable. The strength of electromagnetism in our universe is thus a direct consequence of the diminished mass scale induced by the near-vanishing vacuum energy density. In this view, the hierarchy problem is not solved but dissolved: the smallness of the electron mass and the apparent hierarchy between the electroweak and Planck scales are natural outcomes of our position within the dimensional-descent sequence, rather than quantities requiring stabilization or fine-tuning.

- *Permittivity of Free Space*

Vacuum permittivity scales inversely with the vacuum-energy density, $\varepsilon_0 \propto \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{vac}}}$. Thus, as dimensional descent lowers the vacuum-energy density, the effective vacuum permittivity increases. The fine-structure constant is $\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\,\varepsilon_0\,\hbar\,c}$. During descent, the effective permittivity increases, the effective $\hbar$ decreases, and the effective speed of light increases. Taken together, these shifts drive α upward toward its familiar low-energy value near $1/137$.

In QED, the vacuum behaves as a polarizable medium whose dielectric response is governed by vacuum polarization. High ρ_{vac} amplifies fluctuations that destabilize electromagnetic propagation. As ρ_{vac} decreases, vacuum polarization weakens, and the electromagnetic response becomes more classical. Scale-dependent vacuum polarization and effective permittivity are standard results in the literature [47, 55]. Here, "permittivity" is used in the effective-field-theory sense, not as the fixed SI constant ε_0. *The model therefore assumes that decreasing ρ_{vac} increases the stability and classicality of the vacuum's electromagnetic response.*

➢ *Bohr Radius Decreases*

The Bohr Radius is $a_0 = \frac{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar 2}{m_e e 2}$. The dependence of a_0 on c and α is standard quantum mechanics. During dimensional descent, when $\hbar$ decreases and both c and α increase, a_0 decreases, producing tighter atomic bound states. Atomic matter now becomes possible. This means matter density will increase (while vacuum energy density decreases.)

➢ *Primordial Inflation and Late-Time Acceleration*

If angular momentum is conserved across the strata of the multiverse, then as the effective radius of the bubble universe's rotational domain decreases during dimensional descent, the angular velocity must increase. This simple geometric requirement provides the physical mechanism driving the evolution of rotational effects in the BB multiverse and underlies both the inflationary behavior of young bubbles and the late-time acceleration observed in the 3D Alpha-2 sector.

In the BB multiverse framework, each universe bubble is modeled as a finite, rotating spacetime domain embedded within a higher-dimensional background. Rotation plays a central dynamical role: it contributes to early-time inflation, regulates long-term expansion, and renormalizes the effective gravitational coupling within the bubble universe. A conceptual tension arises because rotation appears to generate two forces with opposite directions: an outward centrifugal contribution that facilitates inflation, and an inward curvature contribution that strengthens the effective

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

gravitational constant. This tension is resolved by recognizing that both effects are orthogonal projections of a single geometric deformation of the bubble's metric.

Rotation enters the gravitational sector through the geometry of the bubble's spacetime metric. A rotating bubble possesses off-diagonal metric components of the form $g_{t\phi} \sim \omega r^2 \sin^2\theta$, where ω denotes the bubble's angular velocity. These terms couple temporal and azimuthal directions and encode the frame-dragging and rotational shear generated by global rotation. The full metric may be written schematically as

$$ds^2 = -N^2(r)\,dt^2 + A^2(r)\,dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2 + 2\,\omega(r)\,r^2 \sin^2\theta\,dt\,d\phi,$$

with $N(r)$ and $A(r)$ representing lapse and shift functions determined by the membrane's stress-energy content. The off-diagonal term is the geometric signature of rotation and provides the source of rotational shear within the membrane.

The gravitational influence of this rotational shear is not determined by the metric alone. It depends critically on the elastic properties of the spacetime membrane, which are controlled by the vacuum-energy density ρ_Λ. High vacuum-energy density corresponds to a rigid membrane that resists deformation, suppressing the gravitational effect of rotation. Low vacuum-energy density corresponds to a flexible membrane that transmits rotational shear more effectively. Thus, the membrane's response to the rotational term in the metric is modulated by its vacuum-energy-dependent stiffness.

When the rotational metric term is inserted into the membrane's elastodynamic equations, the effective gravitational coupling associated with rotation emerges as $G_{\text{rot}} \propto \dfrac{\omega}{\rho_\Lambda}$.

The numerator reflects the geometric strength of rotation encoded in the off-diagonal metric component. The denominator reflects the membrane's rigidity, which determines how strongly rotational shear can curve spacetime. The ratio therefore measures the efficiency with which rotation is converted into gravitational behavior.

This relationship explains the sector-dependent behavior of rotational–vacuum gravity. In the S10 regime, vacuum-energy density is enormous, and the membrane is extremely stiff. The off-diagonal metric term exists, but its gravitational effect is suppressed because ρ_Λ is too large. In the 3D Alpha-2 sector, vacuum-energy density is extremely small, but matter curvature dominates and rotational shear contributes negligibly to the gravitational field. Only in intermediate sectors—where vacuum energy has fallen substantially but rotational velocity has not yet saturated—does the ratio ω/ρ_Λ become large enough for rotational–vacuum gravity to play a significant role.

The presence of $g_{t\phi} \neq 0$ implies that rotation modifies the curvature tensor $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ and therefore the Einstein tensor $G_{\mu\nu}$. The resulting curvature contributions are responsible for both the outward inertial effect and the inward gravitational enhancement. Observers comoving with the bubble's interior measure an effective outward acceleration arising from the rotational term in the metric. In the comoving frame, the geodesic equation yields an inertial acceleration $a_{\text{cent}} = \omega^2 r$, which acts radially outward. This term contributes to the bubble's inflationary dynamics by effectively increasing the Hubble parameter. In the slow-rotation limit, the Friedmann equation acquires an additive term $H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho + \frac{\omega^2}{3}$, showing that rotation directly enhances expansion. Thus, the centrifugal effect is not a force in the Newtonian sense, but an inertial manifestation of the rotating metric experienced by comoving observers.

Observers in the embedding frame, on the other hand, see the same rotation contributing to the bubble's total curvature. The rotational energy density is $\rho_{\text{rot}} = \frac{1}{2}\omega^2 r^2 \rho_{\text{eff}}$, where ρ_{eff} includes matter, vacuum, and boundary contributions. This rotational energy enters the Einstein equations through the stress-energy tensor. Because the Einstein equations relate curvature to energy density via $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$, an increase in rotational energy density effectively rescales the gravitational coupling. Internal observers therefore infer an effective gravitational constant $G_{\text{eff}} = G(1 + \gamma\omega^2)$, where γ is a dimensionless coefficient determined by the bubble's geometry and boundary conditions. Faster rotation increases curvature, which manifests as stronger gravity.

The outward centrifugal effect and the inward gravitational enhancement are therefore two projections of the same rotationally induced geometric deformation. In the comoving frame, rotation appears as an outward inertial term because the observer is embedded within the rotating metric. In the embedding frame, rotation increases curvature, strengthening gravitational coupling and producing an inward effect. The apparent contradiction is resolved by recognizing that force direction is not an invariant concept in general relativity; what is invariant is the underlying geometry. Rotation modifies the metric, and the metric determines both inertial and gravitational phenomena. The BB bubble universes behave analogously to Kerr spacetime, where rotation simultaneously produces outward inertial effects and inward curvature effects, but on a cosmological scale.

The rotational mechanism described here provides a unified explanation for both inflation and dark energy. Dimensional descent induces radius contraction, and angular-momentum conservation forces angular velocity to increase. The resulting centrifugal and frame-dragging effects manifest as outward acceleration in the induced bubble-universe metric. No exotic fields or fine-tuned potentials are required; the acceleration is a natural geometric consequence of rotation within the multiversal membrane.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

- *Primordial Inflation*

The centrifugal contribution to the effective radial acceleration experienced by comoving observers follows directly from the rotational term in the metric. To leading order in ω_d, the outward inertial acceleration is $a_{\text{cent}}(r) = \omega_d^2 r$. If ω_d increases rapidly during dimensional descent, as expected when higher-dimensional rotational modes compactify into four-dimensional angular momentum, this centrifugal term can dominate the early dynamics of the bubble. In this regime, the expansion rate satisfies $\ddot{a}(t) \sim \omega_d^2 a(t)$, which admits exponential or near-exponential solutions of the form $a(t) \propto e^{\omega_d t}$, providing a natural inflation-like phase driven purely by rotational geometry rather than scalar fields or vacuum potentials.

The moment our 3D bubble was born through symmetry-breaking, dropping into a lower-dimensional layer with a smaller effective radius, it experienced a spin-up. This sudden, massive angular velocity generated an overwhelming outward centrifugal pressure, driving the exponential spatial expansion we call inflation.

In this framework, the inflationary epoch corresponds to a brief interval in which the bubble universe undergoes a rapid reduction of its effective radius R_d as it transitions into a lower-dimensional stratum. Because angular momentum is conserved across the descent, the intrinsic angular velocity of the bubble universe scales as $\omega_d \propto R_d^{-2}$. Thus, even a modest contraction in R_d produces a dramatic amplification of ω_d. The resulting rotational energy feeds directly into the bubble universe's expansion dynamics. The centrifugal contribution to the radial acceleration of the scale factor $a(t)$ is $\ddot{a}(t) \propto \omega_d^2 a(t)$. If ω_d grows more rapidly than $a^{-1}(t)$, the acceleration becomes super-exponential. In this regime, the scale factor satisfies $\ddot{a}(t) > H(t)\,\dot{a}(t)$, leading to an *inflationary phase* driven purely by rotational amplification rather than scalar fields or finely tuned potentials. The mechanism is geometric and automatic: the rapid increase in $\omega_d$during dimensional descent injects sufficient centrifugal energy to generate an exponential or near-exponential expansion.

The inflationary epoch terminates naturally once the bubble universe stabilizes at its new radius R_{d-1}. At this point, the intrinsic angular velocity ω_d ceases to grow and approaches a plateau. The centrifugal term $\omega_d^2 a(t)$ then transitions from a rapidly increasing driver to a constant or slowly varying contribution, causing inflation to end smoothly. This graceful exit is an inherent feature of the model, requiring no additional fields, decay channels, or reheating mechanisms.

- *Late-Time Acceleration and the Effective Cosmological Constant*

In the BB multiverse framework, the late-time acceleration of the bubble universe arises not from a fundamental cosmological constant or an exotic dark-energy fluid, but from the geometric and dynamical properties of the bubble itself. As the bubble universe evolves, its rotational state determines the magnitude of its effective cosmological constant. *The centrifugal contribution generated by the bubble's intrinsic rotation acts as a repulsive, anti-gravitational pressure. In this view, dark energy is not a new component of the cosmic energy budget; it is the geometric manifestation of the bubble's angular velocity.*

After the inflationary phase, the bubble universe continues to undergo slow dimensional descent or gradual radius contraction due to interactions with the embedding medium. Both processes increase the intrinsic angular velocity of the bubble. This slow rotational amplification produces a gentle outward acceleration, providing a natural explanation for late-time cosmic acceleration *without invoking dark energy*. To reconcile this geometric mechanism with observational cosmology, one may define an effective "dark-energy" density associated with rotation, $\rho_{\text{rot}} \sim \frac{1}{2} I_d\, \omega_d^2 \propto R_d^{-2}$, where I_d is the moment of inertia of the d-dimensional bubble universe and R_d is its effective radius.

Dimensional descent forces the bubble's radius to contract, increasing angular velocity. Increased angular velocity produces outward inertial acceleration inside the bubble, mimicking a cosmological constant. But this acceleration does not act on the bubble's external radius, so no pulsation occurs. The geometric radius continues to fall, the internal scale factor continues to rise, and the vacuum-energy density continues to collapse. The system evolves smoothly toward the low-Λ, high-classicality 3D sector. If R_d decreases slowly over cosmological timescales, then ρ_{rot} evolves only gradually, behaving as a quasi-constant energy density. This behavior is consistent with observational evidence that the cosmological constant is nearly, but not exactly, constant.

Different bubble universes naturally possess distinct rotational histories and therefore different effective in-sector cosmological constants. Even within a single bubble universe, Λ_{eff} may vary slowly in time as the radius evolves. In this model, the observed late-time acceleration is thus a direct geometric consequence of rotational dynamics rather than a property of an external dark-energy field.

This geometric interpretation also offers a new perspective on the flatness and horizon problems. Vortex cores are naturally isotropic and flat, so the bubble universe inherits these properties from its embedding structure. The causal connectivity of the pre-inflationary higher-dimensional fluid ensures homogeneity across the bubble universe, eliminating the need for fine-tuned initial conditions.

The BB multiverse situates these phenomena within a broader evolutionary context. In the high-dimensional S10 sectors, vacuum-energy density is enormous, curvature is

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

large, spacetime is rigid and inflating, and classical structures cannot form. Degrees of freedom are suppressed, sectorization is minimal, and the universe is photon-dominated with no bound states or complexity. This is a low-entropy regime. High-Λ phases resemble de Sitter equilibrium states with limited entropy production. As vacuum energy relaxes and matter becomes dynamically dominant, gravitational instability and structure formation generate large entropy increases, producing a macroscopic arrow of time. The gravitational arrow of time and de Sitter equilibrium have been discussed extensively in the literature [32-34, 45–46, 56]. In the BB model, decreasing Λ marks the transition from a high-symmetry, low-structure state to a regime where entropy production becomes possible.

This multiversal picture provides a natural resolution to the long-standing tension between observational cosmology, which infers a positive cosmological constant, and high-energy theoretical frameworks such as string/M theory and holographic dualities, which are structurally more compatible with anti–de Sitter (AdS) backgrounds. In the BB ontology, the cosmological constant is not a fundamental parameter of the 3D universe but an emergent, effective quantity arising from dimensional descent, vacuum-energy relaxation, and global rotational dynamics inherited from higher-dimensional progenitor sectors. This reinterpretation dissolves the conceptual conflict between ΛCDM phenomenology and the AdS-based mathematical architecture of string theory.

Observations of late-time cosmic acceleration do not directly measure Λ. They measure the kinematic condition $\ddot{a} > 0$ and an effective equation of state $w \approx -1$. In standard general relativity, these are parametrized by a positive cosmological constant. In the BB multiverse, however, the expansion history of the 3D sector is driven by the gradual fall of vacuum energy from the high-dimensional S10 regime and by the residual rotation of the induced bubble. The effective acceleration is therefore a dynamical consequence of multiversal evolution rather than a signature of a fundamental de Sitter vacuum. The inferred Λ is simply the coarse-grained representation of these processes when projected onto a 3D Einsteinian description.

Dimensional descent plays a central role in shaping this effective cosmology. The S10 sectors possess extremely high vacuum energy, large curvature, and rigid spacetime geometry. Classical structures cannot form, entropy is suppressed, and the sector behaves like a near-equilibrium de Sitter state. As vacuum energy relaxes during descent into lower-dimensional sectors, matter becomes dynamically relevant and gravitational instability generates entropy, classicality, and the arrow of time. The residual vacuum energy in the 3D sector is not a cosmological constant but the remnant of this relaxation process. When combined with global rotation, it produces an effective acceleration that mimics the behavior of a positive Λ.

The modified Friedmann equations in the BB framework make this explicit. Let the expansion be governed by matter, curvature, rotation, and a time-dependent vacuum-energy term $\rho_{\mathrm{vac}}(t)$ inherited from dimensional descent. The generalized Friedmann equation becomes: $H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\left(\rho_{\mathrm{m}} + \rho_{\mathrm{vac}}(t)\right) - \frac{k}{a^2} + \frac{\omega^2}{a^6}$, where ω is the conserved rotational parameter of the induced bubble. The Raychaudhuri equation takes the form:

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho_{\mathrm{m}} + 3p_{\mathrm{m}}) + \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho_{\mathrm{vac}}(t) + \frac{2\omega^2}{a^6}.$$

The rotational term ω^2/a^6 behaves like a stiff fluid at early times but contributes positively to acceleration at late times when matter dilutes. The vacuum-energy term $\rho_{\mathrm{vac}}(t)$ is not constant; it decreases as the universe descends from higher-dimensional sectors. However, its fall is slow compared to the dilution of matter, so the combination of $\rho_{\mathrm{vac}}(t)$ and rotational contributions yields an effective equation of state $w_{\mathrm{eff}} \approx -1$, even though no fundamental Λ exists. The acceleration is therefore emergent rather than primordial.

This reinterpretation has deep implications for the relationship between cosmology and high-energy theory. String and M theory naturally accommodate AdS backgrounds with negative cosmological constants, where holographic dualities such as AdS/CFT are mathematically well-defined. The difficulty of constructing stable de Sitter vacua in string theory has long been a conceptual obstacle for connecting fundamental theory with cosmological observation. In the BB multiverse, this tension disappears. The higher-dimensional progenitor sectors may indeed possess AdS-like or non-Λ vacuum structures. The 3D universe is not a fundamental de Sitter space but a non-equilibrium, rotating, sectorized slice whose coarse-grained dynamics produce an effective de Sitter-like expansion. The positive Λ inferred from observations is therefore a phenomenological artifact of dimensional descent rather than a fundamental property of the underlying multiversal vacuum.

From a holographic perspective, this structure is especially natural. The true bulk geometry of the multiverse may be AdS-like, while the 3D universe emerges as a lower-dimensional effective boundary theory undergoing vacuum-energy relaxation. The apparent de Sitter behavior is then a transient, dynamical phenomenon rather than a stable vacuum. This aligns with the view that de Sitter space is not a fundamental ground state but an effective description of a system evolving toward equilibrium. The BB multiverse thus provides a unified framework in which observational cosmology, string/M theory, and holographic dualities coexist without contradiction.

In this picture, the cosmological constant problem is reframed. The small positive value inferred from observations is not a fine-tuned fundamental constant but the residual of a multiversal relaxation process. The difficulty of constructing de Sitter vacua in string theory is no longer a problem because the universe does not inhabit a true de Sitter vacuum. The holographic preference for AdS geometries is preserved at the fundamental level, while the effective de Sitter behavior of the 3D sector arises naturally from the dynamics of dimensional descent and rotation. The BB multiverse therefore resolves the dS/AdS tension by distinguishing between fundamental vacuum structure and emergent cosmological phenomenology, providing a coherent and mathematically consistent bridge between high-energy theory and observational cosmology.

- *The Need for a Fundamental Arbitrary Cosmological Constant Is Removed*

The BB multiverse eliminates the need for a fundamental cosmological constant because the phenomena attributed to Λ in general relativity arise naturally from the geometric and dynamical structure of the bubble universe. In standard GR, Λ is introduced as an external parameter—a uniform vacuum-energy term added to the Einstein equations to produce accelerated expansion. Nothing in the Einstein–Hilbert action requires it. It is a phenomenological insertion, justified only because observations demand late-time acceleration. This lack of structural origin has always made Λ conceptually opaque, especially given the enormous discrepancy between its observed value and quantum-field-theoretic predictions.

In the BB multiverse, the situation is fundamentally different. The accelerated expansion of the bubble universe emerges from the natural dynamics of dimensional descent, membrane elasticity, and rotational amplification. As the bubble descends from higher-dimensional sectors, its effective radius contracts. Angular momentum is conserved across strata, so contraction forces the angular velocity to increase. This increase modifies the bubble's metric through off-diagonal rotational terms, producing frame dragging and rotational shear. In the comoving frame, these geometric deformations appear as outward inertial accelerations, effectively enhancing the Hubble parameter. In the embedding frame, the same rotational deformation increases curvature, strengthening the effective gravitational coupling. The outward and inward effects are not independent forces but orthogonal projections of a single rotationally induced geometric modification.

The membrane's elastic response plays a central role. Vacuum-energy density determines membrane rigidity: high ρ_Λ produces a stiff membrane that suppresses curvature, while low ρ_Λ produces a flexible membrane that transmits rotational shear more effectively. As dimensional descent proceeds, vacuum-energy density falls super-exponentially, making the membrane increasingly responsive to rotational deformation. The effective gravitational coupling associated with rotation emerges as $G_{\text{rot}} \propto \frac{\omega}{\rho_\Lambda}$, showing that the apparent and mysterious "dark-energy-like" acceleration is a dynamical consequence of rotation interacting with a softening membrane. No fundamental cosmological constant is required. The quantity that observational cosmology interprets as Λ is simply the coarse-grained projection of rotationally induced curvature onto a 3D Einsteinian description.

As discussed above, this reinterpretation dissolves the conceptual tension between GR and high-energy theory. String and M-theoretic constructions naturally prefer AdS-like vacua, where holographic dualities are well-defined. The difficulty of constructing stable de Sitter vacua has long been a major obstacle. In the BB multiverse, the universe does not inhabit a true de Sitter vacuum. The apparent de Sitter behavior is emergent, arising from rotational amplification and vacuum-energy fall during dimensional descent. The cosmological constant problem is reframed: the small positive value inferred from observations is not a fine-tuned fundamental constant, but the residual of multiversal relaxation combined with rotational shear.

The BB multiverse therefore provides a transparent physical origin for cosmic acceleration. It shows that Λ *is not a fundamental parameter of nature but an emergent kinematic artifact of the bubble's geometry. The model replaces an ad hoc constant with a dynamical mechanism grounded in the multiverse's structure.* Rotation, membrane elasticity, and dimensional descent together generate the effective equation of state $w_{\text{eff}} \approx -1$ without invoking exotic fields or fine-tuned potentials. The transparency of this mechanism is one of the strongest conceptual advantages of the BB multiverse: it explains cosmic acceleration, resolves the cosmological constant problem, and aligns observational phenomenology with the geometric foundations of high-dimensional theory.

- *Hawking Chronology Protection*

In the S10 sectors, the vacuum is dense with high-frequency modes, and the Casimir force is strong enough to dominate over the extremely weak gravitational constant characteristic of these high-dimensional regimes. The geometry is shaped primarily by vacuum-mode pressures rather than curvature. Wormholes, closed timelike curves, and fluctuating topologies are not anomalies but stable environmental structures. The time signature is weak and only loosely distinguished from spatial directions, producing a soft causal architecture in which loops, shortcuts, and non-rigid temporal order are natural features. For any substrate-relative lifeforms native to the S10 sectors, this environment is entirely stable; their physics is meta-classical, internally coherent, and deterministic within their own dimensional frame.

As dimensional descent proceeds, the vacuum energy density falls, and the Casimir force weakens. The stabilizing influence of vacuum-mode suppression diminishes, and gravitational curvature becomes increasingly significant. The time signature strengthens, and the geometry transitions from a vacuum-dominated regime to a curvature-dominated one. By the time the system reaches the E6 sectors, the time-like direction is sharply distinguished from the spatial ones, and the metric enforces a rigid causal ordering. Wormholes pinch off rapidly, closed timelike curves cannot

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

be sustained, and the vacuum no longer supports the exotic stress-energy configurations that are commonplace in the S10 sectors. This is the environment historically labeled "classical," not because it is ontologically privileged, but because human scientific history unfolded entirely within it.

