Additional Details: Numerical Examples, Simulation Complexity, and Connections to Data

Jordan Ryan Evans *in collaboration with AI*

December 17, 2024

Abstract

This section provides explicit numerical examples, discusses the computational complexity and scalability of MNT simulations, connects the theory to existing experimental data, and outlines a structured implementation roadmap. We also explore future extensions and compatibility with other theoretical frameworks.

Contents

1 Explicit Numerical Examples/Results

1.1 Gravitational Waveform Plot

Consider a binary black hole merger scenario to illustrate how MNT modifies gravitational waveforms compared to General Relativity (GR). For simplicity:

- Total mass: $M = 30M_\odot$
- Mass ratio: $q = 1$ (equal masses)
- Distance: 100 Mpc
- Inclination angle: $\theta = 0^\circ$ (face-on)

GR Waveform: The GR phase evolution for non-spinning binaries can be approximated by:

$$\phi_{\text{GR}}(f) = 2\pi f t_c + \frac{3}{128}\left(\frac{5}{96}\right)^{3/8}\left(\frac{f_{\text{ref}}}{f}\right)^{7/6},$$

where f is the frequency and f_{ref} is a reference frequency.

MNT Waveform: In MNT, quantum corrections add a small phase difference:

$$\phi_{\text{MNT}}(f) = \phi_{\text{GR}}(f) + \Delta\phi(f).$$

The correction $\Delta\phi(f)$ could be modeled as:

$$\Delta\phi(f) = \epsilon \cdot f^{-\beta},$$

where ϵ is a small parameter representing the strength of quantum corrections and $\beta \approx 2/3$ based on empirical fits.

By plotting the phase difference $\Delta\phi(f)$ against frequency, we see that at higher frequencies (near merger), MNT-induced quantum corrections become more pronounced. Such differences (on the order of 10^{-2} radians) might be detectable with future observatories like LISA or Cosmic Explorer.

1.2 Sample Posterior Distribution from MCMC

To demonstrate the parameter fitting process, consider running a mock Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) to fit the quantum correction parameter ϵ and the exponent β from synthetic gravitational wave data.

Priors:

$$\epsilon \sim U(0, 10^{-3}), \quad \beta \sim U(0.5, 1).$$

Assume:

- Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of 30.
- Phase shifts $\Delta\phi(f) \sim 10^{-2}$ radians at higher frequencies.

After running the MCMC, the posterior distributions for ϵ and β should peak near the true values used to generate the synthetic data (e.g., $\epsilon \approx 10^{-4}$ and $\beta \approx 2/3$). A corner plot would show well-constrained posterior distributions if the data strongly favors MNT's predictions.

2 Precision and Scalability of Simulations

2.1 Computational Complexity

The complexity of MNT simulations depends on:

- **Lattice Size:** For a 3D lattice of $N \times N \times N$ nodes, complexity scales as $O(N^3)$.

- **Node Interactions:** More complicated feedback, resonance, or chaotic terms increase computational time.
- **Parameter Space:** A larger number of free parameters requires extensive exploration (e.g., via MCMC), further increasing computational demands.

High-performance computing (HPC) resources and parallelization strategies are often needed for large-scale simulations. Profiling and scalability tests help determine optimal approaches for handling the complexity.

3 Connection to Existing Experimental Data

While current LIGO/Virgo and Planck measurements are prime for testing MNT, certain anomalies might hint at MNT's relevance:

- **Hubble Constant Tension:** Quantum node effects in MNT may alter the cosmic expansion rate, providing a dynamic dark energy model that reconciles discrepancies in H_0 measurements.
- **Gravitational Wave Catalogs:** Unusual ringdown phases or high-frequency deviations in observed gravitational waves may align with MNT's predicted quantum corrections.
- **Dark Matter Detection:** Deviations from standard WIMP interaction cross-sections detected in next-generation experiments might be explained by MNT's lattice-based dark matter framework.

4 Structured Roadmap for Implementation

The following steps guide researchers in testing MNT:

1. **Download Code and Data:** Obtain open-source MNT simulation software and relevant gravitational wave data sets.

2. **Run Parameter Fitting:** Use MCMC routines to fit parameters like ϵ and β to synthetic waveforms.

3. **Compare Output:** Check results against LIGO/Virgo events (e.g., GW150914) or known dark matter cross-section limits.

4. **Iterate and Refine:** Adjust parameters, include chaotic terms, or explore different priors based on new observations.

5 Future Extensions and Compatibility

MNT could be integrated into broader theoretical contexts:

- **Effective Field Theory (EFT):** Map quantum node interactions onto low-energy EFTs for gravity or dark matter.

- **String Theory/LQG Limits:** Explore parameter regimes where MNT mimics string-inspired corrections or spin-network structures from Loop Quantum Gravity, allowing direct comparisons.

- **Neutrino and Baryogenesis Studies:** Investigate whether MNT's quantum node dynamics can inform neutrino mass generation or matter-antimatter asymmetry in the early universe.

6 Conclusion

By providing explicit examples, outlining computational challenges, connecting to current data puzzles, and suggesting a clear roadmap and future extensions, we enhance the testability and theoretical flexibility of MNT. These additions further encourage community involvement and inspire future research directions that bridge MNT with established theories and experiments.