COHERENCE DYNAMICS: BRIDGING CLASSICAL AND PURE MATHEMATICS

Department of Coherence Dynamics Mathematics

# The L'Var Bi-Topological Engine: A Cross-Domain Analysis of Advanced Use Cases for the L'Varian Spring in Geometric Mechanics, Certified Control, and Non-Archimedean Modeling

*A Cross-Domain Analysis of Advanced Use Cases for the L'Varian Spring*

L.E. L'Var (ORCID: 0009-0009-1254-2396)

L'Var Institute of Coherence Dynamics (LICD)

CDM-2025-02 — v1.0 — October 14, 2025



l.e.lvar@the-ap.org — https://the-ap.org

**Executive Synthesis**

The L'Varian Spring's three pillars—(I) *Geometric Mechanics* via the Riemannian Newton law $G(x)\,\ddot{x} + \Gamma^{\flat}_{G}(x)[\dot{x},\dot{x}] = -\nabla V(x)$, (II) *Dual-Certified Optimization* via the Route A/Route B equivalence to $G(x)\,\ddot{x} + \Gamma^{\flat}_{G}(x)[\dot{x},\dot{x}] = -\nabla V(x)$ and its damped form $G(x)\,\ddot{x} + \Gamma^{\flat}_{G}(x)[\dot{x},\dot{x}] + \zeta(t)\,G(x)\,\dot{x} = -\nabla V(x)$, and (III) *Compositional and Verifiable Structure* in the category **L′VarSpring**—power a single engine that handles smooth evolution and hierarchical collapse with the same guarantees [1].

# 1 Introduction and Architectural Synthesis

## 1.1 The Synthesis of Dynamics and Hierarchy: Review of Bi-Topological Foundations

The L'Varian Spring is formalized as a unique dynamical object defined by the quadruple $(\mathcal{S}, G, E, L)$, operating on a common state set $\mathcal{S}$ [1]. Its foundation rests upon the critical synthesis of two complete, yet topologically inequivalent but compatible, metrics on $\mathcal{S}$: the smooth, Archimedean topology ($\tau_\infty$), which supports continuous calculus via the elastic metric $G$, and the ultrametric, $p$-adic topology ($\tau_p$), which supports exact hierarchical discretization [1]. The mathematical necessity of compatibility—rather than equivalence—is essential, as requiring a homeomorphism would either destroy the calculus (by eliminating paths and geodesics) or collapse the quantization (by losing clopen hierarchies) [1]. By preserving both, the Spring allows the single, iterative trajectory $x_{n+1} = L(x_n)$ to be simultaneously governed and certified by two logically independent convergence mechanisms: smooth energy descent and ultrametric contraction [1].

This dual certification mechanism is realized through the system's core components. The smooth regime is defined by the Elastic Metric $G$, a symmetric positive-definite matrix field that induces the Riemannian geometry of the state space. This metric is physically interpreted as a position-dependent mass matrix [1]. The dynamics are implemented by the map $L$, a unary recursion constructed to be both continuous and a strict contraction in both the $d_\infty$ and $d_p$ metrics [1]. Convergence is regulated by the Energy Functional $E$, a bi-proper Lyapunov function whose precompact sublevel sets ensure that the energy strictly decreases along orbits, guaranteeing terminal behavior where the trajectory collapses onto the fixed-point set $\mathrm{Fix}(L)$, with this terminality certified in both topological regimes [1].

## 1.2 The Three Pillars of Advanced L'Var Spring Utility

The practical significance of the L'Varian Spring for advanced modeling and engineering extends far beyond the foundational examples of the harmonic oscillator detailed in Section 7.1 of the core paper [1]. Its utility derives from three core structural consequences:

The first consequence, **Pillar I: Geometric Mechanics (Variable Mass/Inertia)**, is the emergence of the full Riemannian Newton Law (R-NL) in the continuous limit: $G(x)\,\ddot{x} + \Gamma^{\flat}_{G}(x)[\dot{x},\dot{x}] = -\nabla V(x)$ [1]. This structure generalizes classical $F = ma$ by integrating the configuration-dependent mass matrix $G$ and the inertial curvature $\Gamma^{\flat}_{G}$, which accounts for non-Euclidean inertial forces [1].