This framework reveals that Hawking's chronology protection conjecture is not a universal principle but an emergent property of the E6 sectors. Chronology protection operates only where the time signature is strong enough to enforce causal rigidity and where the vacuum lacks the mode density required to sustain exotic topologies. In the S10 sectors, the conjecture simply does not apply. The time signature is too weak, the vacuum too active, and the geometry too flexible for causal loops to generate divergent stress. Wormholes and CTCs are stable features of the meta-classical environment, and causality is soft but internally consistent. Chronology protection emerges only after dimensional descent has stripped the vacuum of its ability to support the structures that make CTCs possible.

- *Meta-Classical CTCs and Temporal Parallax*

Closed timelike curves in the S10 sectors cannot be understood using the lower-dimensional intuition inherited from the E6 sectors. The very notion of a "timelike loop" presupposes a rigid, one-dimensional time axis and a fixed causal orientation—conditions that do not exist in the S10 regime. In the S10 sectors, time is partially spatialized, the time signature is weak, and the bubble itself undergoes rotation that mixes spatial and temporal directions through a bivector transformation. As a result, the geometry of a CTC in the S10 sectors is not a simple tight loop in a single temporal dimension but a higher-dimensional, dynamically renewing trajectory whose properties differ radically from the classical picture.

Because time is spatialized, an S10-sector CTC does not trap an observer in a rigid, endlessly repeating temporal loop. Instead, the loop renews itself on each cycle due to temporal parallax—the shifting alignment between the observer's internal time direction and the sector's weak, rotating time signature. The observer's proper time does not close perfectly; it advances slightly with each traversal because the temporal axis is not fixed but rotates with the bubble. *This produces a form of meta-classical immortality: the immortal observer experiences continuous renewal rather than repetition.* They do not age in the classical sense because the loop resets the temporal component of their trajectory, yet they do not stagnate because the spatialized time dimension allows drift, slippage, and reorientation.

The rotation of the bubble introduces an additional layer of complexity. From the perspective of an S10 observer, both space and time undergo bivector rotation. The observer's local frame is continuously reoriented relative to the global geometry, and this reorientation prevents the CTC from being identical on each pass. The loop is not a closed track but a rotating, evolving path through a higher-dimensional manifold. Because the geometry changes slightly with each cycle, the observer does not encounter the same events in the same order. The loop is topologically closed but dynamically open. This prevents the classical paradoxes associated with CTCs in lower-dimensional sectors, because the conditions required for paradox—rigid repetition, fixed temporal ordering, and invariant causal structure—are absent.

Spatialization of time also allows escape routes that do not exist in lower-dimensional CTCs. In the E6 sectors, a CTC is a closed curve in a strictly timelike direction, and an observer trapped within it cannot leave without violating the metric signature. In the S10 sectors, the time direction has spatial components, and the observer can slip out of the loop by shifting along one of the spatialized temporal axes. This is not a violation of causality but a natural consequence of the meta-classical geometry. The loop is not a prison, but a stable, navigable structure embedded in a higher-dimensional space where the distinction between "inside" and "outside" is not binary.

Because the loop renews itself, because the bubble rotates, and because time is spatialized, causality is not violated in the S10 sectors. The classical notion of causality presupposes a single, rigid time axis and a fixed ordering of events. In the S10 sectors, these assumptions do not hold. Causality is soft, multi-directional, and internally consistent within the meta-classical regime. The apparent paradoxes arise only when a lower-dimensional observer attempts to project their rigid causal framework onto a higher-dimensional structure. For S10 observers, the CTC is simply another stable feature of their environment, no more paradoxical than a gravitational orbit is to an E6 observer. CTCs that arise will evolve more slowly as the number of spatial dimensions increase and time becomes increasingly spatialized until, at some point and for all practical purposes, they stop from our reference frame.

This understanding reinforces the central principle of the BB multiverse: causality is sector-indexed, not universal. In-sector stability—whether classical in the E6 sectors or meta-classical in the S10 sectors—produces coherent, paradox-free behavior. Cross-sector instability produces the distortions historically labeled quantum. The S10 CTC is therefore not a violation of causality but an expression of a different causal architecture, one that becomes paradoxical only when viewed from a lower-dimensional frame. Hawking's Chronology Protection is not required in the S10 sectors.

- *Geometric vs. Dynamical Scaling During Dimensional Descent*

Dimensional descent simultaneously alters the *geometry* of a bubble's embedding and the *dynamics* of processes occurring within it. These two forms of scaling—geometric and dynamical—are often conflated because both involve changes in spatial extent, temporal structure, and causal reach. Yet they arise from distinct layers of the ontology and therefore must be treated as orthogonal transformations rather than competing descriptions of the same phenomenon.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

Geometric scaling concerns the shape, orientation, and radius of the bubble as an embedded object in the higher-dimensional vacuum. As the relational budget inherited from the primordial bubble is progressively spent, the spatial hyperplane loses the capacity to sustain higher-dimensional extension. The bubble's radius contracts monotonically, and the temporal axis becomes increasingly orthogonal to the spatial manifold. This "verticalization" of time is not a dynamical effect but a structural one: the time direction becomes more purely temporal as the entanglement-rotation defining the bubble's internal frame approaches its lower-dimensional fixed point. In this sense, geometric time *expands*—it becomes cleaner, more one-dimensional, more sharply distinguished from the spatial directions—while geometric space *contracts* as the bubble shrinks.

Dynamical scaling, by contrast, concerns the metric properties governing propagation, causality, and the internal kinematics of excitations. As vacuum energy density decreases during descent, the rotation rate of the bubble increases, and the effective speed of light rises accordingly. A higher value of c widens causal cones, increases the spatial reach per unit proper time, and shortens dynamical time intervals. From the perspective of internal observers, space appears to "expand" dynamically—signals traverse greater distances in less proper time—while time appears to "contract" dynamically, since the duration required for causal influence diminishes.

These two forms of scaling are not contradictory because they operate on different structures. Geometric contraction refers to the shrinking of the bubble's embedding radius, whereas dynamical expansion refers to the widening of causal structure within the bubble. Likewise, geometric expansion of the time axis refers to the sharpening of its orientation, while dynamical contraction of time refers to the shortening of metric intervals. Both arise from the same underlying rotational transformation of the entanglement-metric substrate, but they are projections of that transformation onto different descriptive layers.

Dimensional descent therefore produces a coherent dual scaling: the bubble contracts geometrically even as its internal causal reach expands dynamically; the time axis becomes more purely temporal even as dynamical time intervals shorten. The apparent oppositions dissolve once the geometric and dynamical layers are kept distinct. Both are necessary to capture the full structure of the descent process, and together they reveal dimensional descent as a unified rotation of relational degrees of freedom rather than a competition between incompatible tendencies.

➤ *The BGV Boundary as Realized Through the Architecture of Domain 3*

The BGV (Borde-Guth–Vilenkin) theorem [20] asserts that any spacetime exhibiting positive average expansion along a congruence of geodesics is past-incomplete. Classical spacetime cannot be extended indefinitely into the ultraviolet regime; it must terminate at a boundary where the manifold description fails. In standard inflationary cosmology, this boundary is interpreted as a pre-inflationary singularity or a quantum gravitational domain beyond which classical geometry ceases to exist. In the BB multiverse architecture, this theorem is not merely satisfied but *geometrically realized* through the structure of Domain 3 and its inherited transition from Domain 2.

The BB multiverse does not begin with classical spacetime. It begins with Domain 1, a purely relational, pre-geometric substrate containing only amplitudinal relations and combinatorial constraints. Domain 2 emerges when these relations acquire amplitudes, inner products, and entanglement topology, forming a fully quantum, non-geometric vacuum. Domain 2 contains no spacetime, no observers, and no classical universes. It is the substrate from which classical sectors can be instantiated, but it is not itself classical.

Domain 3 begins when Domain 2 nucleates the first domain wall. This symmetry-breaking event creates the initial geometric manifold and initiates dimensional descent. Crucially, the earliest universes in Domain 3—those spanning 11D down to 7D—are not classical universes but near-quantum universes. They inherit the ontology of Domain 2: coherence is high, curvature is weak, decoherence is insufficient to stabilize identity, and sectoral rigidity has not yet formed. These universes belong to Domain 3 because they are already on the geometric side of the first domain wall, but they remain near-quantum because the dimensional descent has not yet reached the classicality threshold.

The near-quantum cliff—the transition between the 7D and 6D regimes—is therefore a feature of Domain 3, not Domain 2. It is the point within Domain 3 where the inherited quantum ontology of Domain 2 becomes dynamically incompatible with further geometric stabilization. Above the cliff (11D–7D), universes are geometric but not classical; below the cliff (6D–3D), universes progressively acquire curvature, decoherence, and sectoral rigidity. The cliff is the moment where the geometry of Domain 3 becomes capable of supporting classical identity. It is the threshold at which the relational fiber bundle transitions from near-quantum geometry to classical geometry.

This threshold is the BB model's realization of the Guth–Vilenkin boundary. The theorem's "past incompleteness" is reinterpreted as the impossibility of extending classical spacetime backward through the near-quantum cliff into the higher-dimensional near-quantum universes of Domain 3, and certainly not into Domain 2. Classical spacetime is not past-eternal because it is not fundamental; it is an emergent structure that appears only after dimensional descent has driven the geometry below the near-quantum cliff. The Guth–Vilenkin boundary is therefore not a singularity but the dimensional-descent threshold where classicality becomes dynamically viable.

The BB architecture thus provides a model-specific realization of the Guth–Vilenkin theorem. The theorem's

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

boundary is embedded within Domain 3 itself, at the point where the inherited quantum ontology of Domain 2 collapses into classical geometry. Classical universes arise only after this threshold; before it, there exist only near-quantum universes whose geometry is too coherent and too high-dimensional to support classical identity. The multiverse is eternal as a standing geometry, but classical spacetime is not. The Guth–Vilenkin theorem applies only to the classical (E6) sectors of Domain 3, which are finite in dimensional depth and cannot be extended backward into the near-quantum regime or into Domain 2.

In this way, the BB multiverse transforms the Guth–Vilenkin theorem from a constraint on inflationary cosmology into a geometric feature of dimensional descent. The theorem's past boundary is the near-quantum cliff within Domain 3, where the relational fiber bundle transitions from the quantum ontology of Domain 2 to the classical ontology of the low-dimensional sectors. Classical observers, classical universes, and classical causal structure arise only after this threshold. Before it, there is only the multiversal standing geometry with no sectoral identity, no classical manifold, and no localized degrees of freedom. The BB model therefore realizes the Guth–Vilenkin theorem by embedding its boundary within the dimensional architecture of Domain 3.

- *End of Dimensional Descent and Sector-Creation Process*

As bubbles nest inward, vacuum energy decreases progressively. By the time the cascade reaches our universe, the vacuum energy is almost negligible. With nearly zero vacuum energy, the potential well bottoms out, leaving no excess pressure for quantum tunneling. Compressing our 3D domain further would require an enormous increase in angular velocity to conserve momentum, but the lack of vacuum energy prevents this transition. Therefore, our universe represents the kinematic and thermodynamic ground state of the multiverse, being the lowest energy configuration capable of maintaining structure. Hence, symmetry-breaking stopped at our 3D universe with the depletion of vacuum energy and the quantum requirement for a ground state. The energy gradient powering dimensional descent was exhausted, preventing further vacuum branching.

V. OBSERVATIONAL CONSEQUENCES AND TESTABLE PREDICTIONS

Although each universe is a projection of a facet of the cosmological polytope, the boundaries between universes are not perfectly opaque. Gravitational waves, portal-mediated interactions, and relics of earlier CP-offset universes can leave detectable imprints. These imprints form the observational backbone of the model.

- *Anomalous Gravitational Waves*

The most direct observational signature of a CP-offset precursor universe would be a stochastic gravitational-wave background. Because gravitational waves couple only to the spacetime metric and not to the specific matter content, they traverse CP boundaries without attenuation. If the Alpha-1 (parent) universe preceded Alpha-2 (our universe), then its early-epoch phase transitions would have generated gravitational waves that propagated throughout the multiversal manifold. These signals would eventually enter Alpha-2 with a characteristic spectral profile. In such a scenario, the gravitational-wave background would exhibit an amplitude that increases with frequency, producing a spectrum that rises toward the nanohertz band. This monotonic rise constitutes a *blue-tilted* gravitational-wave spectrum.

Recent observations from pulsar timing arrays have reported an anomalous nano-Hertz gravitational-wave signal with a slight blue tilt. This signal is difficult to reconcile with astrophysical sources such as supermassive black hole binaries, which produce spectra that decrease with frequency. However, a first-order phase transition in a hot, high-energy mirror universe naturally produces a blue-tilted spectrum. If Alpha-1 underwent such a transition before Alpha-2 (our universe) formed, its gravitational waves would appear in the nano-Hertz band where the anomaly is observed.

Gravitational waves are affected by the sector because their propagation depends on the causal structure of spacetime. As the causal speed decreases in the higher sectors, gravitational waves that interact with the bulk or with the portal interfaces experience frequency-dependent damping and polarization rotation. This produces chiral gravitational waves, with one polarization mode propagating more efficiently than the other. The dispersion relation for gravitational waves becomes anisotropic, with $\omega^2 = c^2 k^2 + \Delta(k)$, where $\Delta(k)$ encodes the effect of dimensional rotation and CP offsets. This anisotropy may be detectable by future gravitational wave observatories.

The mergers of CP-offset black holes in Alpha-2 can also produce gravitational signatures. In a higher-energy universe, black holes form earlier, merge more rapidly, and reach higher masses than in Alpha-2. These mergers produce gravitational waves that can propagate across CP boundaries. The gravitational waves from CP-offset black hole mergers have higher characteristic masses and shorter merger timescales than those from stellar black holes in Alpha-2. Observations of black hole mergers in the 100 to 150 solar mass range may therefore represent the gravitational echoes of CP-offset black holes.

Another observational signature arises from parity violation. If Alpha-1 and Alpha-2 differ in CP orientation, then the gravitational waves they produce would exhibit net circular polarization. This polarization arises because the gravitational waves have a preferred handedness, either left-handed or right-handed, depending on the CP orientation of the source universe. Detecting such polarization would provide direct evidence for a CP-offset precursor universe.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

- *CMB and DM Halo Structures*

Portal bridges also produce observational signatures. These bridges arise from the mixing of dark photons across CP boundaries and allow limited energy transfer between universes. The dark matter in Alpha-1 interacts weakly with dark photons from other universes, producing subtle deviations in the behavior of dark matter halos. These deviations may manifest as unexpected density profiles, anomalous rotation curves, or unexplained substructures.

In the BB Multiverse, the narrowing of the light cone and the rotation of the time axis in the higher-dimensional sectors produce a distinct class of parity-odd imprints on the cosmic microwave background (CMB). These arise because the CP-offset precursor universes, whose temporal axes are rotated relative to that of Alpha-2, transmit their geometric orientation into the primordial perturbations that leak through the portal interfaces. The resulting anisotropies manifest observationally as non-vanishing TB and EB correlations in the CMB polarization field.

In standard ΛCDM cosmology, the temperature anisotropies and the polarization modes are decomposed into scalar E-modes and pseudo-scalar B-modes, yielding the familiar TT, EE, BB, and TE power spectra. The remaining cross-spectra, TB and EB, are strictly parity-odd. Under parity-preserving physics, both must vanish identically. Any detection of TB or EB correlations therefore signals a fundamental parity violation in the underlying spacetime structure, or a rotation of the polarization plane induced by new physics. Within the BB Multiverse, these correlations arise naturally: the rotation of the time axis in the higher-dimensional sectors induces cosmic birefringence, causing the polarization of CMB photons to rotate by an angle proportional to the integrated dimensional rotation along the line of sight. This birefringent rotation mixes E-modes into B-modes, generating precisely the TB and EB anomalies that would otherwise be forbidden in a parity-even cosmology.

Thus, the presence of nonzero TB and EB correlations in Alpha-2 constitutes a direct observational signature of the CP-offset architecture of the multiverse. They encode the orientation of the precursor universes, the degree of temporal-axis rotation, and the cumulative geometric twisting experienced by photons as they traverse the inter-sectoral manifold. In this sense, TB and EB anomalies function as polarization-based fossils of higher-dimensional dynamics, revealing the imprint of the parent universe's geometry on the observable sky of Alpha-2.

The structure of dark matter halos is influenced by the presence of the Alpha-1, Beta, Gamma, and Delta sectors. Self-interacting dark matter from the E6 dark sectors produce cored halo profiles, while dark radiation suppresses small-scale structure. The presence of multiple dark matter components with different self-interaction strengths and different degrees of quantum coherence explains the diversity of halo shapes and the discrepancies between observations and ΛCDM predictions.

Portal interactions produce nuclear anomalies in Alpha-2 (our universe). The X17 boson, which mediates mixing between Alpha-2 and Alpha-1, produces anomalous $e^+ e^-$ angular correlations in certain nuclear transitions. These anomalies arise because the mixing angle θ between the photon of Alpha-2 and the photon of Alpha-1 is small but nonzero, allowing a fraction of the energy in a nuclear transition to leak into Alpha-1. The mixing angle satisfies $\tan 2\theta \approx \varepsilon$, where ε is the kinetic mixing parameter, and the observed anomalies correspond to $\varepsilon \approx 10^{-3}$.

The variation of the fine-structure constant α across the higher-dimensional sectors generates a second class of observational signatures, most clearly expressed in quasar absorption spectra and high-precision atomic clock comparisons. In the BB Multiverse, α is not globally fixed; its value depends on the local geometric environment defined by the dimensional hierarchy of the surrounding sectors. As Alpha-1, Beta, Gamma, and Delta possess progressively higher effective dimensionality—slightly above three dimensions for Alpha-1, four for Beta, five for Gamma, and six for Delta—their influence on the electromagnetic sector of Alpha-2 induces *spatial* gradients in α. Photons originating from distant quasars therefore traverse regions in which α is modulated by the proximity and orientation of these higher-dimensional domains. The resulting absorption lines exhibit systematic shifts that cannot be attributed to cosmological redshift alone but instead reflect the imprint of the multiversal dimensional structure on electromagnetic coupling.

Temporal variations in α arise through a complementary mechanism. The rotation of the time axis in the precursor sectors, together with the evolving vacuum energy density in Alpha-1, induces a slow drift in the effective electromagnetic coupling experienced within Alpha-2 (our universe). Atomic clocks based on distinct transitions respond differently to such temporal modulation. As α evolves, the relative frequencies of these transitions diverge, producing measurable drifts between clocks that would remain synchronized in a universe with a strictly constant α. In this way, atomic clock networks become sensitive probes of the dynamical geometry of the multiverse, registering the cumulative effect of temporal-axis rotation and vacuum-energy evolution in the parent sector.

The presence of parity-odd correlations in the CMB, cosmic birefringence, and chiral gravitational waves provides evidence for CP alternation and dimensional rotation. The existence of cored halo profiles, suppressed small-scale structure, and dark radiation signatures provides evidence for the Alpha-1, Beta, Gamma, and Delta sectors. The presence of nuclear anomalies provides evidence for the portal interfaces. The variation of α provides evidence for the scaling of vacuum energy and the narrowing of the light cone.

These predictions are not ad hoc; they follow directly from the intrinsic structure of the sectors. The alternation between predominantly thermal and predominantly

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

non-thermal plasma regimes, the rotation of the time axis, the scaling behavior of α, and the existence of portal interfaces all contribute to the model's observable signatures. Taken together, they form a coherent interpretive framework for a wide range of cosmological and astrophysical phenomena.

The model specifies a concrete bulk warp factor and a well-defined bubble universe embedding, and it derives an explicit effective potential $\Phi_{\text{bulk}}(\hat{n})$ on Alpha-2. These elements provide the dynamical backbone that links sector geometry to measurable physical consequences.

- *Cold Spot and Dark Flow*

The large-scale structure of the cosmos contains several anomalies that challenge the assumptions of isotropy and homogeneity embedded in the standard cosmological model. Among these, the Eridanus Cold Spot in the cosmic microwave background and the phenomenon known as Dark Flow stand out for their coherence, scale, and resistance to conventional explanation. Both anomalies point toward a preferred direction in the sky, a feature that is difficult to reconcile with inflationary randomness or ΛCDM initial conditions. In the BB multiverse model, where our universe (Alpha-2) is embedded within a larger CP-offset parent domain (Alpha-1), these anomalies arise naturally from the geometry of off-center embedding. The same curvature gradient that imprints a temperature depression on the last-scattering surface also induces a coherent bulk motion of matter across cosmological distances. Thus, the Cold Spot and Dark Flow are not isolated curiosities but two observational manifestations of a single geometric cause.

In the BB model, Alpha-2 is not an isolated bubble nucleated in an inflating background, but a curvature-stabilized region nested within Alpha-1. The embedding is asymmetric. The center of curvature of Alpha-2 does not coincide with the geometric center of its parent Alpha-1 universe, producing a gradient in vacuum stress, curvature, and tensor-mode propagation across Alpha-2. The transition between the two domains is not a thin wall but a smooth interface where quantum factorization stabilizes, vacuum polarization reverses parity, and increasingly classical geometry emerges from the underlying tensor-product structure. The transition layer transmits the curvature asymmetry of Alpha-1 into the interior of Alpha-2, establishing a global anisotropic boundary condition.

- *The Cold Spot as a Photon-Level Imprint of Embedding Asymmetry*

The Eridanus Cold Spot, a roughly ten-degree region with a temperature decrement of approximately seventy microkelvin, has long resisted explanation within ΛCDM. Its size, coherence, and lack of a surrounding hot ring make it incompatible with Gaussian fluctuations, supervoid imprints, or bubble-collision signatures predicted by eternal inflation. In the BB model, the Cold Spot arises from the direction of maximal curvature gradient imposed by Alpha-1 (our parent universe). Photons originating from the last-scattering surface in this direction traverse a deeper gravitational potential, experience enhanced integrated Sachs–Wolfe cooling and arrive with a coherent temperature deficit. Because the embedding gradient is smooth rather than discontinuous, the resulting anisotropy lacks sharp boundaries, rings, or polarization discontinuities. The Cold Spot is therefore the photon-level projection of Alpha-2's (our universe) off-center placement within Alpha-1 (our parent universe).

- *Dark Flow as the Matter-Level Counterpart of the Same Gradient*

Dark Flow refers to the observation that galaxy clusters across hundreds of megaparsecs exhibit a coherent motion of roughly six hundred to one thousand kilometers per second toward a specific region of the sky. This motion does not correlate with known mass distributions, does not diminish at large distances, and appears to extend beyond the observable horizon. In the BB model, the same curvature gradient that cools photons also shapes the geodesics of matter. The side of Alpha-2 closer to the curvature center of Alpha-1 experiences a slightly deeper gravitational potential, producing a small but persistent acceleration toward that direction. Over billions of years, this anisotropic geodesic structure generates a large-scale bulk flow aligned with the Cold Spot. Dark Flow is therefore the matter-level dynamical imprint of the same embedding asymmetry that produces the Cold Spot's temperature depression.

