

Theory of Latent Geometric Regions

AL_78

Independent Researcher

Working Document — April 2026

Abstract

This work proposes a novel conceptual framework for quantum gravity phenomenology based on the notion of **latent geometric capacity**. We distinguish between *space* — the pre-geometric capacity to contain adjacency relations — and the *universe* — the actually occupied classical volume. Within this picture, the orientation sign $\mu_v = \pm 1$ of spin-network vertices in Loop Quantum Gravity is reinterpreted: $\mu_v = -1$ corresponds not to a gauge artifact, but to *unactualized capacity* — geometric potential that exists topologically but contributes negatively to the volume operator. Similarly, negative-tension branes in M-theory compactifications are recast as *compressed capacity* stored in compactified dimensions.

We postulate that cosmological expansion proceeds via **geometric annihilation**: the dynamical conversion of negative-capacity regions (V_-) into positive classical volume (V_+) at their interface. The effective 4D dynamics are governed by the standard Einstein equations supplemented by an effective energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}^{(V_-)}$ sourced by this latent capacity.

The primary contribution of this paper is **conceptual and interpretative**, not computational. We identify a unifying category — *latent geometric capacity* — that bridges two major but often disconnected approaches to quantum gravity. Phenomenological consequences are outlined in broad terms, including potential imprints on the primordial power spectrum, quasinormal mode spectra of compact objects, and logarithmic corrections to black hole entropy. All numerical estimates are explicitly identified as illustrative placeholders pending first-principles derivations from spin-foam dynamics and stabilized string compactifications.

The framework is offered as a **heuristic program** aimed at stimulating further work on the physical interpretation of orientation degrees of freedom in quantum geometry and their possible cosmological role.

Contents

1	Motivation: Expansion as Symmetry Breaking	3
2	Postulates	3
2.1	Coherent Domains of Inverse Orientation (LQG)	3
2.2	Compressed Capacity as Boundary Conditions (M-Theory)	3
2.3	Geometric Annihilation as Actualization	4
3	Mathematical Formalism	4
3.1	Volume Operator in LQG (Large-Scale Limit)	4
3.1.1	Schematic Form	4
3.1.2	Order of Magnitude Estimate	5
3.2	Latent Region Contributions (M-Theory)	5
3.3	Effective Energy-Momentum Tensor (Bubble Wall Model)	5

4	Predictions: Theoretical and Observational Status	6
4.1	Summary Table (as of April 2026)	6
4.2	Representative Quantities (Theoretical)	6
4.3	Where to Look: Proposed Experimental Tests	7
5	Cosmological Consequences	7
5.1	Potential Correction	7
5.2	Primary Power Spectrum	7
5.3	Dark Energy Correction	8
6	Black Holes, QNM, and Wormholes	8
6.1	Entropy Correction	8
6.2	QNM Frequency Shifts (Population Analysis)	8
6.3	Wormhole Conditions	9
7	Limitations and Open Problems	10
8	Future Experimental Directions	10
8.1	High-Precision CMB and Large-Scale Structure Surveys	10
8.2	Gravitational-Wave Population and Ringdown Spectroscopy	11
8.3	Analog Quantum Simulation of Spin-Network Volumes	11
8.4	High-Redshift Structure and Cross-Correlation Anomalies	12
8.5	Summary of Experimental Targets	12
9	Conclusions	13
9.1	Summary of the Proposal	13
9.2	Principal Novelty	13
9.3	Status of Predictions	13
9.4	Limitations and Open Directions	14
9.5	Closing Remarks	14
A	Formula Summary	14

1 Motivation: Expansion as Symmetry Breaking

Standard cosmology treats the expanding universe as a scaling of a pre-existing manifold. We propose a different conceptual framework: **expansion as spontaneous symmetry breaking of the adjacency graph**.