The second consequence, **Pillar II: Dual-Certified Optimization**, formalizes the vanishing-step convergence of two entirely independent discretization routes—Route A (discrete variational integrators) and Route B (accelerated proximal schemes)—to the same R-NL [1]. This geometric equivalence rigorously establishes the Spring as an optimization algorithm that is both geometrically preconditioned (via $G$ and $\Gamma^{\flat}_{G}$) and globally convergent (via the Lyapunov principle), regardless of whether the perspective is mechanical or purely iterative optimization [1].

The third consequence, **Pillar III: Compositional and Verifiable Structure**, arises from the formal algebraic framework of the Category **L′VarSpring** (Section 9 of [1]). This category permits the principled, modular construction of complex dynamical systems. The existence of limits and colimits ensures that properties such as stability, energy conservation, and dynamical coherence can be algebraically verified and preserved when subsystems are coupled or partitioned [1].

# 2 Advanced Computational Use Cases: Geometric Optimization and Hierarchical Learning

This domain analysis centers on exploiting the robust dynamics and dual convergence guarantees provided by Pillar II, primarily for tackling complex computational problems in non-Euclidean and hierarchical spaces.

## 2.1 Dual-Certified Global Optimization for Non-Convex Landscapes

The convergence of the accelerated mirror/prox scheme (Route B) to the damped Riemannian Newton Law [1] establishes the L'Varian Spring as a globally convergent, geometrically adaptive optimization algorithm. In this context, the elastic metric $G$ is naturally interpreted as the inverse metric field that structures the optimization space. This interpretation means the continuous limit recovers a highly generalized form of the Riemannian Newton method [2, 3]. Such Riemannian methods are required when dealing with constrained optimization, such as minimizing complex energy functionals on curved manifolds like the Stiefel manifold in quantum chemistry or enforcing geometric constraints in machine learning problems [2].

The inertial curvature term, $\Gamma^\flat_G$, provides a dynamic correction that is key to superior performance in non-Euclidean optimization. This term, derived from the Levi-Civita connection of $G$ [1], accounts for the curvature of the energy landscape, guiding the trajectory along geodesics. This geometric directionality ensures faster and more stable convergence pathways compared to traditional first-order methods, which often struggle with poor conditioning in highly curved spaces [3]. Furthermore, the damping term $\zeta(t)$, derived from Nesterov-type or constant acceleration schedules in Route B [1], provides regularization. Whether the friction is constant ($\gamma$) or vanishing ($\alpha/t$), this damping ensures global convergence and robust energy dissipation (Corollary 6.2 in [1]), even when strong convexity guarantees are absent [1].

A critical extension lies in the domain of **Hybrid Optimization for Mixed-Discrete Problems**. Many optimization routines involve mixed parameter spaces—continuous parameters (e.g., weights in a network) and hierarchical, discrete structures (e.g., clustering or graph topology) [4]. Conventional methods struggle to unify these domains. However, the ultrametric topology $\tau_p$, inherently linked to hierarchical structure [6], works alongside the smooth topology $\tau_\infty$. Since the Spring's map $L$ is simultaneously contractive in $d_\infty$ and $d_p$ [1], it provides a unified iterative step that continuously follows the smooth energy gradient while collapsing the solution onto a robust point in the hierarchical discrete space. This framework is ideally suited for applications like Optimal Transport over Ultrametric Trees, where continuous parameters and discrete tree topology must be optimized simultaneously [5], providing a rigorous foundation for integrating continuous and hierarchical constraints in complex computational learning schemes, such as Supervised Ultrametric Learning [4].

## 2.2 Machine Learning on Inherently Hierarchical Data ($\tau_p$ Exploitation)

The ultrametric topology ($\tau_p$) offers a distinct advantage in analyzing data where similarity is measured by hierarchy or tree proximity rather than continuous distance, typical of $p$-adic metric spaces [6]. This is crucial for domains like NLP taxonomies and phylogenetic structures, where interpolation between points is often nonsensical [6]. The L'Varian framework provides a dynamical system capable of converging robustly on such bi-topological data.

This approach addresses instability issues often plaguing conventional, Euclidean-based clustering techniques [7]. The strict ultrametric contraction property of $L$ (Definition 3.1 in [1]) guarantees the explicit formalization of hierarchical collapse. This is directly applicable to robust **Longitudinal Data Clustering**, where the similarity of individual temporal trajectories must be quantified hierarchically [8]. The ultrametric dynamics ensure that the grouping accounts for the structural closeness of temporal evolutions, leading to superior performance in determining the number of clusters and classifying individuals accurately [8].