- *The Giant Ring as an Embedding-Curvature Artifact in the BB Multiverse*

The recently reported "Giant Ring," an approximately 3-billion-light-year, quasi-toroidal overdensity at redshift $z \approx 1$, is best understood not as a statistical anomaly within a homogeneous ΛCDM background, but as a geometric inheritance feature arising from the embedding of the Alpha-2 bubble within its CP-reversed progenitor, Alpha-1. In the BB multiverse ontology, large-scale structure is not constrained by global statistical homogeneity; instead, it reflects the ancestral curvature fields, tidal offsets, and phase-transition fronts that propagate through the bubble lineage. The Giant Ring therefore functions as a diagnostic imprint of the embedding geometry rather than a violation of cosmological principles.

- ✓ *Embedding Curvature and the Origin of Super-Horizon Modulations*

In the BB framework, the spatial curvature experienced within Alpha-2 is not a global scalar but a local embedding curvature, defined by the manner in which the child bubble is seated within the parent's higher-dimensional curvature manifold. A slight tilt, eccentric offset, or anisotropic tension gradient in the Alpha-1 to Alpha-2 embedding induces a family of super-horizon modulation fields that persist through inflation and reappear as coherent, ultra-large structures in the late universe.

Let $K_{(1\to2)}(x)$ denote the inherited embedding curvature field projected onto the Alpha-2 interior. Its

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

lowest-order multipole components generate ring-like caustics when intersected with the comoving 3-surface of constant cosmic time. The Giant Ring corresponds to such an intersection: a codimension-one curvature sheet inherited from Alpha-1, sliced by our observational hypersurface into a toroidal overdensity.

✓ *Tidal Anisotropy and the Alignment of the Giant Ring with the Giant Arc*

The Giant Ring is not isolated. It is co-located with the previously discovered Giant Arc and associated filamentary structures, all lying along a common orientation. In ΛCDM this alignment is inexplicable; in the BB ontology it is expected. The embedding curvature field $K_{(1\to2)}$ possesses a preferred tidal axis, determined by the direction of maximal curvature shear in the parent bubble. This axis imprints a global anisotropy that manifests as:

- Elongated arc-like overdensities,
- Partial or complete ring-like caustics,
- Corkscrew-like density modulations (as reported for the Big Ring),
- And coherent filamentary attachments.

The Giant Ring and Giant Arc complex is therefore a single geometric object, fragmented only by the slicing of our observational frame.

✓ *Phase-Transition Fronts and the Emergence of Toroidal Density Contours*

During the early evolution of Alpha-2, symmetry-breaking events propagate as phase-transition fronts across the bubble interior. These fronts are not spherical; they are shaped by the inherited curvature field and by the E6-sector's internal symmetry constraints. When two such fronts intersect a pre-existing curvature sheet, the resulting density discontinuity acquires a toroidal or quasi-toroidal morphology. The Giant Ring's diameter, coherence, and redshift placement are consistent with a front-sheet intersection occurring during the epoch when the embedding curvature was dynamically dominant.

Let Σ_{PT} denote a phase-transition front and $\mathcal{C}$ the inherited curvature sheet. Their intersection $\Gamma = \Sigma_{\mathrm{PT}} \cap \mathcal{C}$ is generically a closed, ring-like curve on the comoving slice. The observed Giant Ring corresponds to such a Γ, with its thickness and density contrast determined by the front's propagation speed and the local curvature gradient.

✓ *Non-Gaussianity as a Signature of Bubble Lineage*

The Giant Ring's morphology is explicitly non-Gaussian, violating the statistical assumptions underlying ΛCDM's large-scale structure predictions. In the BB model, non-Gaussianity is not a perturbative correction but a structural consequence of bubble genealogy. The embedding curvature field introduces deterministic anisotropies that cannot be captured by Gaussian random fields. The Giant Ring's coherence over about 3 Gpc (Gigaparsec) is therefore not an outlier but a natural scale for curvature-inherited modulations.

Moreover, the BB ontology predicts that such structures should cluster at specific redshift bands corresponding to epochs when the embedding curvature's influence is maximal. The Giant Ring's placement at $z \approx 1$ aligns with the expected curvature-transition epoch, when the Alpha-2 interior geometry was still adjusting to its inherited tidal configuration.

✓ *Observational Consequences and Falsifiable Predictions*

Interpreting the Giant Ring as an embedding-curvature artifact yields several testable predictions:

- Co-located structures: Additional arcs, partial rings, or filaments should exist at the same redshift and orientation.
- Preferred-axis alignment: Polarization and weak-lensing maps should reveal a common tidal axis matching the Giant Ring's orientation.
- Non-BAO (Baryon Acoustic Oscillations) morphology: The structure should not exhibit BAO-like spherical symmetry or characteristic BAO radii.
- Mirror-sector counterpart: If the embedding geometry is CP-reflected, a distorted counterpart may exist on the antipodal sky.
- Curvature-linked redshift clustering: Similar structures should appear in other redshift bands corresponding to earlier curvature-transition epochs.

These predictions distinguish the BB model from ΛCDM and from modified-gravity alternatives, providing a clear empirical pathway for adjudicating between cosmological ontologies.

- *The BB Multiverse Model Aligns Better with Observations*

A growing set of large-scale anomalies continues to strain the assumptions of ΛCDM. The standard model predicts no preferred direction, no coherent bulk flow beyond scales of order one hundred megaparsecs, no large-scale temperature depression without a compensating hot ring, and no alignment among the lowest CMB multipoles. It also predicts that matter fluctuations should be statistically homogeneous and Gaussian on scales larger than roughly one gigaparsec. Yet observations repeatedly violate these expectations. The Cold Spot cannot be explained by the observed supervoid, which is too small and too shallow. Dark Flow cannot be attributed to local structure because the flow extends to scales comparable to, or exceeding, the observable horizon. Bubble-collision models predict azimuthally symmetric rings and polarization signatures that have not been detected. And now, the discovery of the Giant Ring, an approximately 3-billion-light-year, quasi-toroidal overdensity, at $z \approx 1$, adds a new and even more striking challenge: ΛCDM simply does not permit coherent structures of this scale or morphology.

The BB multiverse model requires none of the auxiliary hypotheses invoked to rescue ΛCDM from these anomalies. It introduces no exotic inflationary potentials, no

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

fine-tuned initial conditions, and no speculative collision events. Instead, the anomalies arise directly from the geometry of embedding: the manner in which Alpha-2 is seated within its CP-reversed progenitor, Alpha-1. In this framework, large-scale structure is shaped not only by internal dynamics but also by inherited curvature fields, tidal gradients, and phase-transition fronts originating in the parent bubble. The Giant Ring, like the Giant Arc and Big Ring before it, is therefore not an outlier but a natural manifestation of the embedding-curvature field $K_{(1\rightarrow 2)}$.

A remarkable feature of the observational record is that many of the most persistent anomalies—the Cold Spot, Dark Flow, the hemispherical power asymmetry, the quadrupole–octopole alignment, and the so-called Axis of Evil—point toward nearly the same region of the sky. Under isotropic inflation this alignment is extraordinarily improbable; under asymmetric embedding it is expected. Each anomaly corresponds to a different physical response to the same inherited geometric condition. The Cold Spot reflects the photon response to the curvature gradient. Dark Flow reflects the matter response. The hemispherical asymmetry reflects the modulation of fluctuation amplitudes across the sky. The low-ℓ alignments reflect the suppression and orientation of long-wavelength modes along the preferred axis. (The study of low-ℓ alignments in cosmology involves examining the alignments of the lowest multipoles of the CMB temperature sky.) The Giant Ring extends this pattern to the realm of late-time structure formation: it is the matter-density imprint of the same embedding geometry that shapes the CMB anomalies.

Within the BB framework, these phenomena are not independent puzzles but different observational slices of a single geometric structure. The curvature gradient imposed by Alpha-1 establishes a direction of maximal embedding asymmetry within Alpha-2. Photons respond through temperature modulation, matter responds through coherent motion, long-wavelength modes respond through alignment and suppression, and large-scale density fields respond through the formation of ring-like or arc-like caustics when phase-transition fronts intersect inherited curvature sheets. The preferred axis that emerges across multiple datasets is therefore not an accident of cosmic variance but a direct observational signature of the multiversal embedding geometry.

The BB multiverse model thus provides a unified explanation for several of the most persistent large-scale anomalies in cosmology. The Cold Spot, Dark Flow, hemispherical asymmetry, low-ℓ alignments, and now the Giant Ring all arise naturally from the off-center embedding of Alpha-2 within Alpha-1. This interpretation preserves general relativity within Alpha-2, requires no departures from standard inflationary dynamics, and invokes no speculative collision events. Instead, it reflects the deeper geometric structure of the multiverse and the role of embedding curvature in shaping observable phenomena. In this sense, the Cold Spot, Dark Flow, and the Giant Ring are not cosmological mysteries but windows into the architecture of the larger domain of the local multiverse in which our universe is nested.

- *Cross-Sector Propagation of Gravity and Sector-Confinement of Particles*

String-theoretic models such as M-theory postulate that gravitons are closed strings capable of propagating through the higher-dimensional bulk, while Standard Model particles are open strings confined to branes. This distinction is asserted but not explained: the theory specifies that open strings terminate on branes, but not *why* the brane should enforce such confinement, nor why closed strings alone should possess bulk mobility. The BB multiverse provides a more transparent geometric-relational explanation for both phenomena without invoking string-theoretic ontology.

In the BB framework, gravity propagates across sectors because curvature is a property of the spacetime membrane itself. A deformation in one bubble produces a curvature gradient that extends into adjacent bubbles, just as tension in one region of a continuous elastic sheet influences the strain distribution in neighboring regions. This mechanism naturally accounts for cross-sector gravitational phenomena such as the Cold Spot and the dark-flow signature in Alpha-2, both of which arise from the curvature imprint of the parent Alpha-1 bubble. In this view, gravitational influence is not the transmission of a particle through a higher-dimensional bulk but the geometric continuation of membrane deformation across nested bubble boundaries.

The situation is fundamentally different for material particles. *Particles do not propagate freely across sectors because they are not independent objects moving through a background; they are sector-specific expressions of higher-dimensional relational structures.* When a particle's worldline intersects a region of different dimensionality, it undergoes dimensional transmutation: its degrees of freedom must reconfigure to match the symmetry and dimensional constraints of the new sector. A 4D excitation entering a 3D sector cannot retain its original structure; it must compress into a 3D configuration compatible with the local membrane geometry. This is not a confinement mechanism in the sense of brane attachment but a compatibility requirement: only those excitations whose relational structure fits the dimensionality of the sector can persist.

Thus, particles appear confined to sectors not because they are prevented from leaving but because their identity is defined by the dimensionality of the sector itself. Crossing into a sector of different dimensionality *forces a re-expression of the excitation*, altering its properties, stability, or even its existence. In contrast, curvature is not an excitation *within* a sector but a deformation of the membrane, and therefore its influence extends naturally across sector boundaries.

This distinction resolves the conceptual asymmetry that string theory leaves unexplained. Gravity propagates across sectors because curvature is a global property of the membrane, while particles remain sector-specific because their identity is determined by the dimensional and symmetry constraints of the region in which they are expressed. *The BB multiverse therefore provides a unified geometric explanation for both gravitational cross-sector coupling and particle sector-locality without invoking brane-string dualities or postulated confinement rules.*

➢ *JWST Anomalies*

- *Little Red Dots (LRDs)*

JWST has revealed a population of compact, extremely red, high-redshift sources whose spectral lines are broadened primarily by electron scattering within dense ionized cocoons rather than by Doppler motion. These objects appear in large numbers at epochs when the universe was less than a billion years old, and many host young supermassive black holes. Their abundance and maturity are incompatible with standard hierarchical growth models.

Within the BB multiverse framework, the existence of LRDs is a direct consequence of Alpha-2's embedding inside the CP-offset Alpha-1 bubble. The inherited tidal potentials and curvature gradients generate localized enhancements in the amplitude density field, which accelerate early collapse. The amplitude distribution takes the form $A(\mathbf{x}) = A_0 \exp\left[-\frac{(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}_0)^2}{2\sigma^2} + \eta\, T(\mathbf{x})\right]$, where $T(\mathbf{x})$ encodes the inherited tidal potential. Regions where $T(\mathbf{x})$ is maximal collapse rapidly into compact objects surrounded by ionized scattering envelopes. Thus, LRDs are not anomalous within the BB model; they are required signatures of the inherited geometric asymmetry.

- *Primordial Black Hole Clusters and Early Massive Black Hole Seeds*

JWST has identified black hole seeds with masses of order 10^7 to $10^8 M_\odot$ at redshifts $z \gtrsim 10$, including candidates at only 600 Myr after the Big Bang. These objects are too massive and too early to be explained by stellar-remnant seeds or standard accretion histories. Theoretical work motivated by JWST observations suggests that these seeds may originate from clusters of primordial black holes formed via long–short mode coupling.

In the BB multiverse, such clustering is not stochastic but geometric. The initial metric of Alpha-2 contains a tidal correction $g^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} = g^{\mathrm{FRW}}_{\mu\nu} + \delta g^{\mathrm{tidal}}_{\mu\nu}$, which induces deterministic long–short mode coupling. The inherited curvature gradients produce localized over-densities that collapse into primordial black hole clusters. These clusters undergo rapid mergers, generating the heavy seeds observed by JWST. *The BB model therefore predicts both the existence and the spatial distribution of early massive black holes.*

- *Early Massive Galaxies*

JWST has detected galaxies at redshifts $z \gtrsim 10$ whose stellar masses and luminosities exceed ΛCDM expectations by an order of magnitude or more. These galaxies appear too massive, too bright, and too evolved for the available cosmic time.

The BB multiverse explains this by noting that inherited curvature gradients accelerate baryonic collapse. The density contrast evolves according to $\delta(\mathbf{x},t) = \delta_{\mathrm{FRW}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \epsilon\, T(\mathbf{x})\, D(t)$, where $D(t)$ is the growth factor and ϵ measures the CP-offset amplitude. In regions where $T(\mathbf{x})$ is large, collapse proceeds more rapidly, producing massive galaxies earlier than ΛCDM allows. *The BB model therefore predicts the existence of early massive galaxies as a structural consequence of the embedding.*

- *Early Quiescent Galaxies*

JWST NIRSpec and MIRI observations have revealed quiescent galaxies at redshifts as high as $z \approx 8$. These galaxies exhibit old stellar populations and suppressed star formation only a few hundred million years after the Big Bang. Their number density evolves in a mass-dependent manner: massive quiescent systems decline rapidly beyond $z \approx 4$, while lower-mass quiescent galaxies maintain a nearly constant density across z = 4 to 8.

In the BB multiverse, rapid quenching is a natural outcome of the same inherited tidal potentials that accelerate early collapse. Regions of strong curvature produce intense early star formation followed by rapid gas depletion and feedback-driven quenching. The mass-dependent number-density evolution reflects the spatial variation of the inherited tidal field: massive systems form in regions of maximal curvature, while lower-mass systems arise in regions where the inherited potential is weaker but still sufficient to trigger early quenching. Thus, *early quiescent galaxies are predicted by the BB model as a secondary effect of the embedding geometry.*

- *Metallicity Anomalies in Early Galaxies*

JWST has identified high-redshift galaxies with unexpectedly elevated metallicities, implying rapid chemical enrichment on timescales that ΛCDM cannot easily accommodate. Some galaxies show near-solar metallicities at epochs when only a few generations of stars could have existed.

The BB multiverse predicts accelerated enrichment because inherited curvature gradients enhance the early star-formation rate. The ionization rate satisfies $I(\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp[\kappa\, R(\mathbf{x})]$, where $R(\mathbf{x})$ is the Ricci scalar modified by the embedding. Regions of enhanced curvature undergo rapid star formation and early supernova activity, enriching the interstellar medium far earlier than ΛCDM would predict. Metallicity anomalies therefore reflect the geometric imprint of Alpha-2's position within Alpha-1.

- *Gravitational Lensing Anomalies*

JWST has observed strongly lensed systems whose inferred lens masses, alignments, or substructure distributions deviate from ΛCDM halo models. Some lenses appear too massive or too concentrated; others exhibit anomalous shear patterns.

In the BB multiverse, the lensing potential obeys a modified Poisson equation $\nabla^2\Phi_L = 4\pi G\rho + \delta\rho_{\text{tidal}}$, where the additional term arises from the inherited curvature of Alpha-1. This modification produces lensing configurations that appear anomalous under ΛCDM assumptions but are natural consequences of the multiversal embedding. *The BB model therefore predicts deviations in lensing structure, particularly along directions aligned with the CP-offset geometry.*

- *Excess Cosmic Structure at Early Times*

JWST has revealed an unexpectedly high abundance of early cosmic structure, including dense stellar clusters, compact star-forming regions, and proto-galactic fragments. These structures appear earlier and in greater numbers than ΛCDM simulations predict.

The BB multiverse requires such excess structure because inherited tidal potentials seed early fragmentation. The growth of perturbations is enhanced by the curvature term $T(\mathrm{x})$, which increases the effective gravitational potential in certain regions. As a result, structure formation proceeds more rapidly and more heterogeneously than in a purely FRW universe. The observed excess of early structure is therefore a direct signature of the embedding.

- *Anisotropic Distributions and Preferred Directions*

Several JWST deep-field analyses have hinted at mild anisotropies in the distribution of early galaxies and compact objects. While not yet statistically conclusive, these patterns suggest the possibility of preferred directions in early-epoch structure.

The BB multiverse predicts such anisotropies because Alpha-2 is CP-offset within Alpha-1 rather than concentrically embedded. The tidal potential $T(\mathbf{x})$ acquires a preferred orientation, imprinting directional structure on early collapse, star formation, and black hole growth. Any observed anisotropy in JWST deep fields would therefore be a direct observational signature of the multiversal embedding.

➢ *Black Hole Anomalies*

- *Black Holes as Porous Domain-Wall Portals Between Sectors*

In the BB multiverse ontology, stand-alone inter-dimensional black holes—those not entangled with partner black holes within the same universe—act as transient punctures in the domain wall separating nested bubble-universes. Since Alpha-2 (our universe) is embedded within its parent universe Alpha-1, these punctures briefly connect two vacuum manifolds with different ground-state energies. The vacuum-energy gradient $\Delta\rho_{\text{vac}} = \rho_{\text{vac}}^{(1)} - \rho_{\text{vac}}^{(2)} > 0$ ensures that whenever the domain wall opens, even for extremely short intervals, higher-energy particles from Alpha-1 surge into Alpha-2. This inflow is unidirectional because Alpha-1 possesses a higher vacuum-energy density and a correspondingly lower effective causal speed, $c_{\text{eff}} \propto \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{vac}}}, c_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} < c_{\text{eff}}^{(2)}$. Particles in Alpha-1 therefore carry higher rest-frame energies and exist in a more compressed causal structure. This difference has direct consequences for black-hole formation. Because the Schwarzschild radius $r_s = \frac{2GM}{c_{\text{eff}}^2}$ is larger in Alpha-1 for the same mass, gravitational collapse is easier to trigger there. Black holes can therefore form from either side of the domain wall: from the Alpha-2 side through familiar collapse mechanisms, and from the Alpha-1 side through collapse processes that require lower mass-density thresholds. The domain wall does not privilege one universe; it merely mediates the conditions under which collapse occurs.

Once formed, the interior of such a black hole is not a singularity but a transitional throat through which Alpha-1 particles descend into Alpha-2. The geometry of this throat is most clearly understood by following the trajectory of these incoming particles, which move with the vacuum-energy gradient rather than against it. This is discussed below.

- *Dimensional Transmutation and Hawking Radiation*

As an Alpha-1 particle approaches the throat, it encounters a region where the spatial frame of Alpha-2 is rotated relative to its own. Because the spatial axes of Alpha-1 and Alpha-2 differ in parity orientation, the particle must undergo a gradual spatial-parity rotation in order to align with the Alpha-2 spatial frame. This transformation can be expressed as $\mathcal{S}^{(1)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}^{(2)}(\phi)$, where ϕ is the spatial-parity rotation angle. Simultaneously, the effective dimensionality decreases from $3+\epsilon$ toward 3 as the particle descends into the lower-energy manifold.

The temporal transformation is equally structured. Because the time axis in Alpha-1 is less vertical than in Alpha-2, the incoming particle experiences temporal parallax: the time axis rotates toward a more vertical orientation as it approaches Alpha-2. The mapping $e_t^{(1)} \longrightarrow e_t^{(2)}(\theta)$ involves a rotation angle θ that aligns the Alpha-1 temporal direction with the Alpha-2 temporal axis. At the same time, the particle experiences a decrease in time dilation because the effective causal speed increases as it moves into the lower-energy environment. The proper-time metric therefore transitions smoothly toward the Alpha-2 form, $d\tau^2 = g_{\mu\nu}^{(2)}(\theta,\phi)\, dx^\mu dx^\nu$.

However, this geometric description must not be mistaken for a traversable pathway. The throat is dominated by a continuous inward flux of higher-energy particles from Alpha-1 to Alpha-2. Any hypothetical traveler from Alpha-2 would be attempting to climb up the vacuum-energy gradient and against this incoming current. The Casimir force, which stabilizes the throat from the Alpha-1 side, is weaker on the Alpha-2 side, further suppressing any outward motion. The throat is either open—with matter

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

flowing into Alpha-2 from Alpha-1—or closed. There is no regime in which matter from Alpha-2 can slip through in the opposite direction.

This inflow has a decisive consequence: *no matter from Alpha-2 ever reaches the deep interior of the throat*. The incoming Alpha-1 particles carry opposite charge assignments relative to their Alpha-2 counterparts. As they transmute into Alpha-2 particles by shedding excess energy, they annihilate any infalling Alpha-2 matter before it can penetrate further. The annihilation products escape as radiation (currently classified as Hawking radiation [56]. The thermal spectrum of the annihilations that emerge is not simply the result of pair creation at the horizon but the effect of inter-dimensional annihilation events. The Hawking temperature $T_H = \frac{\hbar c^3}{8\pi G M k_B}$ is therefore a coarse-grained thermodynamic signature of this deeper process.

The process described above is termed a "dimensional transmutation" of a particle as it traverses two different sectors with dimensional structure.

- *Particle Properties Change with Dimensionality*

The behavior of Alpha-1 particles during dimensional descent reveals a deeper layer of physics. Their transmutation into ordinary Alpha-2 particles is not merely an energetic adjustment but a structural transformation that ties particle identity to the geometry of the vacuum. Because the particle must undergo spatial-parity rotation ϕ, temporal-axis rotation θ, and dimensional contraction from $3+\epsilon$ to 3, its internal degrees of freedom are re-expressed within the Alpha-2 relational fiber bundle. The transformation $\left(\mathcal{S}^{(1)}, e_t^{(1)}, D^{(1)}\right) \longrightarrow \left(\mathcal{S}^{(2)}, e_t^{(2)}, D^{(2)}\right)$ is therefore a geometric operation, not a purely quantum-field-theoretic one. ($\mathcal{S}$: its spatial orientation sector, e_t: its temporal axis orientation, D: the dimensionality of the local vacuum's entanglement structure.) Particle identity is inseparable from the dimensional structure of the vacuum in which it is embedded.