We distinguish **space** — the capacity to contain geometry — from the **universe** — the actually occupied volume. Space exists as a graph of possible adjacencies: spin network structure in Loop Quantum Gravity, brane-world configurations in M-theory. **Latent geometric regions** correspond to orientation-reversed vertices or negative-tension branes — configurations that carry negative volume expectation because they represent unactualized capacity.

The universe’s expansion corresponds to the dynamical conversion of pre-geometric capacity into classical volume. This is the “universe” filling the “space.” We consider expansion not as stretching of the existing, but as the filling of previously unoriented or oppositely oriented volume, **similar to how magnetization aligns random spins in a ferromagnet**.

The theory below formalizes this picture. Postulates 1–3 define latent geometric regions in established frameworks. Sections 4–5 derive observable consequences. The status of predictions — as of April 2026 — is assessed in Section 3.1.

2 Postulates

2.1 Coherent Domains of Inverse Orientation (LQG)

In the spin network description of space, each vertex v carries an orientation factor $\mu_v = \pm 1$. The positive value ($\mu_v = +1$) corresponds to actualized geometric volume. The negative value ($\mu_v = -1$) corresponds to **latent geometric capacity** — adjacency structure that exists as potential but carries negative volume contribution.

A single isolated $\mu_v = -1$ is a gauge artifact (left-handed triad orientation). However, a **connected cluster of such vertices** — a Coherent Domain of Inverse Orientation — constitutes a physical object with negative volume due to violation of global manifold orientation:

$$\hat{V}_\Omega |\gamma_{\text{inv}}\rangle = -\ell_P^3 \sqrt{|q_v|} |\gamma_{\text{inv}}\rangle, \quad \mu_v = -1 \quad (1)$$

where $q_v = \det(g_{\text{discr}})$ and $\ell_P = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$.

Origin: Inverse orientation arises from topological defects in the capacity graph — local failures of triad consistency that create “holes” where geometry can later actualize. In standard LQG, orientation is determined by triad consistency; local causality violations or topological defects can induce $\mu_v = -1$. Numerical simulations (spin foam dynamics, Monte Carlo) are needed to estimate $P(\mu_v = -1)$ in typical states and the minimal size of physically significant coherent domains.

Connection to Section 0: The negative eigenvalue represents latent capacity — unaligned spins before magnetization. Expansion of the universe corresponds to dynamical conversion of $\mu_v = -1$ domains to $\mu_v = +1$ through geometric annihilation (Postulate 3).

Connection to Section 3.1: The schematic volume operator (3.1) implements this postulate explicitly, with μ_v distinguishing actualized from latent capacity.

2.2 Compressed Capacity as Boundary Conditions (M-Theory)

In compactified M-theory, orientifold planes with negative tension represent **boundary conditions for compactified dimensions** that store information about potentially accessible degrees of freedom. These boundaries carry **compressed geometric capacity** — dimensional reduction configurations where the “room” of extra dimensions contributes negatively to effective 4D volume:

$$\delta V_{4D} = -\kappa |T_p| \int_{CY_3} \star_6 \left(e^{-\phi} \text{Re } \Omega_3 \right) \quad (2)$$

where $|T_p| > 0$ is absolute tension, $\kappa = (2\pi)^7 g_s \ell_s^8$ (model-dependent).

Origin: Negative tension arises in flux compactifications or with orientifold planes. In this picture, the O-plane is treated not as an object, but as a boundary condition for compactified dimensions that store information about potentially accessible degrees of freedom. When a brane moves, it annihilates with part of this capacity, which appears effectively in 4D as a transition $V_- \rightarrow V_+$.

Connection to Section 0: The negative contribution $\delta V_{4D} < 0$ represents capacity compressed into extra dimensions — not absence of space, but its topological storage in latent form. Decompactification or brane dynamics can release this capacity, contributing to effective expansion.

Connection to Section 2.3: After compactification, this induces effective metric deformation with $k < 0$ for regions dominated by compressed capacity.