Furthermore, the existence lemma (Lemma 2.2 in [1]) provides a constructive pathway for engineering the dynamics of neural architectures. This is vital for developing **Ultrametric Neural Architectures** that natively respect data hierarchy, corresponding, for example, to Deep Belief Networks modeled as ultrametric spin glasses [9]. By guaranteeing that the map $L$ is simultaneously contractive in $d_\infty$ (allowing standard backpropagation) and $d_p$ (ensuring stable feature quantization), the Spring provides a rigorous mathematical basis for handling hierarchical data structures [1].

### 2.3 Distributed and Modular Optimization via Categorical Pullbacks

The L'Varian Spring's categorical structure (Section 9 in [1]) allows for the rigorous modular decomposition and assembly of complex computational systems. This is particularly relevant for large-scale distributed optimization, such as algorithms utilizing decomposition and coupling constraints [10].

The central algebraic tool for composition is the categorical **Pullback**, or fiber product $A \times_C B$ [1]. This structure precisely models constraint-coupled systems where independent subsystems ($A$ and $B$) are forced to agree on a common interface $C$ (where $\Phi(a) = \Psi(b)$) [1]. Because the Pullback construction guarantees that the resulting composite object remains a $\mathbf{L'VarSpring}$ object (Proposition 9.10 in [1]), the full set of bi-topological stability and convergence guarantees is inherited. This mechanism ensures that complex coupling constraints are enforced algebraically without compromising the certified energy descent property of the underlying dynamics. The utilization of finite limits (products and equalizers) makes $\mathbf{L'VarSpring}$ a Cartesian monoidal category, ideal for structuring complex, distributed computational systems with verifiable stability [1].

## 3 Applications in Complex Physical Systems and Material Science

This domain explores the high-fidelity modeling capabilities derived from Pillar I: Geometric Mechanics, focusing on the implications of a non-trivial, configuration-dependent elastic metric $G$.

### 3.1 Modeling Configuration-Dependent Elastic Media: Dynamic Metamaterials

The generalized R-NL framework provides a potent geometric tool for characterizing dynamic mechanical metamaterials (MMs)—engineered structures whose effective mechanical properties are defined by their complex microstructural geometry [11]. By utilizing the general form of the variable metric $G$, the R-NL serves as an advanced geometric reduced-order model [11]. In this model, $G$ is identified as the effective, configuration-dependent inertia tensor, which can be derived through computational homogenization techniques that account for the complex microstructure [12].

The non-linear inertial effects inherent to these structured media are entirely contained within the Christoffel term $\Gamma^\flat_G$ [1]. This term captures non-linear reaction forces that arise from the coupling between material deformation and the non-uniform mass distribution of the MM structure, explaining exotic behavior such as negative Poisson's ratio or the creation of tunable band gaps [12].

The geometric encapsulation of non-linearity provides a powerful theoretical insight: when $G$ is configuration-dependent, the non-linear inertial effects are not external forces but internal forces resulting from the system traversing a curved configuration space defined by $G$. This means that the complex non-linear dynamics often modeled by empirical constitutive laws in finite-strain elastodynamics [13] can be reformulated geometrically as the geodesic equation on a curved configuration manifold [14]. This geometrical reformulation simplifies the predictive modeling of material behavior: instead of deriving complex, empirical laws for new metamaterials, one analyzes the geometric properties ($G$ and $\Gamma^{\flat}_{G}$) of the system's configuration space to predict its mechanical response [12].

### 3.2 Active Matter Dynamics with State-Dependent Inertia

The L'Varian Spring offers a continuum description for active matter systems, which are governed by complex interactions that modulate local inertia and resistance [16]. In active systems, the movement resistance often depends on the particle's direction and local field context, making the inertia tensor anisotropic.

By defining $G$ as a tensor field dependent on local variables such as polarization or density [16], the R-NL provides a continuum hydrodynamic model for highly non-linear, collective flow [15]. The damping term $\zeta(t)$ in Route B, which controls mechanical energy dissipation (Corollary 6.2 in [1]), can be parameterized to model specific, state-dependent dissipation mechanisms, such as viscous drag that changes based on local alignment or particle reorientation events that drive the system toward stable, ordered phases [15].