This process is analogous to kinetic mixing between hidden-sector and visible-sector photons, but here the mixing is induced by geometry rather than gauge couplings. For this reason, the phenomenon is best described as *geometric kinetic mixing*: the particle's identity changes because its embedding in the multiversal fiber bundle changes. *This is the dimensional transmutation hypothesis: particles must change identity when sliding down dimensions to fit the local metric.*

- *New Insight into Neutrino Oscillations*

The same geometric principles that govern the transmutation of Alpha-1 particles during dimensional descent also illuminate the long-standing puzzle of neutrino mixing. In the BB multiverse ontology, the three known neutrino species—electron, muon, and tau—are not simply different flavors of a single particle type but represent different degrees of dimensional embedding. Their mixing is not merely a quantum-mechanical rotation in flavor space; it is a geometric rotation arising from the fact that the muon and tau neutrinos are *vestiges of higher-dimensional particles* projected into the 3D vacuum of Alpha-2.

Because Alpha-2 cannot support the full higher-dimensional structure of these particles, the muon and tau neutrinos appear in our universe only as amputated, energetically suppressed projections. Their natural lifetimes and interaction strengths would be very different in their native higher-dimensional sectors. In Alpha-2, however, they must continuously adjust their geometric embedding to remain compatible with the local metric. This adjustment is the same process that Alpha-1 particles undergo when descending into Alpha-2: a coordinated transformation involving spatial-parity rotation, temporal-axis rotation, and dimensional contraction.

Thus, neutrino oscillations are not simply flavor oscillations but dimensional oscillations. The transformation $\nu_\tau \longrightarrow \nu_\mu \longrightarrow \nu_e$ is a *dimensional descent sequence*, in which the particle sheds higher-dimensional structure to fit the Alpha-2 vacuum. The oscillation matrix is therefore a geometric operator acting on the relational fiber bundle, not merely a quantum mixing matrix. This is the clearest manifestation of the *dimensional transmutation hypothesis*: particles change identity when sliding down dimensions to fit the local metric.

In this view, the tau and mu neutrinos are not unstable or short-lived in the usual sense; rather, they are *geometrically* unstable in Alpha-2 because the 3D vacuum cannot sustain their full higher-dimensional configuration. Their oscillation into the electron neutrino is the natural endpoint of dimensional descent, where the particle finally reaches a configuration fully compatible with the Alpha-2 metric.

This interpretation also predicts that if we could probe higher energies—energies sufficient to excite deeper layers of the multiversal hierarchy—we would observe additional neutrino-like species corresponding to higher-dimensional sectors. These would appear as extremely short-lived, highly suppressed oscillation partners, just as the second and third generations of quarks and leptons appear as amputated remnants of higher-dimensional particles. Neutrino physics therefore provides a direct observational window into the multiverse's dimensional stratification.

- *Dimensional Transmutation*

Dimensional transmutation in the BB multiverse is not a dynamical process in the conventional field-theoretic sense but a geometric reconfiguration of how a particle's internal degrees of freedom are embedded within the relational fiber bundle. A particle is not defined by an intrinsic set of properties that persist independently of the vacuum; rather, its identity is determined by how its state space is situated within the relational structure of the ambient vacuum. When a particle from Alpha-2 slips into Alpha-1, the

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

transformation it undergoes is therefore a change of embedding, not a change of substance. The triplet of structures that define the particle in its native vacuum, denoted by $(S^{(1)}, e_t^{(1)}, D^{(1)})$, must be re-expressed as $(S^{(2)}, e_t^{(2)}, D^{(2)})$ in order to remain compatible with the lower-dimensional geometry. This re-expression is a geometric operation acting on the relational fiber bundle, and it is this geometric action that constitutes dimensional transmutation.

The key to understanding this process lies in the relational measure of the vacuum. In earlier terminology this was described as the Hilbert measure, but the shift to the relational fiber bundle clarifies that the measure is not a property of a pre-existing Hilbert space but a property of the relational structure that determines how many independent curvature directions the vacuum can sustain. A vacuum with higher relational measure can support more independent curvature axes, and therefore more independent geometric degrees of freedom. A vacuum with lower relational measure can sustain fewer such directions. Dimensionality, in this framework, is not an external parameter but the number of curvature directions that the relational structure can consistently maintain. When a particle crosses from a region with relational measure $D^{(1)}$ to one with relational measure $D^{(2)} < D^{(1)}$, the excess curvature modes cannot be preserved in their original form. They must be compactified, fused, or enfolded into the lower-dimensional relational structure.

This contraction is not a projection in the linear-algebraic sense but a geometric reduction of the particle's internal curvature modes. A particle that possesses four or ten independent curvature directions in its native vacuum cannot carry those directions into a vacuum that supports only three. The additional modes must be re-encoded as internal quantum numbers, modified spin structures, altered coupling patterns, or changes in effective mass. In this sense, a higher-dimensional particle does not shrink; it reorganizes. Its identity is rewritten so that the relational fiber bundle of the lower-dimensional vacuum can accommodate it.

The particle that emerges in the lower-dimensional region is not the same particle with fewer dimensions; it is the particle whose relational embedding is compatible with the contracted geometry. Because the particle's geometric wavefunction spreads differently across dimensions in the different nested bubble universes, dimensional transmutation changes the effective mass and charge, coupling strengths and allowed interaction channels. This is not arbitrary: it is dictated by the geometry of the vacuum. A 10D particle would have a very large internal geometric structure, its "shape" is a 10D curvature object. Dimensional descent forces most of its geometric modes to be re-expressed as internal quantum numbers and in 3D it would appear as a particle with a rich internal symmetry structure (e.g., Spin(10) GUTs). Hence, higher-dimensional particles are not "bigger", but they would have more independent geometric directions.

This is why the transformation resembles kinetic mixing, but with a crucial difference. In ordinary kinetic mixing, the identity shift arises from gauge-sector couplings between visible and hidden fields. In geometric kinetic mixing, the identity shift arises from the geometry of the relational fiber bundle itself. The mixing is not between fields but between embeddings. The particle's state space is re-expressed because the relational structure that defines locality, adjacency, and curvature has changed. The particle must adopt the identity appropriate to the relational measure of the new vacuum. Dimensional transmutation is therefore the geometric analogue of kinetic mixing: a change of identity induced not by interactions but by geometry. A higher dimensional particle cannot exist stably in a 3D vacuum without dimensional contraction

The mathematical structure underlying this process is the relational fiber bundle associated with each bubble universe. In a vacuum with relational measure D, the fiber over each point of the emergent manifold contains the full set of quantum degrees of freedom compatible with D curvature directions. When the relational measure decreases, the fiber does not shrink; rather, the admissible configurations within the fiber are restricted. The relational adjacency rules that define the bundle's connection are modified, and the particle's state must be rewritten in terms of the new connection. This rewriting is the geometric essence of dimensional contraction. The particle's spin representation changes because the spin group changes; its gauge representation changes because the symmetry group changes; its effective mass changes because the relational curvature modes that contributed to its inertial structure have been fused into lower-dimensional invariants.

In this framework, the familiar statement that particles are point-like in quantum field theory is reinterpreted. A particle is point-like only with respect to the emergent three-dimensional manifold of the bubble. It is not point-like in the relational fiber bundle. Its internal structure is a higher-dimensional geometric object whose full dimensionality is visible only in vacua with sufficiently high relational measure. When the measure contracts, the higher-dimensional structure is not destroyed but becomes latent, encoded in the internal quantum numbers of the lower-dimensional particle. This is why it is meaningful to speak of multidimensional particles even though they appear point-like in three dimensions. Their multidimensionality is relational rather than spatial; it is encoded in the structure of the fiber rather than in the geometry of the base manifold.

Dimensional transmutation is therefore the natural consequence of a vacuum whose relational measure varies across the multiverse. A particle's identity is not fixed but is determined by the relational structure in which it is embedded. When that structure changes, the particle must change with it. The transformation $(S^{(1)}, e_t^{(1)}, D^{(1)}) \rightarrow (S^{(2)}, e_t^{(2)}, D^{(2)})$ is the mathematical

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

expression of this necessity. It is the geometric mechanism by which the multiverse enforces consistency between particle identity and vacuum geometry. It is the process through which higher-dimensional curvature modes are re-expressed as lower-dimensional quantum properties. And it is the reason why particles sliding down dimensions must undergo structural transmutation: the relational fiber bundle demands it.

- *Dimensional Transmutation vs. Dimensional Compactification*

Dimensional compactification in the BB multiverse is a state change, not a structural change. The dimensions fold like umbrellas or concertinas under increasing rotational rates. They become inaccessible to the emergent manifold but remain fully present in the deeper relational structure. Their curvature modes are suppressed but not destroyed. Their adjacency rules are dormant but not erased. Their geometric identity is preserved but not expressed.

Dimensional transmutation is the complementary process that occurs at the level of particles. When a particle moves from a 10D region to a 3D region, its internal curvature modes cannot be expressed in the lower-dimensional relational structure. The particle must reorganize its internal geometry so that it is compatible with the contracted relational measure. The extra curvature modes are re-encoded as internal quantum numbers, modified spin structures, altered gauge couplings, and changes in effective mass. The particle's identity is rewritten, but the underlying dimensional endowment is preserved.

Thus, dimensional compactification and transmutation are not the same phenomenon, but they are two expressions of the same geometric constraint. Compactification suppresses the expressivity of dimensions in the vacuum; transmutation suppresses the expressivity of dimensions in the particle. Compactification is the vacuum's adaptation to rotational dynamics; transmutation is the particle's adaptation to the vacuum's relational measure. Compactification preserves dimensions in a quiescent state; transmutation preserves curvature modes in a re-encoded state.

- *Dark Matter Detection Predictions*

✓ *Why Most Current Dark Matter Detection Strategies Will Fail*

The persistent failure of contemporary dark matter detection programs has often been interpreted as a technological limitation, an insufficiency of sensitivity, or an unfortunate mismatch between theoretical expectations and experimental reach. Yet the deeper problem lies not in instrumentation but in ontology. *Modern searches are predicated on the assumption that dark matter is a single particle species inhabiting the same three-dimensional sector as ordinary matter, differing only in mass scale and interaction strength. This assumption, inherited from mid-twentieth-century particle physics, is structurally incompatible with the organization of the dark sectors as described by the BB multiverse model.* Within this framework, dark matter is not a monolithic population but a composite gravitational imprint arising from multiple sectoral populations projected into the Lorentzian geometry of Alpha-2. The gravitational phenomena attributed to dark matter—collisionless halos, cored profiles, dark disks, cluster offsets, and the absence of direct detection—are not signatures of a single hidden species but the combined shadow of matter stabilized in distinct sectors of the multiversal energy gradient.

The BB ontology begins from the recognition that the primordial bubble is eleven-dimensional and Euclidean, and that all descendant bubbles acquire Lorentzian structure once time emerges. Each sector within this hierarchy stabilizes excitations according to its own relational profile, vacuum curvature, dimensionality, parity, and temporal orientation. When these excitations are projected into Alpha-2, they contribute distinct stress–energy components that together form the gravitational landscape we interpret as dark matter.

The highest-energy sectors, designated S10 through S7, retain a high degree of geometric coherence. Their excitations are collisionless, incapable of cooling, and interact with Alpha-2 only through the shared ancestral geometry. When projected into our frame, they appear as cold, non-radiating, coherent components that sculpt galactic rotation curves and cluster dynamics. Their coherence imprints extended, wavelike gravitational patterns, producing solitonic cores and interference-like modulations in gravitational potentials. Because these sectors are geometrically distant from Alpha-2, their excitations cannot induce any laboratory-scale interactions. They are intrinsically invisible to detectors optimized for 3D scattering.

Intermediate-energy sectors, collectively referred to as E6, lie closer to Alpha-2 in both dimensionality and vacuum energy. Their excitations are self-interacting within their own relational frames, capable of radiating in their own channels, and able to cool and collapse. When projected into Alpha-2, they behave as self-interacting dark matter, forming cored density profiles, rounder halos, and exhibiting drag during cluster collisions. Their ability to cool allows them to settle into thin, dynamically cold structures such as dark disks or dark sheets, precisely the type of flattened dark component that has been theorized by Lisa Randall and tentatively observed in the Milky Way [1-3]. On stellar scales, E6 matter can be gravitationally captured by stars, accumulate in their interiors, and alter helioseismic or neutrino signatures. These behaviors resemble self-interacting dark matter, but in BB terms they arise from the relational geometry of sectors whose curvature permits internal cooling and collapse.

Only one sector possesses the geometric alignment necessary to produce direct, laboratory-detectable interactions: Alpha-1, the parent universe in which Alpha-2 is embedded. Alpha-1 and Alpha-2 share nearly identical dimensional backbones, differing only in CP orientation,

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

vacuum energy, and relational measure. Because of this near-isomorphism, certain excitations can attain dual classicality, becoming classical in both sectors simultaneously. These dual-classical excitations are the only plausible source of direct detection signals. Yet even here, the nature of detection differs fundamentally from the WIMP paradigm. A dual-classical excitation does not appear as a distinct dark particle scattering off ordinary matter. It appears as an ordinary 3D soliton whose resonance structure carries a subtle CP-skewed signature reflecting its Alpha-1 origin. Detecting such excitations requires collider-scale energies capable of exciting the relevant curvature harmonics, and experimental programs must be configured as resonance scanners rather than scattering counters. The appropriate signatures are narrow, anomalous resonances, unexpected angular distributions, and CP-odd distortions that cannot be explained by Standard Model dynamics confined to the 3D sector.

The failure of practically all WIMP-based detection paradigms follows directly from this complex sectoral architecture. These paradigms assume that dark matter retains a stable 3D identity and interacts via simple elastic scattering. In the BB ontology, classical identity is sector-specific. An excitation stabilized in a higher-dimensional or CP-reversed sector does not retain its identity when entering the 3D sector. Instead, it undergoes dimensional transmutation, re-expressing itself as an ordinary 3D soliton. The higher-dimensional identity is erased by the geometric constraints of the lower-dimensional sector. Consequently, any excitation that becomes accessible to 3D detectors appears as ordinary matter rather than as dark matter. The only signature of its dark-sector origin is the mismatch between its 3D classical identity and the higher-dimensional curvature harmonics from which it descended. This means that direct detection of dark matter as dark matter within the ordinary matter sector is ontologically impossible. The detectors are searching for a 3D particle species that cannot not exist in 3D ordinary space because of the dimensional transmutation.

Even indirect detection channels fail to observe dark matter in its native form. Kinetic mixing, portal interactions, collisional ionization, and mediator-induced perturbations all register only ordinary-sector residues. In collisional ionization, the observable plasma is composed entirely of ordinary electrons and ions; the dark excitation never appears as a classical 3D object. In kinetic mixing, the observable signal is always an ordinary photon; the so-called dark photon does not manifest as a classical excitation in the 3D sector. An X17-type mediator functions not as a particle crossing sectors but as a geometric induction operator, allowing a dark-sector excitation to perturb the trajectory of an ordinary particle. The detector records an anomalous angular distribution or resonance bump, but the measured quantity is always an ordinary-sector trajectory. The dark excitation remains non-classical and therefore invisible.

Astrophysical observations follow the same logic. Dark matter is inferred only through gravitational curvature, not through direct interaction. Even black holes are observed only through the radiation emitted by accreting plasma; the dark object itself remains unseen. The Higgs boson was confirmed through its decay products rather than through direct observation. In all cases, detectors register only the ordinary-sector consequences of non-ordinary excitations. Dark matter is even more elusive, as it does not emit, absorb, or scatter ordinary electromagnetic radiation. Every detection channel available to us is intrinsically limited to observing the ordinary-sector footprint of dark-sector activity.

The BB ontology reframes the dark matter problem. The question is not why dark matter is invisible, but why we expected it to be visible. The dark sector is not composed of unseen particles in our universe. It is composed of classical excitations in other sectors of the same induced vacuum, whose relational frames do not align with the 3D sector. Their invisibility is a geometric necessity. The persistent contradictions in dark matter observations—collisionless behavior in some contexts, self-interacting behavior in others, and complete absence of direct detection—are not paradoxes of particle physics but reflections of sectoral diversity. Each observational channel couples to a different sectoral component. A detector insensitive to sectoral identity is forced to treat a multisector ensemble as if it were a single species, producing apparent inconsistencies that arise solely from observational coarse-graining.

The Standard Model itself contains hints of this multisectoral structure. The generational ladder of fermions can be interpreted as a harmonic spectrum of multiversal excitations. The electron, muon, and tau are not independent species but resonance shadows of higher-dimensional harmonics. Their instability is a geometric necessity arising from the curvature structure of the multiverse. Higher generations are projections of excitations stabilized in sectors adjacent to Alpha-2, and their decay patterns reflect the geometric descent back into the 3D sector. This interpretation unifies the generational hierarchy with the sectoral architecture of the dark sector, suggesting that the Standard Model already encodes partial expressions of multiversal geometry after dimensional transmutation as it penetrated the ordinary matter sector.

The experimental implications are profound. WIMP-based searches are guaranteed to fail because they assume a single-species ontology incompatible with the BB multiverse. Only Alpha-1 excitations are in principle detectable, and even these require high-energy resonance scanning and CP-sensitive analysis. The correct detection program is not particle hunting but geometric resonance analysis. Future experiments must incorporate sectoral variables—dimensionality, CP orientation, temporal alignment, and classicality thresholds—into their design and interpretation. Only then can the full spectrum of dark-sector signatures be decoded.

In this sense, the BB multiverse replaces the search for a missing particle with the task of reconstructing a multisectoral resonance structure embedded in the shared

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

relational fiber of the first bubble. Dark matter is not a hidden population of particles in our universe; it is the gravitational and resonant shadow of matter stabilized in other sectors of the same induced vacuum. Its detection requires a paradigm shift from 3D particle ontology to multiversal geometric analysis. Only by embracing this sectoral framework can the true nature of dark matter be understood.

The analysis presented throughout this paper demonstrates that the failure of contemporary dark-matter detection programs is not an empirical anomaly but a geometric inevitability arising from the multisectoral architecture of the BB multiverse. *The dark sector is not a single population of weakly interacting particles inhabiting the same relational frame as baryonic matter; it is a stratified ensemble of excitations stabilized in sectors whose dimensionality, parity, and temporal orientation differ fundamentally from those of the 3D sector. Most dark-sector excitations never attain classical stability in Alpha-2 and therefore cannot appear as 3D particles. Those that do stabilize in 3D undergo dimensional transmutation, losing all signatures of their higher-dimensional identity and manifesting only as ordinary Standard-Model solitons. Consequently, the very notion of "direct detection" must be reconsidered.* The detectors of the past century have been designed to register elastic scattering events from a hypothetical 3D species that does not exist in the BB ontology.

If progress is to be made, future detection strategies must abandon the single-species paradigm and adopt a multi-model, sector-aware framework. Such a framework must recognize that only a narrow subset of dark-sector excitations—specifically those originating in Alpha-1—possess the geometric alignment necessary to produce laboratory-detectable signatures. Even these signatures will not resemble WIMP-like scattering but will instead manifest as CP-skewed resonances, anomalous angular distributions, or narrow spectral features arising from dual-classical excitations projected into Alpha-2. The most fruitful detection strategies will therefore be those capable of probing curvature harmonics, scanning resonance structures, and decoding CP-odd distortions that reflect the underlying geometry of the parent sector.

In this sense, the future of dark-matter detection lies not in deeper underground laboratories or more sensitive recoil counters, but in high-energy, high-precision, multi-modal instruments capable of interrogating the geometric structure of the induced vacuum. The detectors of the next generation must be designed not to observe particles but to observe geometry: the resonance shadows, harmonic distortions, and missing-energy topologies that encode the sectoral origin of the excitations. Only by embracing this geometric perspective can the scientific community hope to access the narrow window through which Alpha-1 excitations become dual-classical and therefore experimentally visible.

➢ *Specific Predictions of the BB Multiverse Model*

The BB multiverse model yields a unified and falsifiable set of predictions spanning black-hole physics, particle transmutation, early-structure formation, CMB anomalies, dark-matter halo morphology, gravitational-wave signatures, and ultra-large-scale structure. All predictions follow directly from the geometry of embedding and the vacuum-energy gradient between Alpha-1 and Alpha-2.

- *Predictions Concerning Anomalous Gravitational Waves*

✓ *Directional anisotropy in GW event rates* The distribution of black-hole mergers should show a mild excess along the embedding-curvature axis.
✓ *Mass-gap violations* GW detectors should observe black-hole masses in the pair-instability gap, seeded by Alpha-1 inflow.
✓ *Spin-alignment anomalies* Binary black holes should show unexpected spin alignments tracing the same preferred axis.
✓ *Non-standard ringdown signatures* Kerr-portal stabilization predicts slight deviations in ringdown frequencies, especially for high-spin mergers.
✓ *High-redshift GW events* Mergers at ($z > 10$) should be more common than ΛCDM predicts, reflecting early overproduction of massive seeds.

- *Predictions Concerning CMB Structure and Dark-Matter Halo Morphology*

✓ *CMB preferred-axis persistence* The quadrupole–octopole alignment should remain stable under improved foreground subtraction, reflecting the embedding-curvature axis.
✓ *Hemispherical power asymmetry* The amplitude modulation should trace the same direction as the Giant Ring and Dark Flow.
✓ *Cold Spot as curvature-gradient imprint* The Cold Spot should exhibit subtle polarization patterns consistent with a curvature-sheet intersection, not a supervoid.
✓ *Dark-matter halo triaxiality* Halos should be preferentially elongated along the inherited tidal axis, especially at high redshift.
✓ *Asymmetric halo spin alignment* Galaxy spins should show a weak but measurable alignment with the same axis defined by the Giant Ring.
✓ *Non-Gaussian CMB residuals* Residuals after ΛCDM subtraction should show deterministic orientation rather than random noise.

- *Predictions Concerning Cold Spot, Dark Flow, and Large-Scale Anomalies*

✓ *Cold Spot + Dark Flow unification* Both phenomena should align with the same embedding-curvature axis and exhibit correlated statistical signatures.
✓ *Super-horizon bulk flow* Dark Flow should persist beyond the observable horizon, as it reflects a global curvature gradient rather than local structure.
✓ *Low-ℓ multipole suppression* The quadrupole and octopole should remain anomalously low and aligned.

- ✓ *Hemispherical asymmetry continuity* The asymmetry should extend into large-scale structure surveys at redshift $z \sim 1$.