2.3 Geometric Annihilation as Actualization

The filling of latent capacity — conversion of unoriented domains to oriented volume — proceeds through geometric annihilation. Combination of positive and negative contributions in leading order gives:

$$V_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{v \in \Omega} \mu_v V_v + \delta V_{\text{brane}}, \quad V_{\text{eff}} < \sum_v |V_v| \quad (3)$$

The effective volume is less than the sum of absolute capacities because annihilation occurs at the interface between actualized and latent regions.

Stability Condition: To prevent runaway conversion (collapse of all capacity into immediate actualization):

$$\frac{|V_-|}{V_+} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (4)$$

Stricter dynamical constraints follow from modified Einstein equations (see Section 2.3).

Connection to Section 0: This is the mathematical description of magnetization — alignment of randomly oriented spins into a coherent domain.

Connection to Section 5: The stability bound (1.4) ensures wormhole configurations remain metastable against geometric collapse.

3 Mathematical Formalism

3.1 Volume Operator in LQG (Large-Scale Limit)

3.1.1 Schematic Form

Convenient schematic form for the discrete volume operator:

$$\hat{V}_\Omega = \sum_{v \in \Omega} \mu_v \sqrt[3]{\frac{i}{48} \sum_{e_I, e_J, e_K} \epsilon^{ijk} \hat{J}_i^{(e_I)} \hat{J}_j^{(e_J)} \hat{J}_k^{(e_K)}} \quad (5)$$

where \hat{J}_i^e are flux operators associated with edges e incident to vertex v .

Critical Note on Additivity: In this form, the operator is non-additive: the sum of volumes of two adjacent vertices does not equal the volume of their union. We specify that (2.1) applies **in the large-scale limit** or with smeared volume operators (e.g., Quantum Reduced Loop Gravity approach). Otherwise, $V_+ + V_- \neq 0$ during annihilation, creating an “incompressible remainder” of geometry.

3.1.2 Order of Magnitude Estimate

If N_v vertices contribute roughly one Planck volume each and a fraction f_{inv} are inverted:

$$|V_-| \sim f_{\text{inv}} N_v \ell_P^3 \quad (6)$$

Numerical example: For $N_v \sim 10^2$, $f_{\text{inv}} \sim 0.1$:

$$|V_-| \sim 10 \ell_P^3 \approx 10^{-104} \text{ m}^3$$

Very small in SI units, large in Planck units.

Connection to Section 4: Typical illustrative value $|V_-| \sim 10^{-30} \text{ m}^3$ used in entropy and cosmology calculations corresponds to larger coherent regions or brane contributions; this is an arbitrary placeholder, not a derived prediction (see Section 3.2).

3.2 Latent Region Contributions (M-Theory)

From dimensional reduction on a Calabi-Yau 3-fold, terms of type (1.2) collect. Representative toy model estimates:

$$\delta V_{4D} \sim -\ell_{\text{char}}^3 \quad (\text{per brane, model-dependent}) \quad (7)$$

Note on scale: The value of the characteristic length ℓ_{char} depends on the compactification geometry. The numerical placeholder 10^{-30} m^3 (corresponding to $\ell_{\text{char}} \sim 10^{-15} \text{ m}$) is chosen solely for dimensional illustration as a mesoscopic scale intermediate between the Planck volume ($\sim 10^{-104} \text{ m}^3$) and atomic scales. No specific string compactification is claimed to yield exactly this value; it serves as an order-of-magnitude proxy for estimating potentially observable effects. A first-principles derivation of ℓ_{char} from a stabilized Calabi-Yau compactification remains an open problem.

Induced metric deformation:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a(t)^2 \left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\Omega^2 \right] \quad (8)$$

with $k < 0$ for latent-region-dominated areas.

Connection to Section 2.3: The effective energy-momentum tensor incorporates both LQG and brane contributions through ρ_{lat} .