The bi-topological nature is crucial for modeling **Bi-Topological Phase Transitions** in active matter. The smooth dynamics ($\tau_\infty$) track the continuous flow and velocity fluctuations, while the ultrametric contraction ($\tau_p$) models the rapid, quantized collapse into a stable, discrete topological configuration, such as a state defined by stable defect patterns (winding numbers) [17]. This structure is ideal for describing the topological bifurcations, or "perestroikas," that dictate the final, stable state of the material [18]. The guaranteed terminality (Proposition 3.3 in [1]) implies a rapid, verifiable settling into the topologically stable configuration.

## 4 Certification and Resilience in Safety-Critical and Autonomous Systems

The Spring framework provides a rigorous foundation for building and certifying systems where failure carries catastrophic risk, leveraging its dual convergence guarantees (Pillar II) and compositional algebra (Pillar III).

### 4.1 Guaranteed Trajectory Planning in Autonomous Systems

Autonomous system control demands stability in continuous motion combined with certifiable robustness in discrete decision-making. The smooth dynamics, defined by the R-NL (Equation 3 in [1]), allow for the derivation of energy-optimal, smooth, geodesic trajectories. By encoding physical constraints (like acceleration limits) within the elastic metric $G$, the R-NL generates geometrically informed motion plans that integrate naturally into optimal control or MPC frameworks [19].

The ultrametric topology ($\tau_p$) handles the necessary discrete decision-making, ensuring that the system navigates the hierarchical road network or interaction space robustly [19]. The $d_p$ contraction guarantees rapid, decisive convergence toward certified safe, discrete nodes, preventing hazardous prolonged oscillation or indecision near critical topological events, such as traffic merge points, which can be modeled using topological braids in multi-agent systems [20].

The dual convergence certification is the core for system certification [21]. The bi-proper energy function $E$ formally excludes divergence in both topological regimes (Proposition 3.3 in [1]). This dual validation provides a formal proof that the system cannot enter topology-specific failure modes, such as continuous runaway instability ($d_\infty$ failure) or pathological numerical errors from hierarchical discretization ($d_p$ failure) [1]. The Bi-Topological Fixed Point Theorem (Theorem 4.1 in [1]) ensures the system achieves a unique, verifiable terminal state defined as a safe operating point.

### 4.2 Verification of Distributed Control Systems (DCS)

Distributed Control Systems are inherently modular and hierarchical, requiring methodologies to rigorously prove overall system correctness from component specifications [23].

The Category **L′VarSpring** (Section 9 in [1]) provides the required mathematical structure. Controllers and physical plants are modeled as Spring objects, connected by morphisms that preserve energy and intertwine dynamics [1]. The existence of finite limits, particularly the Pullback (Proposition 9.10 in [1]), is the necessary algebraic tool for DCS verification.

The Pullback rigorously constructs the composite system resulting from coupling multiple components via constraints (e.g., communication requirements, shared physical interfaces) [1]. Because the resulting composite object is guaranteed to be a **L′VarSpring**, it inherits the full suite of stability guarantees—monotonic energy descent and fixed-point convergence [1]. This facilitates a compositional calculus for safety: stability is achieved and verified by architectural design [23].

The integrity of energy and synchronization across interfaces is further validated by the Noether-type momentum balance (Theorem 8.3 in [1]). For coupled systems, this theorem guarantees that generalized momentum $J_Y$ remains balanced, which is essential for verifying system dependability and coherence across the interfaces defined by the categorical pullbacks [1].

This **Algebraic Calculus for Modularity and Safety** means that if components $A$ and $B$ are individually certified Springs, their coupling via a Categorical Pullback enforcing constraint $C$ guarantees the combined system $A \times_C B$ is also inherently stable and convergent [1]. This shifts the focus of safety verification from exhaustive testing to formal, architectural validation, addressing key challenges in modular AI safety and certified digital twins [24].

## 5 Predictive Modeling of Systems with Non-Archimedean Collapse

This section examines the use of the $\tau_p$ topology in modeling systems that transition between continuous evolution and rapid, hierarchical collapse, a phenomenon common in biochemical and financial networks.