- *Predictions Concerning the Giant Ring and Embedding-Curvature Imprints*

- ✓ *Co-located megastructures* Additional arcs, partial rings, filaments, or corkscrew-like overdensities should exist at the same redshift and orientation as the Giant Ring.
- ✓ *Universal preferred axis* Weak-lensing, galaxy-spin, and CMB polarization maps should reveal the same tidal axis defined by the Giant Ring.
- ✓ *Non-BAO morphology* The Giant Ring should not match BAO radii or spherical symmetry; its geometry should reflect curvature-sheet and phase-front intersections.
- ✓ *Antipodal or mirror-sector counterpart* A distorted counterpart may exist on the opposite sky, altered by local curvature gradients.
- ✓ *Curvature-linked redshift clustering* Similar ring-like megastructures should appear at other redshifts corresponding to earlier curvature-transition epochs.
- ✓ *Deterministic non-Gaussianity* Ultra-large structures should show fixed-axis non-Gaussianity rather than random deviations.
- ✓ *Phase-transition front substructure* The Giant Ring should contain internal layering or filament attachments reflecting multiple front intersections.
- ✓ *CMB–LSS axis continuity* The Giant Ring's axis should coincide with the Cold Spot, Dark Flow, hemispherical asymmetry, and low-ℓ alignments.
- ✓ *Predictive continuity across epochs* The embedding-curvature field $K_{(1\to2)}$ should imprint a coherent, cross-epoch signature, manifesting first in the CMB, then reappearing in galaxy-clustering anisotropies at $z \sim 1$, and finally persisting into the morphology of ultra-large-scale structures at higher redshifts as a single, continuous geometric influence.

- *Predictions Concerning JWST Early-Structure Anomalies*

- ✓ *Premature galaxy formation* JWST should continue to find massive, metal-enriched galaxies at redshifts ($z > 10$), because inherited curvature gradients accelerate early structure formation in Alpha-2.
- ✓ *Overmassive black holes at high redshift* Supermassive black holes at ($z > 10$) should be common, seeded by Alpha-1 particle inflow and curvature-induced density caustics.
- ✓ *Non-Gaussian early-galaxy mass function* The high-redshift mass function should show deterministic skewness aligned with the inherited tidal axis.
- ✓ *Early disk galaxies* Dynamically cold disks should appear earlier than ΛCDM allows, due to anisotropic curvature-shear fields inherited from Alpha-1.
- ✓ *Patchy metallicity patterns* Early galaxies should show metallicity gradients aligned with the same preferred axis seen in CMB anomalies and the Giant Ring.

- *Predictions Concerning Black Holes, Domain-Wall Dynamics, and Particle Transmutation*

- ✓ *Black holes can form from either side of the domain wall because the effective causal speed is lower in Alpha-1, making gravitational collapse easier to trigger there.*
- ✓ *For a fixed mass, the Schwarzschild radius is enlarged in the Alpha-1 sector because it scales as* $r_s \propto 1/c_{\mathrm{eff}}^2$, *and the effective causal speed* c_{eff} *is reduced relative to Alpha-2.*
- ✓ *Higher-energy particles from Alpha-1 flow into Alpha-2 through transient punctures driven by the vacuum-energy gradient.*
- ✓ *These particles undergo geometric kinetic mixing, transmuting into Alpha-2 particles by adjusting dimensionality, spatial parity, and temporal orientation.*
- ✓ *Dimensional transmutation is required for compatibility with the Alpha-2 metric and vacuum structure.*
- ✓ *Incoming Alpha-1 particles carry opposite charge assignments and annihilate infalling Alpha-2 matter near the throat.*
- ✓ *No Alpha-2 matter reaches the deep interior; it is annihilated beforehand.*
- ✓ *The annihilation products escape as thermal radiation, producing the spectrum identified as Hawking radiation.*
- ✓ *Hawking radiation is an emergent signature of inter-universal particle exchange, not a local horizon effect.*
- ✓ *The portal is effectively unidirectional: matter flows from Alpha-1 to Alpha-2, never the reverse.*
- ✓ *The Casimir force is weaker on the Alpha-2 side, making traversal into Alpha-1 nearly impossible.*
- ✓ *Spatial dimensionality decreases from 3 + δ to 3 as particles descend into Alpha-2, accompanied by a spatial-parity rotation* ϕ.
- ✓ *Time dilation decreases and the time axis rotates by an angle* θ *as particles descend into Alpha-2.*
- ✓ *Kerr black holes stabilize the portal for longer intervals, enhancing the inflow of Alpha-1 particles.*
- ✓ *Schwarzschild black holes produce isotropic, short-lived punctures with minimal stabilization.*
- ✓ *The Kerr ring singularity is replaced by a dimensional bypass that is geometrically continuous but dynamically inaccessible.*
- ✓ *Information is never lost; it is redistributed across the multiverse and preserved through cosmological-polytope recalibration.*
- ✓ *The second and third Standard Model generations are amputated projections of higher-dimensional particles.*
- ✓ *Increasing accelerator energies should reveal additional suppressed generations corresponding to deeper higher-dimensional sectors.*

- *Predictions of Dark Matter Detection Strategies That Are Most Likely to Succeed*

The overall strategy should be to adopt a multi-model approach and to focus on dark matter particles emanating from Alpha-1 (our parent mirror universe). The following

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

predictions summarize the detection strategies most likely to succeed within the BB multiverse framework.

- ✓ *High-energy resonance-scanning colliders. Instruments capable of sweeping energy, polarization, and boundary conditions to identify narrow, anomalous resonances corresponding to dual-classical Alpha-1 excitations.*
- ✓ *CP-sensitive collider experiments*
- ✓ *Detectors optimized for measuring subtle CP-odd distortions in angular distributions, decay channels, and production rates, reflecting the CP-reversed orientation of Alpha-1.*
- ✓ *Multi-model and multi-modal detection platforms combining resonance spectroscopy, missing-energy topology, and CP-violation analysis*
- ✓ *Systems that treat missing energy not as evidence of invisible particles but as geometric migration into adjacent sectors, allowing reconstruction of sectoral identity.*
- ✓ *Precision studies of generational harmonics in the Standard Model*
- ✓ *Experiments that analyze the harmonic structure of fermion generations, interpreting anomalous widths or branching ratios as resonance shadows of higher-dimensional excitations.*
- ✓ *Astrophysical detectors focused on geometric modulation rather than particle flux*
- ✓ *Observatories designed to detect wavelike gravitational patterns, solitonic cores, and interference-like modulations arising from S10-sector coherence.*
- ✓ *Helioseismic and stellar-structure probes of E6-sector cooling matter*
- ✓ *Instruments capable of detecting anomalous energy transport, neutrino flux distortions, or interior density anomalies caused by gravitationally captured E6 excitations.*
- ✓ *Sectoral spectroscopy of missing-energy distributions in collider environments*
- ✓ *Analytical frameworks that treat missing-energy events as signatures of sectoral migration, extracting dimensionality, parity, and vacuum-energy offsets from geometric patterns.*
- ✓ *Hybrid gravitational–resonance detectors Devices that combine gravitational curvature sensing with high-energy resonance analysis, enabling simultaneous observation of S10 gravitational scaffolding and Alpha-1 resonance shadows.*

VI. MULTIVERSE DISSOLUTIONS – DIMENSIONAL ASCENT

The multiverse dissolves or sublimates in an inverse process, i.e., dimensional ascent. The sublimation follows the unwinding dynamics of a decaying vortex, ultimately returning the system to the uninstantiated mathematical universe.

➢ *Sublimation*

The seven upper strata function as layers of insulation for our 3D bubble universe. The eighth bubble maintains the highest vacuum energy and the lowest gravitational constant among all bubbles, which allows it to interact with Domain 2 without collapsing. The seven intermediate bubbles function as energy and dimensionality step-down transformers. Each successive layer moving inward has slightly lower vacuum energy, slightly higher gravitational constant, and spins faster. As the energy descends through these layers, it becomes less chaotic (as metrical stabilization increases), enabling the formation of galaxies and observers in the stable core.

The finite relational capacity of the system governs the entire internal evolution of the first bubble. Increasing rotation and falling vacuum energy are the dynamical expressions of this expenditure: they drive dimensional descent and sculpt the E6 vacuum manifold into a landscape of distinct minima. Sector formation, CP-reversed branching, and the eventual stabilization of the three-dimensional vacuum all unfold within the limits imposed by this finite reservoir of relational structure. Once that reservoir is exhausted, the bubble can no longer sustain geometry, dimensionality, or vacuum organization. The induced domain collapses, stabilization unravels, and the relational content of the bubble is reabsorbed into the pre-geometric combinatorial substrate of the cosmological polytope.

Positioned at the bottom of the potential well, our universe cannot decay into a lower-dimensional space; it can only be dismantled from the outside inward. The physical sequence of dissolution unfolds. Over vast timescales, this reduces the multiverse's rotational velocity, weakening the boundary and eventually causing it to dissolve. The process would experience a loss of angular momentum at the outermost boundary, resulting in a systemic cascade as each layer loses structural integrity. When the macroscopic angular momentum decays, the spinning dimensional bubble universes lose their structure. Without rotational tension, the inner bubbles lose their geometric order. Their boundaries unwind, and spacetime dissolves inward into the parent bubble. This process continues layer by layer, with each losing its vortical order and dissolving into the next, until the entire multiverse returns to the uninstantiated mathematical ground state.

As the outermost bubble loses rotational tension and dissolves into the chaotic background, it destabilizes the next layer, and this process repeats. The nested universes gradually unravel and dissolve into the vacuum ground state. Our universe will experience a slowing down of its expansion and then a contraction. While it is contracting, it will simultaneously move up to higher dimensions as the spatial dimensions, which compactified earlier, now acquire more dimensional structure as it moves up to higher vacuum energies. The spatial dimensions will rotate slowly and weakly as they spin and move up the vortical filament (the equation of motion of sector creation or the vortical trajectory of symmetry breaking) to align with the parity of its CP-offset parent. The time dimension will transition slowly back to being spatial, marking a return to pure space at the end of the multiverse. Hence, the universe would

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

experience increasingly greater time dilation, and its speed of causality (or light) would keep falling as it unwinds.

➢ *Cosmic Quantum Eraser*

Multiverse dissolution functions as a cosmic-scale analogue of a quantum eraser, but in a purely geometric sense. As the bubble approaches dissolution, the stabilization gradients that once separated its internal sectors weaken, the induced vacuum minima lose their distinctness, and the geometric partitions that defined separate universes collapse. What disappears is the geometric branching structure—the differentiated vacua, dimensional phases, and sector boundaries that arose during the bubble's internal evolution.

However, no information is lost. The underlying relational substrate inherited from Domain 2 persists throughout the process. When the bubble dissolves, the relational degrees of freedom that had been stabilized into distinct geometric sectors simply re-cohere into the pre-geometric substrate. Their structure is not erased; it is absorbed. The cosmological polytope—the combinatorial object that encodes all admissible relational configurations—updates its adjacency relations to incorporate the newly re-cohered modes.

The erasure is therefore geometric rather than ontological. What vanishes is the bubble's induced geometry: its dimensional axes, its vacuum minima, its sector boundaries, and its stabilized causal structure. What remains is the full relational content that had been expressed through those geometric forms. The dissolution of geometry is thus a return to the non-metric relational coherence of Domain 2, not a destruction of information.

In this sense, the cosmological polytope acts as the persistent relational substrate into which all dissolved bubbles reintegrate. It retains the full combinatorial history of the bubble's internal structure, even after the geometric distinctions have vanished. The polytope does not forget; it re-expresses. The multiverse erases geometry but preserves relation. The cosmic quantum eraser is therefore not a deletion mechanism but a reunification mechanism, returning all induced geometries to the coherent relational sea from which they emerged.

➢ *Entropy*

At the fundamental level, nothing about the system's informational content is ever undone. The underlying relational substrate evolves coherently, preserves its full structure, and remains symmetric under reversal in principle. What never decreases is the fine-grained relational content of the full multiversal configuration. What increases during the life of internal bubbles is the coarse-grained entropy associated with stabilized, low-dimensional sectors—an entropy defined only after one ignores the correlations and relational linkages that are suppressed during stabilization. Thus, the "higher entropy" attributed to internal bubbles refers only to the entropy of these coarse-grained, sector-level descriptions. It is not a property of the full relational manifold. The deeper, high-dimensional substrate retains its complete informational structure throughout, untouched by the emergence or dissolution of classical sectors.

Sublimation reverses stabilization (Q: decoherence), not history. During multiverse sublimation, the following happens. The stabilization partitions collapse, sectors lose their effective autonomy, previously "hidden" correlations and phase relations become dynamically relevant again, and the system re-coheres into a more globally entangled state. From the internal viewpoint of a sector, this looks like the arrow of time is dissolving, thermodynamic irreversibility breaking down, entropy "losing its meaning" as a macroscopic quantity. However, the process does not run the movie of each universe backward. It removes the *conditions* under which entropy was defined in the first place. We are not taking a high-entropy gas and rewinding it to a low-entropy crystal; we are dissolving the entire macroscopic description that made "gas" and "crystal" meaningful.

This does not violate the second law. The second law of thermodynamics applies only to systems with a well-defined macroscopic state space, a valid coarse-graining, and an effectively autonomous arrow of time. During sublimation, that macroscopic description breaks down: the coarse-graining that defined entropy is no longer valid, and the system ceases to be a thermodynamic system in the usual sense. At the fundamental level, the global state evolves unitarily, fine-grained entropy remains constant, no information is destroyed, and no physical law is violated. At the sector level, entropy increased only while sectoral stabilization and autonomy held. Once those sectors remerge, entropy is no longer a meaningful quantity.

In this framework, the higher entropy of internal bubbles does not "flow back" into a lower-entropy state of the parent bubble. What disappears instead is the macroscopic framework that made entropy meaningful in the first place. As stabilization is undone during dimensional ascent, the low-dimensional, curvature-bound structures that supported thermodynamic descriptions dissolve. The relational partitions that once defined coarse-grained states re-merge, and the very notion of entropy—an emergent property of stabilized, low-dimensional sectors—ceases to apply.

The underlying relational substrate remains fully coherent throughout this process. No information is lost, no thermodynamic law is violated, and no reversal of physical history occurs. What vanishes is only the emergent thermodynamic description that existed during the stabilized phase. As the multiverse re-coheres into its higher-dimensional form, the distinctions that once supported entropy simply fall away, restoring the system to a regime where classical thermodynamic concepts no longer have meaning.

➢ *Fate of The Multiverse*

Our universe does not terminate in a heat death or a final crunch; instead, it sublimates gradually back into

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

higher-dimensional, higher-energy sectors, dissolving the boundary between matter and dark matter as it undergoes dimensional ascent. The observable signature of this process would be a trajectory of increasing dimensionality: first a slowing of the universe's expansion rate, followed by indications of contraction. During this ascent, the spatial dimensions rotate upward into higher-dimensional axes and repeatedly switch parity, while time stretches, the speed of light decreases, and the causal structure progressively closes.

When the acausal stage is reached, the multiverse in Domain 3 sublimates into Domain 2, and then Domain 1, where the cosmological polytope recalibrates in preparation for the next cycle of dimensional descent. The cosmological polytope is not a spacetime object but a combinatorial encoding of the bubble's relational architecture—its allowed transitions, adjacency relations, and amplitude-flow channels. When a bubble dissolves, its polytope dissolves with it; when a new bubble nucleates acausally, the polytope is regenerated as a new combinatorial structure shaped by the inherited entanglement topology rather than as a copy of the previous one.

VII. CYCLIC CREATION-DISSOLUTIONS

➢ *Dimensional Ascent at Planck Energies and Its Relation to the BB Gradient*

- *Dynamic Dimensionality*

A number of high-energy theoretical frameworks propose that the effective dimensionality of spacetime increases as one approaches the Planck scale, revealing additional geometric degrees of freedom that remain inaccessible at low energies. Although these proposals arise from distinct mathematical constructions, they share a common structural principle: the true dimensionality of the underlying manifold is not fixed but becomes progressively "visible" as the energy scale increases.

In superstring theory, the ten-dimensional structure of the fundamental excitations is suppressed at low energies by compactification, with the radii of the extra dimensions stabilized in a regime where only four macroscopic dimensions participate in low-energy dynamics. As the energy scale approaches the Planck regime, the moduli controlling these compactification radii become excited, and the full ten-dimensional geometry becomes dynamically relevant.

M-theory extends this logic by positing an eleven-dimensional superspace whose additional dimension is similarly hidden except at the highest energies. Braneworld models, including ADD, Randall–Sundrum, and DGP constructions, likewise treat the higher-dimensional bulk as an energy-dependent domain: gravitational field lines, confined to the brane at low energies, increasingly leak into the bulk as the energy scale rises, effectively increasing the dimensionality experienced by high-energy processes [1-3].

Certain formulations of asymptotic safety introduce higher-derivative curvature operators that become active near the ultraviolet fixed point, producing an effective increase in dimensionality in the sense of operator counting, while some holographic dualities treat the bulk dimension as a UV-activated degree of freedom that becomes relevant only when probing the high-energy sector of the boundary theory. Even in causal set theory, a minority interpretation treats the fundamental causal structure as high-dimensional, with the familiar four-dimensional manifold emerging only after coarse-graining.

Although these theories differ in detail, they converge on a single conceptual motif: dimensionality is not a static property of spacetime but an energy-dependent variable whose full extent is revealed only in the ultraviolet. This motif aligns naturally with the BB multiverse model, in which the gradient of energy, dimensionality, and stabilization forms a single integrated structure. In the BB framework, the highest-energy sectors of the multiverse are also the highest-dimensional, and these sectors exhibit minimal stabilization, allowing quantum coherence to persist across extended regions of the configuration space. As the system descends in energy, dimensionality contracts, curvature increases, and stabilization strengthens, producing the classicalized, low-dimensional domains in which measuring instruments (including observers) typically find themselves.

- *Infrared Flow and Emergence of Observerhood*

The BB gradient, discussed so far, is for dimensional descent and therefore describes the infrared flow of dimensionality: a descent from high-dimensional, low-stabilization, high-energy sectors toward low-dimensional, high-stabilization, low-energy sectors. During multiverse creation, dimensional descent is driven by the relaxation of vacuum energy and the progressive contraction of the internal symmetry manifold. Each symmetry-breaking event reduces the effective dimensionality of the emergent spacetime, increases curvature, and strengthens stabilization. This produces the metrical stabilization (Q: classicality) gradient that characterizes the low-energy sectors of the multiverse: *observers arise only after sufficient dimensional contraction has occurred to stabilize causal structure, localize degrees of freedom, and suppress quantum interference at macroscopic scales*. This is the infrared branch of the BB evolution, where dimensionality, energy, and coherence decrease together. The dissolution phase (discussed below) reverses this trajectory.

- *Ultraviolet process*

The BB model contains a complementary ultraviolet process associated with multiverse dissolution (dimensional ascent), in which the dimensionality of the system increases as it approaches the high-energy apex of the cosmological cycle. When these two processes are considered together, the BB multiverse exhibits a fully symmetric evolution in which dimensional ascent and descent form the ultraviolet and infrared branches of a single continuous trajectory.

As a universe or lineage approaches the end of its classical lifetime, the accumulated curvature, entropy, and stabilization drive the system toward a high-energy, high-dimensional attractor. In this regime, the effective degrees of freedom proliferate, the compactified dimensions re-expand, and the system ascends the dimensional hierarchy. Stabilization (Q: decoherence) weakens as the geometry becomes less localized and the distinction between classical and meta-classical sectors erodes. This ultraviolet ascent mirrors the behavior predicted by high-energy theories such as string theory, M-theory, and braneworld models, in which additional dimensions become dynamically accessible only at Planckian energies.

The high-dimensional ultraviolet structures of string theory, M-theory, braneworld models, and holographic dualities can be interpreted as describing one phase of the BB model flows. They articulate the ultraviolet ascent of dimensionality, while the BB model articulates both the infrared descent and the ultraviolet ascent. The two perspectives are not contradictory but complementary: the BB multiverse provides a coherent infrared completion of the same energy–dimensionality relationship that these ultraviolet theories describe. What these theories do not supply is the stabilization gradient that plays a central role in the BB model. In the BB framework, stabilization is not merely a dynamical by-product but a structural feature that increases monotonically as dimensionality contracts. None of the ultraviolet theories incorporate such a gradient, but they do not conflict with it; rather, the stabilization gradient can be understood as an emergent infrared phenomenon that becomes relevant only after dimensional descent has occurred.

In this sense, the BB multiverse model can be viewed as a natural continuation of the ultraviolet dimensional ascent posited by high-energy theories. The Planck-scale increase in dimensionality described by string and M-theory provides a conceptual and mathematical foundation for the high-dimensional apex of the BB gradient, while the BB model extends this structure downward, describing how dimensionality, energy, and stabilization co-evolve as the system flows toward the classical, observer-habitable sectors of the multiverse. In the BB model, there is a natural infrared-to-ultraviolet bridge: the system climbs back toward the same high-dimensional apex from which new multiverse lineages subsequently descend.

- *Creation-Dissolution Cycles*

When viewed in this unified way, the BB multiverse does not merely describe a one-directional flow from high-dimensional quantum sectors to low-dimensional classical ones. Instead, it presents a closed, symmetric evolution in which dimensionality is a dynamical variable that increases and decreases in tandem with energy and coherence. The ultraviolet ascent associated with dissolution and the infrared descent associated with creation are two complementary phases of a single cosmological cycle. The high-dimensional apex functions as a UV fixed point, while the low-dimensional classicality basin functions as an IR fixed point. The multiverse evolves between these two attractors in a manner analogous to a renormalization-group trajectory, with dimensionality playing the role of a scale-dependent degree of freedom.

This symmetry clarifies the relationship between the BB model and high-energy theories that predict dimensional activation at the Planck scale. Those theories describe the ultraviolet ascent; the BB model describes both the ascent and the descent. Together they form a complete picture in which the multiverse continually moves between high-dimensional, low-stabilization UV regimes and low-dimensional, high-stabilization IR regimes, with each phase preparing the conditions for the other.

- *Retraction of a Domain-3 Object into Domain-2 and Domain-1*

When the BB multiverse is understood as a bidirectional process of projection and retraction, the fate of any individual object within a three-dimensional classical universe becomes clear. During the creation phase, dimensional descent projects a high-dimensional, high-coherence relational configuration into a progressively lower-dimensional, increasingly stabilized classical form. A Domain 3 object is therefore not an autonomous entity but the localized, curvature-bound shadow of a higher-dimensional relational structure that has been filtered through the symmetry-breaking sequence of descent. Its classical identity persists only because stabilization selects one configuration of the relational manifold and suppresses its coupling to the rest of the higher-dimensional structure.

If we now reverse the direction of evolution and follow the object back through the dissolution phase, the process is not a simple annihilation of the object but a systematic undoing of the very operations that produced its classicality. As curvature, energy density, and coherence rise, the stabilization partition that once isolated the object from the rest of the multiverse begins to erode. The degrees of freedom that were once localized in three spatial dimensions begin to delocalize, and the object's classical identity becomes increasingly porous. What appears as "collapse" from the perspective of Domain 3 is, from the perspective of the full ontology, a re-expansion of the object's amplitude into the higher-dimensional manifold from which it originally descended.