3.3 Effective Energy-Momentum Tensor (Bubble Wall Model)

On large scales, regions with latent geometric regions require a modified description. Instead of a simple perfect fluid, we propose a “**rigid 2D fluid**” tensor for the interface between V_+ and V_- :

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(V_-)} = \text{diag}(-\rho, p_r, p_\perp, p_\perp) \quad (9)$$

with equation of state:

$$\begin{aligned} p_r &= -\rho \quad (\text{tension along radius}) \\ p_\perp &= 0 \quad (\text{angular pressure}) \end{aligned}$$

This aligns with the physics of a “bubble wall” absorbing latent volume.

Modified Einstein equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G \left(T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{std}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(V_-)} \right) \quad (10)$$

Connection to Section 4.1: The cosmological constant receives a topological correction $\delta\Omega_{\text{top}} \sim 10^{-3}$ from the ρ_{lat} contribution (illustrative value, not derived).

Connection to Section 5.3: Violation of the null energy condition $T_{\mu\nu} k^\mu k^\nu < 0$ enables wormhole stability.

4 Predictions: Theoretical and Observational Status

4.1 Summary Table (as of April 2026)

Prediction	Sec.	Theoretical Status	Observational Status (Apr 2026)	Assessment
Oscillations in $P_R(k)$ at $\ell \gtrsim 2000$	4.2	Predicted: $\delta n_s \propto \Gamma^2/H_{\text{inf}}^2$; fiducial Γ tuned to $\delta n_s \sim 10^{-4}$	Not detected. DESI DR1/DR2 (2025) hints at dark energy evolution, but no primordial oscillations.	Pending
QNM frequency shifts $\Delta f/f \sim V_- /V_+$	5.2	Predicted: linear scaling; illustrative 10^{-4} adopted	Unverified. LIGO O4 completed (Nov 2025) with ~ 250 candidates; requires hierarchical population analysis.	Pending
Negative $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$ on quantum simulators	–	Theoretically possible	Not implemented. No published IBM/Google results for LGR operator.	Proposed
Modified BH entropy S_{BH}	5.1	Predicted	Not directly testable	Speculative
Wormhole stability conditions	5.3	Predicted	No observational candidate known	Speculative

Table 1: Summary of predictions and current observational status.

4.2 Representative Quantities (Theoretical)

Quantity	Symbol	Physical Meaning	Role in Theory
Planck length	$\ell_P = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$	Fundamental scale of quantum gravity	Sets minimal geometric resolution; $ V_- $ measured in ℓ_P^3 units
Latent geometric region	$ V_- $	Volume of unactualized capacity	Source of geometric annihilation; bounded by (1.4). The magnitude is unknown; range from $\ell_P^3 \sim 10^{-104} \text{ m}^3$ up to GUT scale $\ell_{\text{GUT}}^3 \sim 10^{-94} \text{ m}^3$ or larger. 10^{-30} m^3 is an arbitrary placeholder .
Conversion rate	Γ	Rate of capacity actualization	Determines oscillation frequency in power spectrum; phenomenological parameter.
Latent fraction	$ V_- /V_+$	Ratio of unactualized to actualized capacity	Must satisfy $\ll 1/2$ for stability; controls observable effect magnitudes.
Relative QNM shift	$\Delta f/f$	Fractional change in ring-down frequency	Probe of $ V_- $ near compact objects; order $ V_- /V_+$.

Table 2: Representative quantities and their theoretical status.

4.3 Where to Look: Proposed Experimental Tests

- **Small-scale/high-multipole CMB measurements** ($\ell \gtrsim 2000$) for oscillation features from (4.2).
- **Gravitational wave population analysis** with hierarchical models (LIGO O5, Einstein Telescope) — $|V_-|/V_+$ as hyperparameter.
- **Large-scale structure and growth history reconstructions** (DESI, Euclid) for fine $\delta\Omega$ contributions.
- **Quantum simulation on superconducting qubit platforms** (IBM, Google) for emulating coherent domains — **proposed, not yet implemented.**

5 Cosmological Consequences

5.1 Potential Correction

Inclusion of topological correction in scalar/inflationary potential:

$$V(\phi) = V_0(\phi) + \Lambda_{\text{top}} e^{-\beta\phi}, \quad \Lambda_{\text{top}} = \frac{|V_-|}{\ell_P^4} < 0 \quad (11)$$

Generates localized features/oscillations in the spectrum.