### 5.1 Dynamic Protein Folding and Conformational Changes

Protein folding involves navigating a complex potential energy landscape to reach a unique, low-energy native state [18]. This final state $\mathbf{x}^\star$ is precisely the fixed point of the Spring dynamics (Theorem 3.6 in [1]). The bi-topological structure is uniquely suited to model the dual kinetics of this process:

- **Smooth Dynamics ($\tau_\infty$)**: The R-NL models the continuous, diffusive motion across energy barriers and gradual changes in local conformation (e.g., radius of gyration) [25].
- **Discrete Dynamics ($\tau_p$)**: The ultrametric contraction models the hierarchical clustering of conformational states and the rapid, quantized transition across the transition state ensemble (TSE) [25]. This models the "perestroikas," or topological bifurcations, that govern the decisive folding steps [18].

The bi-topological convergence guarantees terminal behavior (Proposition 3.3 in [1]), certifying that the system collapses into the unique folded state $\mathbf{x}^\star$. This state is verified both by reaching the energy minimum ($d_\infty$ certification) and by achieving a stable, fixed structural hierarchy ($d_p$ certification).

### 5.2 Evolutionary Dynamics and Phylogenetic Tree Space

Phylogenetic trees are ultrametric structures modeling genealogical relationships [26]. The **L′VarSpring** framework models evolution as a dynamical system where the continuous dynamics ($\tau_\infty$) track smooth genetic drift (changes in branch lengths), while the discrete dynamics ($\tau_p$) track irreversible speciation events (topological change).

The $U_p$ adjunction (Theorem 9.13 in [1]) provides the canonical way to lift a hierarchical structure derived from an ultrametric distance (e.g., from genetic sequence data) into a full Spring dynamics. The iteration $L$ then drives the system toward a fixed point $\mathbf{x}^\star$ that represents the most robustly determined phylogenetic tree topology, balancing continuous evolutionary models with discrete structural constraints [27]. This systematic approach overcomes limitations faced by heuristic tree search algorithms [27].

### 5.3 Financial Crisis Modeling and Volatility Collapse

Classical financial models, predicated on smooth assumptions, fail catastrophically during systemic collapse ("Black Swan" events) [28]. The L'Varian Spring, with its adèlic outlook and ultrametric topology ($\tau_p$), addresses this failure by quantifying risk based on hierarchical dependency rather than simple Euclidean distance [29].

The financial state space $\mathcal{S}$ is modeled with dual dynamics: in the **Smooth Regime** ($\tau_\infty$), standard market volatility (e.g., GARCH models [28]) is approximated by the R-NL dynamics. In the **Crisis Regime** ($\tau_p$), when systemic risk reaches a critical threshold, the ultrametric contraction dominates, forcing a rapid, verifiable collapse to a fixed point $\mathbf{x}^\star$ (the crisis floor) [1]. This mechanism provides a rigorous model for catastrophic market contagion, where hierarchical dependencies lead to non-smooth, non-Archimedean failure overlooked by classical models [30]. The topological methodology is increasingly sought in economic dynamics to analyze non-linear systemic behavior and bifurcation [30].

## 6 The Categorical Framework for Compositional System Design

The architectural integrity of the L'Varian Spring is formalized by Pillar III—the Category **L′VarSpring**—which provides the algebraic tools necessary for building complex systems with guaranteed coherence [1].

### 6.1 Formalizing Modularity: Limits and Colimits in L′VarSpring

The fact that **L′VarSpring** admits finite limits (Proposition 9.6 in [1]) and finite colimits (Propositions 9.8, 9.9 in [1]) under mild regularity conditions provides the license for a compositional calculus.

Limits are the canonical mechanism for constraint enforcement. The Pullback (Proposition 9.10 in [1]) is essential for modeling constraint-coupled physical systems, guaranteeing that the resulting composite system retains the core dynamical integrity (stability and energy descent) of the L'Varian Spring structure. Colimits, specifically Coequalizers (Proposition 9.9 in [1]), are necessary for defining quotient systems by identifying states related by symmetry or bisimulation. This simplifies analysis by reducing the effective state space while preserving dynamical coherence, consistent with the coalgebraic view of the Spring [1].