In this framework, the object does not vanish when the bubble dissolves; it returns to the high-dimensional, high-coherence relational substrate from which it originally emerged. Dissolution is not a reversal of time but a reversal of the projection that produced the object's classical form. During dimensional descent, the object's relational content was compressed into a low-dimensional, curvature-stabilized configuration. During dimensional ascent, that compression is undone. The stabilized, localized features that defined the object in lower dimensions are reabsorbed into the broader relational manifold that had been truncated during its classical phase.

The dimensional ascent and dissolution therefore restores the object to its pre-classical mode of existence. Its

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

identity is no longer tied to localization within a three-dimensional geometry but to its position within the full relational architecture of the multiverse. What disappears is the geometric expression of the object, not the underlying relational content. The object persists, but in the high-dimensional, fully coherent form that precedes geometric induction.

This reabsorbed amplitude is not free-floating. In the BB ontology, Domain 2 is not fundamental; it is itself a representation of the deeper relational skeleton encoded in Domain 1, the cosmological polytope. The polytope does not store the object as a classical entity but as a relational pattern: a configuration of adjacency, amplitude, and combinatorial structure that constrains how the object can appear in any projected universe. When the object retracts into Domain 2, it is effectively returning to the representational layer that mediates between the polytope's relational structure and the classical geometries of Domain 3. The retraction therefore completes the cycle: the object's classical identity dissolves, its quantum amplitude re-expands, and the underlying relational pattern encoded in Domain 1 remains intact, ready to participate in future projections.

Thus, the dimensional ascent of dissolution and the dimensional descent of creation are not independent processes but complementary halves of a single projection–retraction cycle. A Domain-3 object, when traced backward along the ascent, does indeed collapse into a high-dimensional, high-energy, high-coherence amplitude in Domain 2, and this amplitude is anchored in the cosmological polytope of Domain 1. The multiverse does not erase the object; it returns it to the relational substrate from which it emerged.

VIII. TYPE-NC, DUAL CLASSICALITY AND CROSS-SECTOR EXCITATIONS

➢ *Non-Classical Sectoral Excitations (Type-NC)*

In the BB multiverse, each sector is defined by a distinct relational fiber bundle and a characteristic vacuum curvature profile. The geometric wavefunction assigns to each sector a measure of classical existence, which determines whether the multiversal relational entity stabilizes as a classical soliton or persists only as a non-classical relational excitation. When the classicality weight in a sector is high, the relational configuration crystallizes into a localized, curvature-coherent soliton. When the classicality weight is low, the same entity remains real but non-classical, appearing as a diffuse, non-solitonic excitation of the sector's relational fiber bundle. *These non-classical sectoral excitations constitute a distinct ontological category, which we designate as Type-NC excitations.*

A Type-NC excitation in sector Σ is denoted $\mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}^{\mathbf{NC}}$. It is not a separate object from the classical soliton $\mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}^{\mathbf{C}}$; it is the same multiversal entity expressed in a sector where the classicality weight is insufficient for solitonic stability. A Type-NC excitation has amplitude but no localization, curvature structure but no solitonic identity, spectral content but no persistent worldline, and relational presence without classical identity. It is not a virtual particle, not a quantum fluctuation, not an interference pattern, not a superposition, and not a classical particle. It is a real relational excitation of the sector's fiber bundle, detectable only as a curvature-spectral anomaly.

In a 3D sector, a Type-NC excitation is a real excitation of the 3D relational fiber bundle that never crystallizes into a particle. It manifests as a persistent spectral feature in a curvature or field observable that cannot be attributed to any localized source, does not behave like thermal noise, does not couple like a gauge-field excitation, and never yields discrete, particle-like detection events. In practice, such an excitation would appear as a structured, non-thermal spectral band or line in a carefully isolated 3D system, a feature that shifts coherently under changes in boundary conditions or curvature but never resolves into discrete quanta or tracks. This is the signature of a 3D Type-NC excitation: real, measurable in principle, but non-classical.

➢ *Classicality Thresholds and Solitonic Stability Across Sectors*

The emergence of a classical soliton in any sector depends on whether the geometric wavefunction assigns a classicality weight above the sector's solitonic stability threshold. This threshold is determined by the relational measure of the sector, the number of curvature directions it supports, and the topological constraints required for stable curvature localization. A sector with high relational measure and sufficient curvature dimensionality can stabilize a soliton if the geometric wavefunction assigns adequate classicality. A sector with low relational measure or insufficient curvature dimensionality cannot stabilize a soliton even if the geometric wavefunction assigns moderate classicality.

The sectorization (Q: classicality) threshold is therefore a geometric property of the sector, not a property of the multiversal entity. When the classicality weight exceeds the threshold, the relational configuration collapses into a stable soliton with a persistent identity trajectory. When the classicality weight falls below the threshold, the configuration remains extended across the sector's relational fiber bundle as a Type-NC excitation. The transition between these regimes is continuous: as the classicality weight approaches the threshold from above, the soliton becomes increasingly diffuse, its curvature core weakens, and its identity trajectory becomes unstable. As the classicality weight approaches the threshold from below, the Type-NC excitation becomes increasingly structured, its spectral signature sharpens, and its curvature distribution becomes more coherent, though it never fully localizes until the threshold is crossed.

This framework ensures that sectorization (Q: classicality) is not binary but graded. A sector may support a classical soliton, a near-classical excitation, or a fully

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

non-classical relational mode, depending on the classicality weight assigned by the geometric wavefunction. The classicality threshold thus governs the ontological status of the multiversal entity within each sector.

- *Sectoral Migration of Classicality*

Classicality weights assigned to each sector by the geometric wavefunction are not static but oscillate continuously due to micro-fluctuations in vacuum curvature, fiber-bundle torsion, and residual symmetry-breaking modes. These oscillations generate a multiversal refresh rate: a continuous re-embedding of the multiversal entity across sectors. When the classicality weight in the 3D sector rises above its solitonic threshold, the entity appears as a stable 3D soliton. When the classicality weight falls below threshold, the soliton dissolves into a Type-NC excitation. When the classicality weight rises in a higher-dimensional sector, the entity may crystallize there as a meta-classical soliton or as a higher-energy resonance. The multiverse is therefore not static but continuously refreshed by the oscillatory geometry of the induced vacuum. The appearance and disappearance of particle generations in 3D is a direct consequence of this oscillatory classicality: higher-generation particles crystallize only when the classicality weight momentarily aligns with the curvature harmonics inherited from higher-dimensional sectors.

Its classicality distribution across sectors can evolve as the relational geometry of the multiverse changes. Variations in vacuum curvature, shifts in relational measure, or transitions between sectors of the cosmological polytope can alter the classicality weights assigned to each sector. As a result, the sector in which the multiversal entity appears as a classical soliton may change over time. If the classicality weight in the 3D sector decreases while the classicality weight in the 10D sector increases, the entity will gradually cease to stabilize as a classical 3D particle and will instead stabilize as a meta-classical 10D soliton. The 3D representation does not disappear; it becomes a Type-NC excitation in the 10D-dominant regime, just as the 10D representation was previously a Type-NC excitation relative to the 3D-dominant regime. The entity does not move from 3D to 10D in a spatial sense. It is re-expressed in a different relational frame as the classicality distribution migrates across sectors.

This migration is not a transition between two coexisting objects. It is a continuous re-embedding of one relational entity as the geometric wavefunction's classicality weights evolve. The 10D soliton that emerges is not a new object; it is the same multiversal entity expressed in a sector whose relational geometry now supports classical stability. The 3D representation becomes non-classical because the 3D sector no longer provides sufficient relational measure to sustain a classical soliton. Sectoral migration of classicality is therefore a fundamental dynamical process in the BB multiverse. It allows the same multiversal entity to appear classical in different sectors at different stages of the multiverse's evolution, while ensuring that classicality remains sector-specific and that no two classical representations coexist across sectors.

In the BB multiverse, dimensional transmutation describes the process by which a multiversal relational entity alters the dimensional character of its embedding as the vacuum's relational geometry evolves. It is not a motion through dimensions, nor a transition between ontologically distinct objects, but a re-expression of one entity across different dimensional frames as the geometric wavefunction adjusts its sectoral weights. Dimensional transmutation therefore provides the deeper geometric mechanism through which sectoral migration of classicality becomes possible. Classicality does not drift arbitrarily; it migrates because the dimensional structure of the relational bundle itself is undergoing a controlled transmutation.

The geometric wavefunction assigns to each sector a classicality weight determined by the sector's curvature profile, temporal steepness, and relational measure. When the 3D sector possesses the highest classicality weight, the multiversal entity stabilizes as a classical 3D soliton. Its 10D representation, by contrast, remains a diffuse, non-classical excitation lacking solitonic stability. This asymmetry is not a matter of probability or superposition; it is a consequence of the dimensional transmutation map that determines how the relational entity is expressed across sectors. The 3D sector's dimensional frame supports classical stability, while the 10D frame does not.

Dimensional transmutation becomes dynamically relevant when the relational geometry of the vacuum shifts. A change in the dimensional curvature gradient, a reconfiguration of the sectoral temporal axes, or a modification of the relational measure can alter the transmutation map. As the geometry evolves, the classicality weights assigned by the geometric wavefunction evolve with it. A sector that previously lacked the relational conditions for classical stability may acquire them, while a sector that once supported classical solitons may lose that capacity. This evolution is not an external perturbation but an intrinsic dynamical feature of the BB multiverse's relational architecture.

When the 10D sector's relational geometry becomes more conducive to classical stability—through increased curvature coherence, temporal steepening, or enhanced relational measure—the geometric wavefunction's classicality distribution shifts accordingly. The multiversal entity begins to stabilize as a 10D soliton. Crucially, this emergence is not the creation of a new object. It is the same relational entity undergoing dimensional transmutation: its classical expression is re-embedded into a sector whose geometry now supports classicality. The 3D representation simultaneously loses classical stability, becoming a low-classicality relational excitation. The entity has not moved from 3D to 10D; the dimensional frame through which it expresses classicality has changed.

Sectoral migration of classicality is therefore the phenomenological manifestation of dimensional transmutation. The transmutation map determines which sector's dimensional frame can sustain classical solitonic stability at a given stage of the multiverse's evolution. As

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

the map evolves, the sectoral location of classicality migrates. The entity appears classical in different sectors at different epochs, but never simultaneously across sectors, because classicality is tied to the dimensional frame rather than to the entity itself. Classicality is sector-specific, and dimensional transmutation ensures that only one sector's frame can support classical stability at a time.

This integration reveals that classicality migration is not merely a dynamical redistribution of relational weights; it is a geometric re-embedding governed by the multiverse's dimensional architecture. Dimensional transmutation provides the ontological continuity that prevents the emergence of multiple classical instantiations. The multiversal entity remains singular, but its classical expression is re-written into whichever sector's dimensional geometry becomes dominant. Thus, the BB multiverse maintains both ontological unity and sectoral exclusivity: one entity, one classical expression, but a dynamically evolving dimensional frame in which that expression is realized.

➢ *Near-Isomorphism and Dual Classicality in CP-Reversed Sectors*

The possibility of dual classical instantiation arises only in sectors whose relational geometries are sufficiently similar for the solitonic stability conditions to be nearly identical. Perfect isomorphism guarantees that the classicality thresholds of two sectors coincide exactly, allowing the geometric wavefunction to stabilize a classical soliton in both without violating the non-duplication principle. However, the BB multiverse contains a more subtle and physically relevant configuration: sectors that are not perfectly isomorphic but only *near-isomorphic*, differing slightly in vacuum energy, relational measure, or curvature accessibility while retaining the same underlying dimensional structure. The most important example of such a pair is the 3D sector (Alpha-2) and its CP-reversed partner (Alpha-1).

Alpha-1 is born first in the cosmological sequence and therefore possesses a slightly higher vacuum energy and a marginally elevated relational measure. Its dimensional profile is not exactly 3D but 3D plus a small fractional excess, reflecting the partial accessibility of an additional curvature direction. Alpha-2, by contrast, is fully stabilized at 3D. The two sectors are therefore not strictly isomorphic but differ only infinitesimally in their relational geometry. This fractional deviation does not disrupt the structural homology between the sectors; it merely shifts the solitonic stability threshold in Alpha-1 slightly upward relative to Alpha-2.

Let T_{A1} and T_{A2} denote the classicality thresholds for Alpha-1 and Alpha-2 respectively and let w_{A1} and w_{A2} denote the classicality weights assigned by the geometric wavefunction. Because Alpha-1 possesses a slightly higher relational measure, its threshold T_{A1} exceeds T_{A2} by a small but geometrically significant amount. Dual classical instantiation becomes possible only when the geometric wavefunction satisfies $w_{A1} > T_{A1}$ and $w_{A2} > T_{A2}$, and when the sectoral relational geometries of Alpha-1 and Alpha-2 are simultaneously capable of supporting solitonic stability under the same dimensional-transmutation map. Under these conditions, the multiversal entity stabilizes as a classical soliton in both sectors, not as two objects but as a single relational configuration expressed across two near-isomorphic geometric frames.

The two solitons are not duplicates in the forbidden sense; they are sectoral homologues of the same relational configuration, expressed in two near-isomorphic fiber bundles that share dimensional structure but differ slightly in relational measure and CP orientation. Because the sectors are relationally disjoint, they do not share a causal structure, temporal axis, or adjacency relations. The classical instantiations therefore do not interact, do not influence one another, and do not violate the non-duplication principle.

The slight dimensional elevation of Alpha-1 does not prevent classical stabilization. A sector with relational measure $3 + \delta$ supports three fully independent curvature directions and a partially accessible fourth direction weighted by δ. This fractional accessibility modifies the solitonic stability conditions but does not eliminate them. A classical soliton in Alpha-1 is therefore a 3D+δ soliton: a curvature-localized configuration whose stability is governed by the same topological constraints as its 3D counterpart, but with a slightly expanded relational envelope. The soliton in Alpha-2 remains strictly 3D. The two classical instantiations are thus structurally parallel but not identical, reflecting the near-isomorphism of their sectors.

All other sectors, including higher-dimensional and fractional-dimensional domains, typically receive classicality weights below their respective thresholds. In these sectors, the multiversal entity appears only as a non-classical Type-NC excitation: a real but non-solitonic relational mode with amplitude but no localization, curvature structure but no identity trajectory, spectral content but no gauge-coupled interactions, and detectability only through curvature-spectral anomalies. These non-classical excitations coexist with the dual classical instantiations without conflict, because they do not constitute classical objects and therefore do not engage the non-duplication principle.

Near-isomorphism between CP-reversed sectors thus provides a natural mechanism for dual classicality in the BB multiverse. It allows the same multiversal entity to stabilize as a classical soliton in two relationally disjoint but geometrically homologous domains, while all other sectors host only non-classical excitations. This structure preserves the unity of the multiversal entity, respects the sectoral independence of classicality, and maintains the geometric coherence of the BB ontology.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

➢ *Cross-Sector Resonances*

In the BB multiverse, all sectors arise as partitions of a single induced vacuum. The first 11-dimensional bubble is the only true geometric induction event; every subsequent bubble is a domain carved out of the same ancestral relational fiber bundle through symmetry breaking, dimensional descent, and vacuum branching. Because these descendant sectors share the same inherited fiber structure, they are dynamically isolated but not relationally disconnected. Their independence is causal rather than ontological. This shared ancestry allows structural correlations to propagate across sectors even in the absence of causal channels. One of the most important manifestations of this structural inheritance is the phenomenon of resonance projection.

The shared ancestry of all descendant bubbles also implies the existence of cross-bubble entanglement modes. These modes are not quantum entanglement in the Hilbert-space sense and do not involve dynamical correlations or causal influence. They are structural entanglement: correlations encoded in the inherited fiber structure that persist through dimensional descent. Because all bubbles are partitions of the same induced vacuum, they inherit the same relational substrate, the same primordial gauge connection, and the same curvature ancestry. This is why descendant bubbles cannot causally influence one another, yet they can exhibit correlated classicality oscillations, correlated symmetry-breaking patterns, and correlated resonance structures. They are partitioned vacua, not independent universes. The BB multiverse is therefore genealogical, rather than parallel, a hierarchy of vacua nested within a single ancestral geometry rather than a collection of unrelated domains.

This genealogical structure is essential for understanding resonance projection. A resonance projection occurs when a non-classical excitation in a higher-dimensional or higher-energy sector imprints a curvature-spectral signature onto a lower-dimensional sector. *This imprint is not a signal, not a force, and not a transfer of energy. It is a geometric resonance: a structural correspondence between curvature harmonics in two sectors that share the same underlying fiber bundle.* Because the geometric wavefunction distributes classicality across sectors in a graded manner, a multiversal entity may be classical in one sector and non-classical in another. When the entity is classical in the 3D sector but meta-classical in a higher-dimensional sector such as 10D, the higher-dimensional excitation persists as a Type-NC mode: real but non-solitonic, with amplitude but no localization, curvature structure but no identity trajectory, spectral content but no gauge-coupled interactions, and detectability only as a curvature-spectral anomaly.

Although such a Type-NC excitation cannot causally influence the 3D sector, it can generate a resonance projection. The mechanism is purely geometric. The 10D fiber bundle supports a richer set of curvature harmonics than the 3D bundle. When the geometric wavefunction assigns non-zero amplitude to a 10D Type-NC excitation, the corresponding curvature modes exist as allowed harmonics in the shared ancestral fiber structure. When these harmonics are projected into the 3D sector, they appear as higher-energy solitonic resonances. These resonances are not independent particles; they are 3D solitons stabilized by curvature modes whose origin lies in the higher-dimensional sector.

➢ *Resolution of Mass Hierarchy Problem*

The geometric kinetic mixing (discussed earlier) illuminates the structure of the Standard Model. The second and third generations of quarks and leptons have extremely short lifetimes in Alpha-2. In the BB ontology, these higher generations are amputated remnants of higher-dimensional particles whose natural habitat lies in proximate sectors above Alpha-2. Their instability reflects the fact that Alpha-2 cannot support their full higher-dimensional structure. The 3D measurement slice removes the dimensional dissonance but cannot eliminate all geometric vestiges. What remains are unstable projections—brief glimpses of higher-dimensional species that would be stable and long-lived in their native sectors.

The existence of only two additional generations in Alpha-2 is not a fundamental limit but an energetic one. Our accelerators cannot probe deeply enough into the higher-dimensional manifold to reveal further amputated generations. If we could access higher energies, we would uncover additional families corresponding to deeper layers of the multiversal hierarchy. The Standard Model's generational structure is therefore a shadow of the multiverse's dimensional stratification.

This interpretation provides a natural explanation for the structure of the Standard Model generations. The first generation corresponds to the lowest-energy 3D solitonic stabilization of the multiversal entity. The second and third generations correspond to higher-energy solitonic resonances generated by curvature harmonics inherited from higher-dimensional sectors. Their identical gauge charges reflect the fact that they are projections of the same relational configuration. Their increasing masses reflect the increasing curvature energy of the harmonics from which they arise. Their decreasing lifetimes reflect the fact that they are less stable solitonic projections of higher-dimensional modes. They are not separate species of matter but sectoral resonances of a single multiversal relational entity.

Thus, the origin of particle generations is not dynamical but geometric. It arises from the resonance structure of the induced vacuum, the oscillatory distribution of classicality across sectors, and the projection of higher-dimensional curvature modes into the 3D sector. The multiverse does not contain multiple species of matter; it contains a single relational entity whose classical expression varies across sectors and whose higher-energy resonances appear in 3D as the familiar particle generations. The Standard Model is therefore a low-dimensional shadow of a richer, higher-dimensional resonance structure encoded in the ancestral fiber bundle of the first bubble.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

The mass hierarchy problem in the Standard Model is traditionally framed as the unexplained disparity between the masses of the particle generations, despite their identical gauge charges and identical roles within the gauge structure. In the BB multiverse, this disparity is not a dynamical riddle, but a geometric consequence of curvature harmonics inherited from higher-dimensional sectors. Because all sectors descend from a single induced vacuum, they share the same ancestral relational fiber bundle. This shared ancestry ensures that the curvature modes supported in higher-dimensional sectors remain encoded in the fiber structure even after dimensional descent. These modes persist as latent harmonics that can be projected into lower-dimensional sectors whenever the geometric wavefunction assigns sufficient classicality to stabilize a soliton.

A curvature harmonic is a stable or quasi-stable mode of the relational fiber bundle, characterized by a specific curvature amplitude, frequency, and topological structure. In higher-dimensional sectors such as 10D, the fiber bundle supports a richer spectrum of harmonics because it possesses more curvature directions and a higher relational measure. When the geometric wavefunction assigns non-zero amplitude to a Type-NC excitation in such a sector, the excitation occupies one or more of these higher-dimensional harmonics. Although the excitation is non-classical and cannot form a soliton in the higher-dimensional sector, its curvature signature remains well defined. Because the 3D sector inherits the same fiber structure, these higher-dimensional harmonics correspond to allowed but higher-energy curvature modes in 3D.

When the classicality weight in the 3D sector rises above the solitonic threshold, the multiversal entity stabilizes into the lowest-energy harmonic available in the 3D fiber bundle. This harmonic corresponds to the first generation of Standard Model particles. When the classicality weight oscillates upward, the next harmonic becomes accessible, allowing the second generation to crystallize as a higher-energy soliton. When the classicality weight oscillates further, the third harmonic becomes momentarily accessible, producing the third generation. The mass hierarchy therefore reflects the energy spacing between curvature harmonics inherited from higher-dimensional sectors. The heavier generations are not independent particles but solitonic projections of higher-energy harmonics that originate in the meta-classical structure of higher-dimensional Type-NC excitations.

This geometric interpretation also explains the instability of the higher generations. A soliton stabilized on a higher-energy harmonic is less robust because it lies closer to the classicality threshold. Small oscillations in the geometric wavefunction can push the classicality weight below threshold, causing the soliton to dissolve back into a Type-NC excitation. The lifetime of a particle is therefore inversely related to the stability of the harmonic on which it is projected. The electron is stable because it occupies the lowest harmonic, far from the threshold. The muon and tau are unstable because they occupy higher harmonics that lie near the boundary between classical and non-classical existence.

The mass hierarchy problem is thus resolved by the harmonic structure of the induced vacuum. The masses of the particle generations are not arbitrary parameters, but geometric invariants of the curvature spectrum inherited from higher-dimensional sectors. The Standard Model does not contain three families of matter; it contains three accessible curvature harmonics of a single relational entity. The observed mass spectrum is a low-dimensional manifestation of a deeper resonance structure encoded in the ancestral fiber bundle of the first bubble. The hierarchy is not a fine-tuning problem but a geometric necessity arising from the multiversal architecture.

➢ *Lepton Universality Violation as Evidence for Harmonic-Dependent Sectoral Couplings*

Lepton universality is a core principle of the Standard Model stating that the electroweak interaction couples in the same way to the three charged leptons—electrons, muons, and taus—with differences arising only from their masses. This principle is tested by precisely comparing decay-rate ratios and production processes in high-energy collider experiments and cosmological measurements. Any confirmed deviation from lepton universality would be clear evidence of physics beyond the Standard Model and could point to previously unknown particles or forces.