Connection to Section 4.2: The parameter $\beta \sim 0.1\text{--}1$ determines oscillation amplitude in the power spectrum.

5.2 Primary Power Spectrum

Scale-dependent correction to the tilt:

$$P_R(k) = A_s \left(\frac{k}{k_0} \right)^{n_s - 1 + \delta n_s(k)}, \quad \delta n_s(k) = \frac{\Gamma^2}{H_{\text{inf}}^2} \exp\left(-\frac{k^2}{k_\Gamma^2}\right) \quad (12)$$

with $k_\Gamma = \Gamma/\ell_P$.

Note on sign: The exponential suppression e^{-k^2/k_Γ^2} applies if annihilation occurs rapidly at early times and then decays. For continuously ongoing annihilation (expansion into “fresh” latent regions), small-scale behavior requires re-examination — possible enhancement rather than suppression.

Theoretical prediction: The amplitude of the oscillatory correction scales as $\delta n_s(k) \propto \Gamma^2/H_{\text{inf}}^2$. The conversion rate Γ is a phenomenological parameter not derivable from first principles within the current framework. For the purpose of assessing observational prospects, a fiducial value $\Gamma \sim 10^{-18} \text{ s}^{-1}$ is adopted. This choice yields $\delta n_s \sim 10^{-4}$, an amplitude deliberately tuned to lie just below the current upper limits from *Planck* 2018 small-scale power spectrum constraints ($\delta n_s \lesssim 10^{-2}$ at $\ell \gtrsim 2000$). This ensures the model is not already excluded, while remaining falsifiable with improved CMB polarization sensitivity or 21-cm power spectrum measurements. The true value of Γ is unconstrained and could be orders of magnitude smaller.

Observational status (April 2026): DESI DR1/DR2 (2025) achieved precision measurements of BAO, growth rate $f\sigma_8$, and dark energy evolution. No detection of primordial power spectrum oscillations at the predicted scale.

5.3 Dark Energy Correction

Treating ρ_{lat} from (2.4) as a dark sector contribution:

$$\Omega_\Lambda = \Omega_\Lambda^{(0)} + \delta\Omega_{\text{top}}, \quad \delta\Omega_{\text{top}} \sim 10^{-3} \quad (13)$$

for representative model parameters (illustrative value, not derived).

Note: DESI 2025 “intriguing hints for evolving dark energy” (phantom crossing at $z \approx 0.5$, 2.8–4.2 σ tension with Λ CDM) are **not** this effect, but suggest the sector may harbor unmodeled physics.

6 Black Holes, QNM, and Wormholes

6.1 Entropy Correction

Accounting for internal microstates with latent regions yields a logarithmic correction:

$$S_{\text{BH}} = \frac{A}{4\ell_P^2} - \pi \ln \left| \frac{V_{\text{int}}}{\ell_P^3} \right| + \dots \quad (14)$$

Such terms may carry information about internal microstates and reduce tension with information loss arguments.

Connection to Section 3.1: For astrophysical black holes, the effect of $\pi \ln |V_{\text{int}}/\ell_P^3|$ is small; for microscopic black holes ($\sim 10^{12}$ kg), potentially significant.

6.2 QNM Frequency Shifts (Population Analysis)

Heuristic relation for quasinormal mode frequency shift:

$$\frac{\Delta f}{f} \sim \frac{|V_-|}{V_+} \quad (15)$$

The fractional frequency shift is estimated to scale linearly with the local latent fraction. The numerical value of this fraction is **not fixed** by the theory. A representative order of magnitude $|V_-|/V_+ \sim 10^{-4}$ is adopted in the discussion below solely for concreteness in estimating detector sensitivity requirements. This value is chosen because:

- (1) It is sufficiently small to satisfy the stability bound $|V_-|/V_+ < 1/2$ from Postulate 3.
- (2) It yields a shift $\Delta f/f \sim 10^{-4}$, which lies below the current single-event sensitivity of LIGO/Virgo ($\sim 5\text{--}10\%$) but above the projected stacked-population sensitivity of next-generation detectors, making it a plausible target for future searches.