Furthermore, **L′VarSpring** is enriched over a quantitative preorder defined by the contraction moduli $(\mathrm{Lip}_\infty, \mathrm{Lip}_p)$ (Proposition 9.14 in [1]). This quantitative enrichment provides an algebraic method for calculating the aggregate stability and safety margin of composed subsystems, transitioning categorical reasoning from qualitative correctness to verifiable quantitative assurance.

### 6.2 Adjunctions for Structure Generation and Abstraction

Adjunctions in **L′VarSpring** formalize the canonical relationship between the bi-topological framework and classical mathematics. The left adjoint $\mathsf{Free}^\eta_\infty$ (Theorem 9.11 in [1]) provides the canonical way to lift a classical Riemannian system (defined by $G$ and $E$) into a full, bi-topological Spring object. This is achieved by systematically constructing the contractive map $L$ and equipping the space with a compatible ultrametric structure, providing a prescriptive method for introducing the necessary discrete dynamics to ensure robust, certified convergence [1].

The concepts of Ind-objects (refinement) and Pro-objects (coarsening) further extend this utility by modeling multiscale analysis [1]. This is vital for complex simulations where discrete numerical models must rigorously converge to the underlying continuum physics. The

**L′VarSpring** structure ensures that the energy descent and contraction properties hold consistently across these changes in scale, guaranteeing the numerical stability of multi-resolution systems [1].

# 7 Synthesis and Strategic Outlook

## 7.1 Cross-Domain Synergy: Unifying Geometric Mechanics and Hierarchical Information Flow

The L'Varian Spring successfully provides a robust, mathematically unified framework for modeling Complex Adaptive Networks, addressing the scientific challenge of co-evolution of state and topology. The ability to enforce smooth, energy-minimizing paths while simultaneously ensuring stable hierarchical collapse unifies domains previously treated separately, from continuous fluid dynamics to topological data analysis.

| Domain | Advanced Use Case | L'Var Spring Feature | Rationale |
|---|---|---|---|
| Materials | Dynamic Metamaterials | Variable $G$, Curvature $\Gamma^{\flat}_{G}$ [1] | Effective inertia $\Rightarrow$ geometric nonlinear forces; bandgaps/precession [12]. |
| Computation | Mixed-Discrete OT | Dual Contraction $(d_\infty, d_p)$ [1] | Simultaneous optimization of continuous parameters and discrete hierarchical structure [5]. |
| Autonomy | Certified Trajectory Planning | Dual Convergence Certification [1] | Smooth path adherence ($\tau_\infty$) coupled with robust, discrete decision-making ($\tau_p$) [1]. |
| Systems | Distributed Control Verification | Category **L′VarSpring** Pullbacks [1] | Formal modeling of constraint-coupled subsystems guaranteeing stability by composition [1]. |
| Finance/Risk | Volatility Collapse (Black Swans) | Ultrametric Topology $\tau_p$ & Adèlic Outlook [1] | Models systemic risk and rapid, non-smooth hierarchical collapse overlooked by smooth models [28]. |

## 7.2 Strategic Recommendations for Research and Development

- **Develop Computational Homogenization for $G$:** Future research must focus on systematically deriving the complex, non-Euclidean elastic metric $G$ for highly non-linear engineered systems, such as metamaterials. This requires extending methods like Peridynamics incorporating Riemannian geometry [12] to accurately parameterize the inertial complexity, moving the R-NL from a theoretical concept to a deployable predictive tool in geometric mechanics.
- **Establish a Formal Verification Toolchain:** A dedicated software library based on the Category **L′VarSpring** is required to allow engineers to model and certify complex distributed control systems using the algebraic properties of limits and adjunctions [1]. This toolchain must utilize the modulus-enriched categorical structure (Proposition 9.14 in [1]) to enable quantitative stability budgeting, providing verifiable safety guarantees based on architectural composition.
- **Advance Adèlic Analysis Integration:** Further mathematical development is needed to integrate the adèlic outlook with practical applications in modeling systems prone to non-smooth collapse. Specifically, research should explore the spectral implications of the Spring-Laplacian for risk quantification, validating how $p$-adic volatility models [29] can be

fully unified with the smooth dynamics to create a comprehensive, certified risk prediction model for complex network failure [28].

## References

[1] L.E. L'Var, "The L'Var Spring as a Bi-Topological Elastic Object: Energy Descent, Dual Discretizations, and the Newtonian Limit," (Core manuscript, 2025).