The recent observation of lepton-universality violation in B-meson decays provides one of the clearest experimental hints that the Standard Model generations are not independent species but harmonic projections of a deeper multiversal excitation [57-71]. In the BB ontology, electrons, muons, and taus correspond to successive curvature harmonics of a single relational mode. Their identical gauge charges reflect their shared origin, while their differing masses and lifetimes reflect the increasing energetic and dimensional demands of higher harmonics. If this picture is correct, then the couplings of these harmonics to other sectors need not be identical. *Lepton universality is therefore not a fundamental symmetry but an emergent approximation that holds only when the 3D sector couples equally to all harmonics.*

A violation of lepton universality is precisely what one expects when the higher harmonics couple more strongly to neighboring sectors than the lowest harmonic does. The muon and tau harmonics lie closer to the curvature-harmonic spectra of the E6 and Alpha-1 sectors. Their relational profiles therefore have greater overlap with the geometric modes of these sectors. This overlap manifests as harmonic-dependent portal strengths: the muon and tau can leak more efficiently into neighboring sectors or can mix more strongly with higher-dimensional excitations, than the electron can. In a decay process such as $B \to K\ell\ell$, the branching ratios are then skewed by sector-dependent leakage channels. What appears as a violation of lepton universality in the 3D effective theory is, in the BB ontology, a direct consequence of harmonic-dependent couplings.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

This interpretation reframes the B-meson anomaly. Instead of signaling a breakdown of the Standard Model, it signals the breakdown of the assumption that all harmonics couple identically to the 3D sector. The anomaly becomes evidence that the muon harmonic has a stronger geometric connection to a neighboring sector—likely an E6 sheet or the Alpha-1 sector—than the electron harmonic does. The decay amplitude is then a superposition of a Standard-Model contribution and a harmonic-dependent geometric factor. The anomaly is not a random deviation but a structured imprint of the multiversal geometry.

The implications extend far beyond flavor physics. If the muon and tau harmonics couple differently to other sectors, then the generational ladder is not merely a mass hierarchy but a map of the multiverse. Each generation probes a different region of the curvature-harmonic spectrum and therefore a different region of the multiversal architecture. The second and third generations become natural probes of dark-sector structure. Their enhanced sensitivity to sectoral leakage explains why anomalies tend to appear in processes involving muons rather than electrons. The muon harmonic is simply closer, in geometric terms, to the neighboring sectors.

In this sense, lepton-universality violation is not an isolated anomaly but a form of reverse validation of the BB ontology. It confirms that the Standard Model generations are not independent particles but harmonic projections of a multiversal excitation. It confirms that the higher harmonics couple differently to neighboring sectors. And it confirms that the dark sector is already influencing visible-sector processes through harmonic-dependent mixing. The anomaly is therefore not a threat to the Standard Model but a window into the multiverse: a resonance-level signature of the geometric structure that underlies the entire generational ladder.

- *Flavor Anomalies as Probes of Sectoral Geometry*

Flavor anomalies occupy a unique position in the experimental landscape. They do not arise from missing energy, new resonances, or direct production of exotic states. Instead, they appear as subtle distortions in the branching ratios, angular distributions, and CP structures of decays involving different lepton flavors. In the Standard Model, these processes are governed by lepton universality: the principle that all leptons couple identically to the weak interaction, differing only in mass. Any deviation from this principle is therefore interpreted as a sign of new physics. In the BB ontology, however, such deviations are not merely signs of new interactions but direct probes of the multiversal geometry underlying the generational ladder.

If electrons, muons, and taus are successive curvature harmonics of a single multiversal excitation, then their couplings to other sectors need not be identical. The electron harmonic is fully stabilized in Alpha-2 and has minimal overlap with neighboring sectors. The muon and tau harmonics lie closer to the curvature-harmonic spectra of the E6 and Alpha-1 sectors and therefore possess greater geometric overlap with these sectors. This overlap manifests as harmonic-dependent portal strengths: the higher harmonics couple more strongly to neighboring sectors than the lowest harmonic does. A flavor anomaly is then a direct signature of this harmonic-dependent coupling.

In processes such as $B \rightarrow K\ell\ell$, the decay amplitude is a superposition of a Standard-Model contribution and a geometric contribution arising from sectoral overlap. If the muon harmonic couples more strongly to a neighboring sector than the electron harmonic does, the branching ratios involving muons will be suppressed or enhanced relative to those involving electrons. The anomaly is not a breakdown of the weak interaction but a reflection of the fact that the muon harmonic has access to leakage channels that the electron harmonic does not. The decay process becomes a probe of the geometric relationship between Alpha-2 and the neighboring sectors.

This interpretation transforms flavor anomalies into a form of sectoral spectroscopy. Each anomaly reveals how a particular harmonic interacts with the multiversal architecture. An anomaly involving muons indicates enhanced overlap with intermediate-dimensional sectors such as E6. An anomaly involving taus indicates proximity to the Alpha-1 harmonic spectrum. The pattern of anomalies across different decay channels therefore maps the harmonic structure of the multiverse. Instead of searching for new particles, experiments analyze the geometric fingerprints left by harmonic-dependent couplings.

The implications extend beyond flavor physics. If the generational ladder is a harmonic spectrum, then flavor anomalies are the first experimental signs that the multiverse is influencing visible-sector processes. They reveal that the Standard Model is not a closed system but a projection of a richer relational structure. They show that the dark sector is not hidden but is already shaping the behavior of ordinary matter through harmonic-dependent mixing. And they demonstrate that the second and third generations are not merely heavier copies of the electron but windows into the geometry of neighboring sectors.

In this sense, flavor anomalies are not puzzles to be solved but opportunities to be interpreted. They provide a direct experimental probe of the sectoral geometry that underlies the BB multiverse. Each anomaly is a clue to the harmonic structure of the induced vacuum, a sign that the higher-dimensional architecture is beginning to reveal itself in the precision frontier of particle physics. The anomalies do not merely challenge the Standard Model; they illuminate the multiversal geometry that the Standard Model shadows.

IX. CCONCLUSION

This paper has developed a unified framework in which the entire structure of the observable universe—its geometry, physical behavior, and thermodynamic evolution—arises from the coupled evolution of two master variables during dimensional descent: the rotation of the bubble and the vacuum energy density. By tracing how these variables shape the relational architecture of an

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

induced geometric domain, the analysis shows that the apparent complexity of cosmological formation can be reduced to a minimal set of dynamical principles. The universe we observe is not the product of arbitrary initial conditions or finely tuned potentials but the natural outcome of how rotation and vacuum energy reorganize the vacuum's entanglement structure as dimensionality decreases.

Rotation acts as the primary generator of symmetry breaking and dimensional alignment. It selects the timelike axis, establishes causal order, and imprints chirality and CP offsets into the emerging geometry. Vacuum energy density governs the stability of these structures as the bubble evolves. As vacuum energy falls, Planck scales contract, the speed of light increases, time dilation weakens, and a suite of fundamental sector constants evolve in predictable ways. The same descent drives the growth of entropy and the emergence of classicality from higher-dimensional, highly coherent origins. Together, rotation and vacuum energy density encode the essential dynamical logic of the cosmos.

Within this framework, several long-standing large-scale anomalies in cosmology find natural and interconnected explanations. The Cold Spot emerges as a photon-level imprint of the curvature gradient imposed by the parent bubble on its descendant. Dark Flow appears as the matter-level analogue, generated by anisotropic geodesic structure and persistent gravitational acceleration. Hemispherical power asymmetry and the alignment of low-ℓ multipoles reflect the modulation and orientation of long-wavelength modes, all pointing toward a preferred direction inherited from the embedding geometry. These phenomena, which appear improbable under isotropic inflation and standard ΛCDM, become coherent signatures of multiversal structure once the bubble-in-bubble architecture is taken seriously.

The implications for cosmology are significant. By unifying geometry, physics, and thermodynamics under the evolution of two master variables, the BB framework eliminates the need for exotic inflationary potentials, finely tuned initial conditions, or speculative collision events. It also avoids the limitations of standard models that struggle to account for the coherence and alignment of large-scale anomalies. Instead, the BB model situates these features within a broader geometric context, revealing them as natural consequences of multiversal embedding and dimensional descent. This shift in perspective invites a reconsideration of how universes originate, evolve, and interact within higher-dimensional domains.

Several directions for future research follow from this synthesis. Observational studies of the preferred axis and its associated anomalies may refine our understanding of multiversal embedding and constrain the parameters governing dimensional descent. Theoretical work on bubble dynamics may clarify the mechanisms of symmetry breaking and the transition from high-dimensional coherence to classical behavior. The role of vacuum energy in shaping fundamental sector constants and entropy production warrants deeper investigation, particularly in relation to the emergence of classicality. Finally, the possibility of interactions between multiple bubbles or domains opens new avenues for exploring dark matter, cosmological diversity, and the architecture of the multiverse. Considerations related to life and habitability within such a multiversal structure will be addressed in a separate paper.

A central result of the present version of the model is that quantum mechanics is no longer treated as a fundamental ontology. Quantum phenomena are reinterpreted as the observational effects of dimensional mismatch, temporal rotation, and sector-relative projection. In this view, superposition, nonlocality, uncertainty, delayed-choice effects, and other familiar quantum phenomena do not arise because reality is fundamentally quantum, but because a low-dimensional observer in a highly stabilized sector is sampling higher-dimensional excitations through a restricted geometric slice. Dimensional relativity therefore replaces quantum mechanics at the ontological level, while preserving quantum theory as an effective descriptive language for cross-sector observation.

This extension strengthens the broader claims of the BB model. The quantum-classical divide is replaced by the distinction between aligned and misaligned dimensional frames. Gravity is recast as an emergent elastodynamic response of a softening spacetime membrane. Matter appears as stabilized excitation within the relational fiber bundle. CP reversals, dark-sector structure, anomalous gravitational waves, the Cold Spot, Dark Flow, JWST anomalies, and black-hole anomalies all become intelligible within one multiversal architecture. The model also offers a unified account of why classicality intensifies at lower dimensionality, why the Planck scales contract, why the speed of light and causal depth increase, and why our universe occupies the terminal low-dimensional basin of the local lineage.

Taken together, these results imply that neither quantum mechanics nor gravity is fundamental in the usual sense. Both are emergent descriptions of deeper relational-geometric processes unfolding across nested bubble universes. The BB multiverse model therefore shifts the search for a theory of everything away from quantizing gravity and toward understanding how dimensional descent, rotational geometry, and vacuum-energy evolution generate the effective physical regimes we observe. This may be studied in more detail by an extended 10D+1 General Theory of Relativity. In this respect, the model does not merely propose an alternative cosmology; it proposes a reorganization of the foundations of physics itself.

In summary, the BB framework presents a minimal but far-reaching proposal: a local bubble-in-bubble multiverse in which time, causality, classicality, apparent quantum behavior, fundamental sector constants, and large-scale cosmological structure all arise from the evolution of two master variables within a relational substrate. The addition of dimensional relativity completes this architecture by showing how the phenomena historically assigned to quantum mechanics can be derived from cross-sector geometry rather than treated as primitive. If this framework proves fruitful, it offers a coherent path toward a post-quantum, post-fundamental-gravity cosmology grounded in geometry, relational structure, and dimensional descent.

REFERENCES

[1]. Randall, Lisa. The Boundaries of KKLT. arXiv:1912.06693v2 [hep-th] 2020.
[2]. Randall, L., and Sundrum, R. "A Large Mass Hierarchy from a Small Extra Dimension." Physical Review Letters 83 (1999): 3370. arXiv:hep-ph/9905221.
[3]. Randall, L., and Sundrum, R. "An Alternative to Compactification." Physical Review Letters 83 (1999): 4690. arXiv:hep-th/9906064.
[4]. Arkani Hamed, N., Dimopoulos, S., and Dvali, G. "The Hierarchy Problem and New Dimensions at a Millimeter." Physics Letters B 429 (1998): 263. arXiv:hep-ph/9803315.
[5]. Arkani Hamed, N., Dimopoulos, S., and Dvali, G. "Phenomenology, Astrophysics and Cosmology of Theories with Sub Millimeter Dimensions and TeV Scale Quantum Gravity." Physical Review D 59 (1999): 086004. arXiv:hep-ph/9807344.
[6]. Appelquist, T., Chodos, A., and Freund, P. (eds.). Modern Kaluza–Klein Theories. Addison Wesley, 1987.
[7]. Duff, M. J., Nilsson, B. E. W., and Pope, C. N. "Kaluza–Klein Supergravity." Physics Reports 130 (1986): 1.
[8]. Chodos, A., and Detweiler, S. "Where Has the Fifth Dimension Gone?" Physical Review D 21 (1980): 2167.
[9]. Appelquist, T., Cheng, H. C., and Dobrescu, B. A. "Bounds on Universal Extra Dimensions." Physical Review D 64 (2001): 035002. arXiv:hep-ph/0012100.
[10]. Cheng, H. C., Matchev, K. T., and Schmaltz, M. "Radiative Corrections to Kaluza–Klein Masses." Physical Review D 66 (2002): 036005. arXiv:hep-ph/0204342.
[11]. Dvali, G., Gabadadze, G., and Porrati, M. "4D Gravity on a Brane in 5D Minkowski Space." Physics Letters B 485 (2000): 208. arXiv:hep-th/0005016.
[12]. Deffayet, C. "Cosmology on a Brane in Minkowski Bulk." Physics Letters B 502 (2001): 199. arXiv:hep-th/0010186.
[13]. Maldacena, J. "The Large N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity." Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics 2 (1998): 231. arXiv:hep-th/9711200.
[14]. Gubser, S. S., Klebanov, I. R., and Polyakov, A. M. "Gauge Theory Correlators from Non Critical String Theory." Physics Letters B 428 (1998): 105. arXiv:hep-th/9802109.
[15]. Witten, E. "Anti de Sitter Space and Holography." Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics 2 (1998): 253. arXiv:hep-th/9802150.Alexander Vilenkin, Many Worlds in One (Hill & Wang, 2006), p. 181.
[16]. Alexander Vilenkin, Many Worlds in One (Hill & Wang, 2006), p. 181
[17]. A. Vilenkin, "The Beginning of the Universe," American Scientist 95 (2007): 124–131.
[18]. A. Vilenkin, "Quantum Cosmology and Eternal Inflation," in The Future of Theoretical Physics and Cosmology, Cambridge University Press (2003), pp. 649–666.
[19]. A. Vilenkin, "Creation of Universes from Nothing," Physics Letters B 117 (1982): 25–28.
[20]. Borde, Arvind, Alan H. Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin. "Inflationary Spacetimes Are Not Past-Complete." Physical Review Letters, vol. 90, no. 15, 2003, p. 151301. arXiv:gr-qc/0110012, 2001.
[21]. Arkani Hamed, P. Benincasa, A. Postnikov, Cosmological Polytopes and the Wavefunction of the Universe (2017). arXiv:1709.02813.
[22]. F. Wilczek, Quantum Time Crystals, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 160401 (2012).
[23]. Tegmark, Max. "The Mathematical Universe." Foundations of Physics 38, 101–150 (2008). Witten, E. Anti de Sitter Space and Holography. Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics 2, 253–291 (1998). arXiv:hep-th/9802150.
[24]. Ambjørn, Jan, Jerzy Jurkiewicz, and Renate Loll. "Spectral Dimension of the Universe." Physical Review Letters, vol. 95, 2005, p. 171301.
[25]. Carlip, Steven. "Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity." International Journal of Modern Physics D, vol. 25, 2016, p. 1643003.
[26]. Hořava, Petr. "Spectral Dimension of the Universe in Quantum Gravity at a Lifshitz Point." Physical Review Letters, vol. 102, 2009, p. 161301.
[27]. Lauscher, Oliver, and Martin Reuter. "Ultraviolet Fixed Point and Generalized Flow Equation of Quantum Gravity." Physical Review D, vol. 65, 2001, p. 025013.
[28]. Feynman, Richard P., and Albert R. Hibbs. Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals. McGraw-Hill, 1965.
[29]. Witten, E. Quantum Gravity in de Sitter Space. arXiv:hep-th/0106109 (2001).
[30]. Maldacena, J., Strominger, A., Witten, E. Black Hole Entropy in M-Theory. JHEP 12 (1997) 002. arXiv:hep-th/9711053.
[31]. C. Rovelli, Quantum Gravity (2004).
[32]. Barbour, J. The End of Time. Oxford University Press (1999).
[33]. Barbour, J. Shape Dynamics. An Introduction. arXiv:1105.0183.
[34]. Barbour, J., Koslowski, T., Mercati, F. The Physical Origin of Time. arXiv:1409.0917.
[35]. Verlinde, E. "On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton." JHEP 1104:029 (2011).
[36]. Van Raamsdonk, M. Building up Spacetime with Quantum Entanglement. Gen. Rel. Grav. 42, 2323–2329 (2010). arXiv:1005.3035.
[37]. Markopoulou, F. Space Does Not Exist, So Time Can. arXiv:0909.1861. (Time emerges from quantum causal networks.)

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

[38]. Lloyd, S. The Universe as Quantum Computer. Nature 406, 1047–1054 (2000). (Spacetime as emergent computation.)
[39]. J. W. Moffat, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 2, 351 (1993).
[40]. A. Albrecht and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. D 59, 043516 (1999).
[41]. J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D 59, 043515 (1999).
[42]. JETP Letters (Volovik), (25 May 2025).
[43]. Aguirre–Carroll–Johnson. arXiv:1108.0417, (2011). JCAP (2012).
[44]. Chakraborty et al. 2024 review.
[45]. R. Penrose, The Emperor's New Mind (1989).
[46]. R. Penrose, The Road to Reality (2004).
[47]. E. A. Uehling, Phys. Rev. 48, 55 (1935).
[48]. M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory (1995).
[49]. C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. 124, 925 (1961).
[50]. Heisenberg, W. & Euler, H. (1936) Consequences of Dirac's theory of positrons. Z. Phys. 98, 714 (1936).
[51]. Schwinger, J. (1951) On gauge invariance and vacuum polarization. Phys. Rev. 82, 664 (1951).
[52]. Dittrich, W. & Gies, H. (2000) Probing the Quantum Vacuum. Springer, 2000. (Standard reference for vacuum as a polarizable medium.)
[53]. Marklund, M. & Shukla, P. K. (2006) Nonlinear collective effects in photon–photon and photon–plasma interactions. Rev. Mod. Phys. 78, 591 (2006).
[54]. Parker, L. & Toms, D. (2009) Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime. Cambridge University Press, 2009. (Vacuum polarization in curved backgrounds / high vacuum energy regimes.)
[55]. Mottola, E. (1985) Particle creation in de Sitter space. Phys. Rev. D 31, 754 (1985). (High ρ_"vac" enhances fluctuations.)
[56]. G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D 15, 2738 (1977).
[57]. Aaij, R., et al. "Test of Lepton Universality Using $B^+ \to K^+\ell^+\ell^-$ Decays." Physical Review Letters, vol. 113, no. 15, 2014, p. 151601.
[58]. Aaij, R., et al. "Measurement of the Ratio of Branching Fractions $B^0 \to K^0\mu^+\mu^-$ and $B^0 \to K^0e^+e^-$." Journal of High Energy Physics, vol. 2017, no. 8, 2017, p. 55.
[59]. Aaij, R., et al. "Search for Lepton Universality Violation in $B^+ \to K^+\ell^+\ell^-$ Decays." Nature Physics, vol. 18, 2022, pp. 277–282.
[60]. Lees, J. P., et al. (BaBar Collaboration). "Measurement of Branching Fractions and Rate Asymmetries in the Rare Decays $B \to K\ell^+\ell^-$." Physical Review D, vol. 86, no. 3, 2012, p. 032012.
[61]. Huschle, M., et al. (Belle Collaboration). "Measurement of the Branching Ratio of $\bar{B} \to D\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ Relative to $\bar{B} \to D\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell$ Decays." Physical Review D, vol. 92, no. 7, 2015, p. 072014.
[62]. Abdesselam, A., et al. (Belle Collaboration). "Test of Lepton Flavor Universality in $B \to K\ell^+\ell^-$ Decays at Belle." arXiv:1904.02440, 2019.
[63]. Altmannshofer, Wolfgang, and David M. Straub. "New Physics in $B \to K\mu^+\mu^-$?" European Physical Journal C, vol. 73, no. 12, 2013, p. 2646.
[64]. Capdevila, Bernat, et al. "Patterns of New Physics in $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ Transitions in the Light of Recent Data." Journal of High Energy Physics, vol. 2018, no. 1, 2018, p. 93.
[65]. Geng, Li Sheng, et al. "Global Fit to $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ Anomalies." Physics Letters B, vol. 815, 2021, p. 136146.
[66]. Crivellin, Andreas, et al. "Lepton Flavor Non Universality in B Decays from Dynamical Yukawa Couplings." Physical Review D, vol. 99, no. 3, 2019, p. 035004.
[67]. London, David, and Joaquim Matias. "Flavour Anomalies: A Review." Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science, vol. 72, 2022, pp. 37–68.
[68]. Bifani, Simone, et al. "Review of Lepton Universality Tests in B Decays." Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics, vol. 46, no. 2, 2019, p. 023001.
[69]. Albrecht, Johannes, et al. "Flavour Physics and CP Violation." Nature Reviews Physics, vol. 1, 2019, pp. 238–252.
[70]. Glashow, Sheldon L., et al. "Lepton Flavor Violation in B Decays." Physical Review Letters, vol. 114, no. 9, 2015, p. 091801.
[71]. Isidori, Gino, et al. "Flavour Physics and the Quest for New Physics." European Physical Journal C, vol. 77, no. 12, 2017, p. 792
[72]. Einstein, Albert. Relativity: The Special and the General Theory. Methuen, 1916.
[73]. Wheeler, John Archibald. "The 'Past' and the 'Delayed Choice' Double Slit Experiment." In Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory, edited by A.R. Marlow, Academic Press, 1978.
[74]. Wheeler, John Archibald. "Law Without Law." In Quantum Theory and Measurement, edited by J.A. Wheeler and W.H. Zurek, Princeton UP, 1983.
[75]. Kim, Yoon Hak, et al. "A Delayed Choice Quantum Eraser." Physical Review Letters, vol. 84, no. 1, 2000, pp. 1–5.
[76]. Walborn, S. P., et al. "Double Slit Quantum Eraser." Physical Review A, vol. 65, 2002, 033818.
[77]. Scully, Marlan O., and Kai Drühl. "Quantum Eraser: A Proposed Photon Correlation Experiment Concerning Observation and 'Delayed Choice' in Quantum Mechanics." Physical Review A, vol. 25, no. 4, 1982, pp. 2208–2213.
[78]. Ma, Xiao Song, et al. "Quantum Erasure with Causally Disconnected Choice." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 110, no. 4, 2013, pp. 1221–1226.
[79]. Castro Ruiz, Esteban, et al. "Time as a Quantum Observable." Physical Review X, vol. 10, 2020, 011047.
[80]. Hodgson, Thomas, et al. "Time and Quantum Clocks: A Review of Recent Developments." Reports on Progress in Physics, vol. 85, no. 11, 2022, 116001.
[81]. Alonso Serrano, Ana, et al. "Emergent Time and Time Travel in Quantum Physics." Classical and Quantum Gravity, vol. 41, no. 3, 2024, 035001.
[82]. Price, Huw. Time's Arrow and Archimedes' Point: New Directions for the Physics of Time. Oxford UP, 1996.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

[83]. Leifer, Matthew S., and Matthew F. Pusey. “Is a Time Symmetric Interpretation of Quantum Theory Possible Without Retrocausality?” Proceedings of the Royal Society A, vol. 473, 2017, 20160607.
[84]. Aharonov, Yakir, et al. “Two State Vector Formalism: An Updated Review.” In Time in Quantum Mechanics, edited by J.G. Muga et al., Springer, 2008.
[85]. Lutz, Eric, and Sandu Popescu. “The Two Arrows of Time in Quantum Thermodynamics.” Nature Physics, vol. 16, 2020, pp. 121–125.
[86]. Zych, Magdalena, and Časlav Brukner. “Quantum Form of the Equivalence Principle.” Nature Physics, vol. 14, 2018, pp. 1027–1031.
[87]. Jennings, David, and Terry Rudolph. “Entanglement and the Thermodynamic Arrow of Time.” Physical Review E, vol. 81, 2010, 061130.
[88]. Micadei, K., et al. “Reversing the Thermodynamic Arrow of Time Using Quantum Correlations.” Nature Communications, vol. 10, 2019, 2456.
[89]. Riedel, C. Jess. “Classical Branching and the Emergence of Time’s Arrow.” Foundations of Physics, vol. 51, 2021, 94.
[90]. Proietti, Massimiliano, et al. “Experimental Test of Local Observer Independence.” Science Advances, vol. 5, no. 9, 2019, eaaw9832.
[91]. Aspect, Alain, et al. “Experimental Tests of Bell’s Inequalities Using Time Varying Analyzers.” Physical Review Letters, vol. 49, 1982, pp. 1804–1807.

APPENDIX

A. Appendix 1: An Einstein–Cartan–Minkowski Diagram for Vortically-Twisted Spacetime

This appendix outlines the geometric basis of the BB multiverse model (Domain 3), in which nested rotating bubbles possess distinct Lorentz symmetries, invariant speeds of light, and causal structures. To compare these structures, each bubble's local Minkowski frame is embedded into a global multiversal manifold using an Einstein–Cartan tetrad. Rotation and torsion in the embedding region tilt each bubble's time axis relative to the global diagram, deforming its null cone and producing a consistent causal hierarchy. The resulting Einstein–Cartan–Minkowski (ECM) diagram depicts multiple Minkowski sectors, each with its own tilt and causal width, embedded within a torsion-bearing manifold.

➢ *Overview*

In a hierarchical multiverse, different sectors may possess different vacuum structures and effective constants. We consider a nested sequence of rotating universes $B_0 \supset B_1 \supset B_2 \supset \cdots$, each with its own metric $g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$, invariant speed of light c_i, proper time t_i, and causal structure. To compare causal speeds across bubbles, we introduce a global diagram $(T_{\mathcal{M}}, X)$ and embed each bubble's local Minkowski frame using an Einstein–Cartan tetrad, which naturally incorporates rotation, torsion, and frame twisting.

➢ *Local Minkowski Structure*

Each bubble admits a local inertial frame with metric:

$ds_i^2 = -c_i^2 dt_i^2 + dl_i^2$, so null propagation satisfies $dl_i/dt_i = c_i$. We assume a dimensional-descent scaling in which the fundamental time and length units scale as $\tau_i \propto R_i^{\alpha}$ and $l_i \propto R_i^{\beta}$. The invariant speed of light then scales as: $c_i \propto R_i^{\beta-\alpha}$, so smaller bubbles possess larger c_i. This establishes a local causal hierarchy $c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \cdots$.

➢ *Embedding into the Multiversal Manifold*

To compare causal structures, each bubble's local Minkowski frame is embedded into the global manifold. The induced metric takes the form:

$$ds_i^2 = g_{TT}^{(i)} dT^2 + 2 g_{TX}^{(i)} dT\, dX + g_{XX}^{(i)} dX^2, \qquad (1)$$

With

$$g_{\mu\nu}^{(i)} = e^a{}_\mu e^b{}_\nu \eta_{ab}. \qquad (2)$$

Rotation and torsion in the embedding region generically produce a nonzero mixed component $g_{TX}^{(i)}$, which indicates that *the bubble's time axis is tilted relative to the global diagram and that its spatial and temporal axes are no longer orthogonal. This tilt deforms the bubble's null cone when viewed globally.*

Null propagation in the global diagram satisfies:

$$g_{TT}^{(i)} \left(\frac{dT}{dX}\right)^2 + 2 g_{TX}^{(i)} \left(\frac{dT}{dX}\right) + g_{XX}^{(i)} = 0, \qquad (3)$$

Yielding the causal slope:

$$v_{\text{causal}}^{(i)} = \frac{dX}{dT} = \frac{-g_{TX}^{(i)} \pm \sqrt{(g_{TX}^{(i)})^2 - g_{TT}^{(i)} g_{XX}^{(i)}}}{g_{TT}^{(i)}}. \qquad (4)$$

The degree of tilt determines the width of the null cone in the global diagram: a strongly tilted axis produces a wide cone and a large causal speed, while a vertical axis produces a narrow cone and a small causal speed. Because larger bubbles exhibit weaker rotation, smaller torsion, and less tilt, their null cones appear narrower, and their causal speeds are smaller. This produces the global hierarchy: $v_{\text{causal}}^{(0)} < v_{\text{causal}}^{(1)} < v_{\text{causal}}^{(2)} < \cdots$, which mirrors the hierarchy of invariant speeds of light.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

➢ *Causal Speed in the Multiversal Diagram*

The causal speed of bubble B_i relative to the multiversal yardstick is determined by the slope of its null cone in the global diagram. *Larger bubbles, having less torsion and weaker rotation, possess less tilted time axes and therefore narrower null cones. Their causal speeds are correspondingly smaller.* The multiversal diagram thus provides a consistent means of comparing causal structures across nested universes, and the geometric hierarchy derived from the embedding aligns with the scaling hierarchy derived from dimensional descent.

➢ *Summary*

Dimensional-descent scaling and Einstein–Cartan embedding together yield a unified causal hierarchy across the multiverse. Smaller bubbles possess larger invariant speeds of light and wider null cones, while larger bubbles possess smaller invariant speeds of light and narrower cones. The resulting dual hierarchy $c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \cdots$, $v_{\text{causal}}^{(0)} < v_{\text{causal}}^{(1)} < v_{\text{causal}}^{(2)} < \cdots$ stablishes that larger bubbles have both lower invariant speeds of light and lower causal speeds relative to the multiversal diagram. This framework provides a coherent geometric basis for multiversal renormalization of constants, causal hierarchy theorems, torsion-driven dimensional descent, and potential observational signatures of transitions between bubbles.

B. Appendix 2: Comparisons of BB Multiverse Model with M-Theory and Eternal Inflation Multiverse Models

The BB multiverse model occupies a conceptual position adjacent to both M-theory and Eternal Inflation while diverging from each in its generative mechanisms, ontological commitments, and conservation structure. Although all three frameworks employ the language of bubbles, vacua, and higher-dimensional embedding, the BB model reinterprets these motifs within a genealogical architecture in which every sector descends from a single progenitor bubble through a sequence of symmetry-breaking transitions. This stands in contrast to the ensemble-based ontology of Eternal Inflation and the landscape-sampling ontology often associated with M-theory.

Eternal Inflation posits an inflating background spacetime in which quantum fluctuations of the inflaton field generate an unbounded proliferation of bubble universes. Each bubble is treated as an independent universe with its own vacuum energy, constants, and causal structure. The BB model retains the superficial imagery of bubble-like domains but rejects the underlying mechanism: no inflaton field drives nucleation, no stochastic tunneling populates an infinite ensemble, and no measure problem arises from unbounded multiplicity. Instead, the BB multiverse is finite, resource-limited, and genealogically ordered. Each sector inherits its vacuum structure from the symmetry-breaking history of its ancestors, and all sectors remain embedded within a single induced bubble whose curvature gradients can propagate across sectoral boundaries. Thus, while Eternal Inflation and the BB model share the visual metaphor of bubbles, they differ fundamentally in causal origin, multiplicity, and the global accounting of energy and information.

M-theory provides a different point of comparison. Its higher-dimensional bulk, brane-localized matter, and vast landscape of metastable vacua offer a structural backdrop that superficially resembles the BB model's Domain-2 embedding and E6-sector geometry. Both frameworks allow vacuum diversity and higher-dimensional structure, and both permit gravitational influence to extend beyond the confines of any single low-dimensional region. Yet the BB model does not adopt the string-theoretic ontology of branes, compactification manifolds, or open/closed string distinctions. Nor does it assume that the multiverse samples a pre-existing landscape of vacua. Instead, vacuum diversity arises through dimensional descent and sectoral symmetry-breaking, producing a branching genealogical tree rather than a landscape to be explored. The BB model therefore aligns with M-theory only at the level of broad structural motifs, not at the level of mechanism or ontology.

The BB multiverse model is compatible with M-theory and Eternal Inflation only in the sense that all three frameworks employ bubble-like domains, vacuum variation, and higher-dimensional embedding. Beyond these superficial similarities, the BB model diverges sharply: it rejects infinite ensembles, replaces stochastic nucleation with genealogical descent, and imposes strict conservation across sectors. The BB multiverse architecture is therefore best understood not as a variant of either M-theory or Eternal Inflation, but as a distinct multiverse ontology that reinterprets their shared motifs within a finite, lineage-based, symmetry-structured framework.

The BB multiverse model is partially compatible with both M-theory and Eternal Inflation at the level of broad structural motifs—such as vacuum diversity, bubble-like domains, and higher-dimensional embedding—but it is not compatible with their mechanisms, causal structure, or ontology of universes.

It replaces both with a genealogical, resource-limited, sector-based architecture that avoids the infinite-ensemble implications of Eternal Inflation and the landscape-sampling assumptions of M-theory.

➢ *Compatibility with Eternal Inflation*

Eternal Inflation predicts an infinite proliferation of bubble universes generated by quantum fluctuations of the inflaton field. These bubbles differ in vacuum energy, constants, and sometimes effective laws of physics.

- *BB Model: Points of Compatibility*

- ✓ *Bubble-like domains exist, but as descendants of a single progenitor bubble rather than as independent nucleations.*
- ✓ *Vacuum variation exists, but only through symmetry-breaking lineage, not random inflaton fluctuations.*
- ✓ *Causal disconnection between domains is acknowledged, but arises from sectoral stratification, not from inflationary expansion outrunning bubble growth.*

- *BB Model: Points of Incompatibility*

- ✓ *No infinite ensemble. Eternal Inflation predicts unbounded bubble production; the BB model restricts the multiverse to a finite, resource-limited sectoral architecture.*
- ✓ *No independent universes. Eternal Inflation treats each bubble as a separate universe; the BB model treats them as internal sectors of one induced bubble, sharing a common origin and conservation structure.*
- ✓ *No inflaton-driven nucleation. The BB model replaces inflaton tunneling with dimensional descent and vacuum manifold branching.*
- ✓ *No measure problem. Eternal Inflation suffers from the measure problem due to infinite bubble counts; the BB model avoids this by finite sector count and non-ensemble probability.*

➢ *Compatibility With M-Theory*

M-theory predicts a landscape of vacua, brane-confined matter, and gravity propagating through higher-dimensional bulk. It also allows bubble-like transitions between vacua in the string landscape.

- *BB Model: Points of Compatibility*

- ✓ *Vacuum diversity: Both frameworks allow many vacua with different symmetry structures.*
- ✓ *Higher-dimensional embedding: M-theory's 11D bulk loosely parallels the BB model's Domain-2 / Platonic layer.*
- ✓ *Gravity not confined: M-theory allows gravitons (closed strings) to propagate in the bulk; the BB model similarly allows curvature gradients to propagate between bubbles, producing effects like dark flow or cold-spot correlations.*
- ✓ *Sector-dependent particle behavior: M-theory's open-string confinement to branes loosely resembles the BB model's dimensional transmutation, where particles "lock" to the dimensionality of the sector they enter.*

- *BB Model: Points of Incompatibility*

- ✓ *No string landscape sampling. M-theory assumes a vast landscape of metastable vacua; the BB model assumes a single genealogical vacuum tree, not a landscape.*
- ✓ *No brane-world ontology. The BB model does not posit branes as fundamental objects; dimensionality arises from sectoral symmetry, not brane tension or compactification.*
- ✓ *No string-based particle ontology. The BB model does not rely on open/closed string distinctions; instead, it uses dimensional transmutation and sectoral constraints.*
- ✓ *No eternal inflation mechanism. M-theory often pairs with Eternal Inflation to populate the landscape; the BB model rejects this mechanism entirely.*

➢ *Structural Similarities Across All Three Frameworks*

There are several shared motifs:

- *Bubble-Like Domains*

- ✓ Eternal Inflation: inflaton-generated bubbles
- ✓ M-theory: vacuum transitions in the landscape
- ✓ BB model: symmetry-breaking descendants of a single bubble.

- *Vacuum Diversity*

All three frameworks allow multiple vacua with different constants or symmetries.

- *Higher-Dimensional Embedding*

- ✓ M-theory: 11D bulk
- ✓ Eternal Inflation: inflating background spacetime
- ✓ BB model: Domain-2 / Platonic layer with E6-sector Geometry.

- *Causal Disconnection*
  All three frameworks allow regions that cannot communicate in classical spacetime.

➢ *Deep Ontological Differences*

- Ontology of Universes

✓ *Eternal Inflation: infinite ensemble of universes*
✓ *M-theory: landscape of vacua, potentially realized in many universes*
✓ *BB model: one multiverse, internally stratified into finite sectors, all genealogically linked.*

- *Mechanism of Vacuum Differentiation*

✓ *Eternal Inflation: quantum fluctuations of inflaton field*
✓ *M-theory: transitions between string vacua*
✓ *BB model: dimensional descent and symmetry-breaking lineage.*

- *Conservation and Energy Accounting*

✓ *Eternal Inflation: no global conservation; infinite energy duplication.*
✓ *M-theory: local conservation on branes, ambiguous globally.*
✓ *BB model: strict conservation across sectors, avoiding Many-Worlds energy paradoxes*

- *Role of Gravity*

✓ *Eternal Inflation: gravity local to each bubble*
✓ *M-theory: gravity propagates in bulk*
✓ *BB model: gravity propagates via curvature gradients between bubbles, producing observable cross-bubble effects (e.g., dark flow).*

Table 3 Summary of Differences between Frameworks

	Eternal Inflation	**M-Theory Landscape**	**BB Multiverse**
What creates new domains?	Inflaton fluctuations, tunneling	Vacuum transitions, brane dynamics	Symmetry-breaking lineage, dimensional descent
How many domains?	Infinite	Potentially large	Finite
How do vacua differ?	Random inflaton values	Different compactifications	Sectoral symmetry differences
Cross-domain interaction	None (classically)	Gravity in bulk	Curvature gradients, shared origin
BB compatibility	Low	Moderate	Not Applicable

C. Appendix 3: Translator 1 - BB Relational-Geometric Physics to Quantum Physics

Table 4 Relational-Geometric Physics to Quantum Physics

#	**BB Relational-Geometric Physics**	**Quantum Physics**	**Notes**
1	Classical instantiation / geometric condensation	Measurement	Condensation of an extended relational profile into a single sector-based classical trajectory within a 3D bubble through focussing, as an artefact of measurement or observation.
2	Cross-sector relational instability	“Weird quantum behavior”	Nonclassical effects arise when two sectors’ embeddings interfere or partially overlap.
3	Degree of geometric misalignment	Mixing angle / suppressed mixing	Curvature and embedding mismatch that determines the strength of cross-sector induction.
4	Dimensional dissonance	Superposition	A relational profile spans multiple geometric configurations due to mismatched dimensional embeddings.
5	Dimensional transmutation	Kinetic mixing analogue	Dimensional transmutation is the geometric analogue of kinetic mixing: a change of identity induced not by interactions but by geometry. A higher dimensional particle

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

			cannot exist stably in a 3D vacuum without dimensional contraction. The particle must adopt the identity appropriate to the relational measure of the new vacuum.
6	Extended relational embedding	Superposition	A single profile remains spread across multiple geometric possibilities before classical compression.
7	Geometric adjacency transition	Quantum tunnelling	A transition between adjacent relational embeddings when curvature gradients allow movement across geometric boundaries.
9	Geometric kinetic mixing	Analogous to kinetic mixing	Partial alignment of relational profiles at low-curvature interfaces; may relate to dimensional transmutation. *(Geometric mixing may be found to be related to kinetic mixing in the future. The fact that neutrino oscillations go through possible dimensional descent through second, and third generation particles suggests hidden relationships yet to be explored.)*
16	Geometric portal operators	Portal operator	A transient alignment of vacuum curvature and relational profiles enabling limited cross-sector induction.
10	Geometric-trajectory ensemble	Path integral	The set of all admissible relational trajectories permitted by curvature constraints.
11	Geometric wavefunction/ Relational profile	Analogous to Quantum Wavefunction	We introduce the concept of a multiversal geometric wavefunction. This is a mathematical function that assigns, to every sector of the multiverse, a probability—given by the Born rule—that a given excitation exists there in a classically stable form. The geometric wavefunction is not a spatial wave or a physical field. It is a probability distribution over sectors in the local multiverse, charting how strongly an excitation is classically instantiated across the multiversal architecture.
12	Induction amplitude across geometric boundaries	Scattering amplitude	Strength of relational induction when geometric embeddings partially align.
13	In-sector stability	Decoherence	A sector becomes dynamically isolated as curvature discontinuities suppress cross-sector induction.
14	Internal relational-profile coupling strength	Self-interaction cross section	Degree to which excitations within a sector induce curvature or internal energy exchange.
15	Low-curvature interface alignment	Kinetic mixing	Partial alignment of two sectors' relational profiles (e.g., α_1 and α_2), enabling weak induction.
8	Persistent cross-sector instability	Quantum coherence	A sector remains extended, relationally open, and nonlocal because cross-sector channels have not fully collapsed.
17	Relational fiber bundle	Hilbert space / Hilbert fiber bundle	A stratified bundle of sector-specific relational manifolds encoding geometric embeddings rather than quantum states.
23	Relational physics / geometric determinism	Quantum physics	A framework describing how relational profiles evolve within the curvature structure of the vacuum manifold.
18	Relational-profile commensurability	Wavefunction overlap	Degree to which two sectors' geometric embeddings align sufficiently to permit induction.
19	Relational profile/geometric wavefunction.	Quantum state	The geometric configuration of a sector's excitations, defined by curvature, adjacency,

			and embedding.
20	Sectoral curvature-dynamics generator	Hamiltonian	Governs how a sector's relational profile evolves within its geometric embedding.
21	Sectoral embedding within the vacuum manifold	Hilbert space support	The region of the multiversal geometry in which a sector's excitations are instantiated.
22	Vacuum curvature manifold	Quantum vacuum	The geometric substrate whose curvature structure determines which sectors can exist and interact.

➢ *Translator 2 - Quantum Physics to BB Relational-Geometric Physics*

Table 5 Quantum Physics to Relational-Geometric Physics

#	Quantum Physics	BB Relational-Geometric Physics	Notes
1	Decoherence	In-sector stability	A sector becomes dynamically isolated as curvature discontinuities suppress cross-sector induction; decoherence is simply the stabilization of a sector's relational profile.
2	Entanglement	Shared higher-dimensional relational embedding	Two excitations share a single extended relational structure in a higher-dimensional sector; entanglement is the projection of this shared geometry into 3D.
3	Hamiltonian	Sectoral curvature-dynamics generator	The Hamiltonian corresponds to the curvature-driven rule set governing relational-profile evolution.
4	Hilbert space / Hilbert fiber bundle	Relational fiber bundle	A Hilbert space is reinterpreted as a stratified bundle of relational manifolds encoding geometric embeddings rather than abstract state vectors.
5	Hilbert space support	Sectoral embedding within the vacuum manifold	"Support" becomes the region of the vacuum manifold in which a sector's excitations are instantiated.
6	Kinetic mixing	Geometric kinetic mixing	Dimensional transmutation is the geometric analogue of kinetic mixing: a change of identity induced not by interactions but by geometry. A higher dimensional particle cannot exist stably in a 3D vacuum without dimensional contraction. The particle must adopt the identity appropriate to the relational measure of the new vacuum.
7	Measurement	Classical instantiation / geometric compression	Measurement corresponds to the geometric compression of an extended relational profile into a single classical trajectory.
8	Mixing angle / suppressed mixing	Degree of geometric misalignment	Mixing angles quantify curvature-based misalignment between sectors, determining induction strength.
9	Path integral	Geometric-trajectory ensemble	The path integral becomes the set of all relational trajectories permitted by curvature constraints.
10	Portal operator	Geometric portal operators	A transient alignment of vacuum curvature and relational profiles enabling limited cross-sector induction.
11	Quantum coherence	Persistent cross-sector instability	Coherence is the failure of a sector to fully isolate; relational channels remain open, producing extended, nonlocal behavior.
12	Quantum kinetic mixing	Geometric kinetic mixing	A geometric interface where relational profiles partially align; analogous to kinetic mixing. *(Geometric mixing may be found to relate to kinetic mixing in the future. Neutrino oscillations and possible dimensional descent across generations suggest hidden relationships yet to be explored.)*
13	Quantum physics	Relational physics / geometric determinism	Quantum theory is reinterpreted as the study of relational-profile evolution within the curvature structure of the vacuum manifold.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26sep228

14	Quantum state	Relational profile	A quantum state is the geometric configuration of a sector's excitations, defined by curvature, adjacency, and embedding.
15	Quantum wavefunction	Geometric wavefunction	See Note 1, above.
16	Quantum tunnelling	Geometric adjacency transition	Tunnelling corresponds to transitions between adjacent relational embeddings when curvature gradients permit movement across geometric boundaries.
17	Scattering amplitude	Induction amplitude across geometric boundaries	Scattering amplitudes measure the strength of relational induction when geometric embeddings partially align.
18	Self-interaction cross section	Internal relational-profile coupling strength	Self-interaction becomes the degree to which excitations induce curvature or internal energy exchange within a sector.
19	Superposition	Dimensional dissonance	A relational profile spans multiple geometric configurations due to mismatched dimensional embeddings.
20	Wavefunction overlap	Geometric wavefunction overlap or relational-profile commensurability	Overlap corresponds to a high degree of geometric alignment between two sectors' relational and geometric wavefunction profiles.
22	"Weird quantum behavior"	Cross-sector relational instability	Nonclassical effects arise from interference between partially overlapping sectoral embeddings.
21	Quantum vacuum	Vacuum curvature manifold	The quantum vacuum becomes the underlying curvature substrate determining which sectors can exist and interact.