[2] M. Ehrlacher et al., "Riemannian Newton methods for Kohn–Sham energy minimization," *PMC*, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11415448/.

[3] Z. B. et al., "A thorough study of Riemannian Newton's method," *arXiv:2506.09297*, https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.09297.

[4] ANR Project, "Supervised Ultrametric Learning," https://anr.fr/Project-ANR-20-CE23-0019.

[5] L. Wang et al., "Learning Ultrametric Trees for Optimal Transport Regression," in *AAAI*, 2024, https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/30052/31852.

[6] A. M. Robert, *A Course in p-adic Analysis*, GTM 198, Springer, 2000.

[7] Apache Spark, "Clustering—RDD-based API (v4.0.1)," https://spark.apache.org/docs/latest/mllib-clustering.html.

[8] J. Tang et al., "clusterMLD: hierarchical clustering for multivariate longitudinal data," *PMC*, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10584088/.

[9] M. Kh. et al., "p-Adic statistical field theory and deep belief networks," https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1305&context=mss_fac.

[10] R. Tibshirani, "Dual Methods and ADMM (notes)," https://www.stat.cmu.edu/~ryantibs/convexopt-S15/lectures/21-dual-meth.pdf.

[11] G. Riva et al., "Reduced-order modeling of dynamic mechanical metamaterials," *J. Appl. Mech.*, vol. 90, no. 9, p. 091009, 2023.

[12] Y. Z. et al., "Riemannian-geometry-based peridynamics homogenization for cellular metamaterials," https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387529561.

[13] A. Carcaterra et al., "Trends and challenges in the mechanics of complex materials," *Phil. Trans. A*, vol. 374, p. 20150139, 2016.

[14] A. K. et al., "Peridynamics modeling of cellular elastomeric metamaterials: wave isolation," https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370763420.

[15] M. K. et al., "Learning hydrodynamic equations for active matter," *PNAS*, vol. 120, e2206994120, 2023.

[16] A. Aquillen, "Lecture notes: Active matter," https://astro.pas.rochester.edu/~aquillen/.

[17] M. J. et al., "ML for topological defects in nematics," *Phys. Rev. Research*, vol. 6, p. 013259, 2024.

[18] A. Goryunov et al., "Local topology and perestroikas in protein folding dynamics," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 111, p. 024406, 2025.

[19] A. Yale Eng., "Faster and more graceful robot (news)," https://engineering.yale.edu/.

[20] C. Mavrogiannis et al., "Abstracting road traffic via topological braids," 2023, https://personalrobotics.cs.washington.edu/.

[21] M. Gehr et al., "AI2: Safety and Robustness Certification of Neural Networks with Abstract Interpretation," in *IEEE S&P*, 2018.

[22] P. J. Antsaklis, "Modeling and Verification of Distributed Control Systems," https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236006372.

[23] S. B. et al., "Modeling and Analysis of DCS: A Methodology," *Processes*, 2024.

[24] E. H. Glaessgen and D. S. Stoudt, "The Digital Twin Paradigm for Future NASA and U.S. Air Force Vehicles," in *53rd AIAA/ASME/ASCE/AHS/ASC Structures, Structural Dynamics and Materials Conference*, 2012.

[25] F. Wolynes et al., "Topological determinants of protein folding," *PNAS*, 1995, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC124342/.

[26] N. Curien, "Random ultrametric trees and applications," *ESAIM Proc. & Surveys*, 2017.

[27] B. St. John et al., "The space of ultrametric phylogenetic trees," *Bull. Math. Biol.*, vol. 78, 2016.

[28] R. Engle & A. Patton, "What good is a volatility model?," NYU Stern note, https://www.stern.nyu.edu/rengle/EnglePattonQF.pdf.

[29] V. Dragovich, "Adelic theory of stock market," *arXiv:1102.2515*.

[30] Mathematics (MDPI) Special Issue, "Topology Unveiled: A New Horizon for Economic and Financial Modeling," 2025.

[31] H. Attouch, J. Bolte, and B. F. Svaiter, "Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems," *Math. Programming*, vol. 137, no. 1–2, pp. 91–129, 2013.

[32] E. A. Lee and S. A. Seshia, *Introduction to Embedded Systems: A Cyber-Physical Systems Approach*, 2nd ed., MIT Press, 2017.