No observed black hole is claimed to possess this specific latent fraction; it is an illustrative benchmark.

Critical note on methodology: Current QNM frequency measurement accuracy is $\sim 5\text{--}10\%$ for most events due to template systematics (SEOBNRv5 vs. PhenomX). A shift $\Delta f/f \sim 10^{-4}$ is indistinguishable in single events.

Required approach: Bayesian population analysis with a hierarchical model, where $|V_-|/V_+$ is a hyperparameter common to the entire black hole population. Expected sensitivity requires stacking hundreds of events through LIGO O5.

Observational status (April 2026): LIGO O4 completed November 2025 with ~ 250 candidate events, 128 confirmed (GWTC-4.0). Population analysis with latent region hyperparameter not yet published.

6.3 Wormhole Conditions

Effective energy-momentum tensor with latent regions can violate the null energy condition:

$$T_{\mu\nu}k^\mu k^\nu \sim -\frac{|V_-|}{V_+\ell_P^2} < 0 \quad (16)$$

Rough stability condition (order of magnitude) for throat radius R_{throat} :

$$\frac{|V_-|}{V_+} \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3 R_{\text{throat}}}} \quad (17)$$

Note: Some estimates drop the square root; the required ratio changes to $\sim \sqrt{10}$ but remains $\ll 1$.

Connection to Postulate 3: The stability bound (1.4) ensures wormhole configurations remain metastable against geometric collapse.

7 Limitations and Open Problems

Issue	Current Status	Needed Work	Connection
Origin of $\mu_v = -1$ domains	Postulated	Spin foam dynamics, Monte Carlo for minimal coherent domain size	Post. 1, Sec. 2.1
Mechanism for $T_p < 0$	Postulated	Flux compactifications, specific CY manifolds	Post. 2, Sec. 2.2
Stability of V_- -dominated configurations	Phenomenological bound (1.4)	Modified Einstein eqs., numerical relativity	Post. 3, Sec. 2.3
Quantitative calibration of $ V_- $	Unknown; illustrative placeholders used	Determination of $P(\mu_v = -1)$ from spin-foam dynamics; derivation of 4D volume deficit from stabilized flux compactifications in M-theory	Post. 1,2; all predictions in Secs. 4–5 depend on this scale
High- ℓ oscillation detection	Not observed	Improved CMB polarization; re-examine sign of exponential in (4.2) for ongoing annihilation	Sec. 4.2
QNM shift isolation	Requires population analysis	Bayesian hierarchical models with $ V_- /V_+$ as hyperparameter	Sec. 5.2
Quantum vacuum decay	Not addressed	Estimate probability of $V_+ \rightarrow V_-$ tunneling; if high, V_- regions collapse to wormholes or Big Rip	–
Quantum simulation	Not implemented	Proposal for superconducting qubit implementation of coherent domains	Sec. 3.3
Cross-correlations among anomalies	Not searched	DESI + JWST high- z structure + CMB small-scale	Sec. 3.3

Table 3: Limitations and open problems.

8 Future Experimental Directions

The conceptual framework of latent geometric regions (LGR) is constructed to be falsifiable. Although first-principles calculations of key parameters ($|V_-|$, Γ) are not yet available, the theory makes qualitative predictions that can be tested with forthcoming experiments. Below we outline four concrete observational and experimental avenues, their scientific goals, and the implications of potential outcomes for the LGR hypothesis.

8.1 High-Precision CMB and Large-Scale Structure Surveys

Experiment/Observatory: CMB-S4, Simons Observatory, LiteBIRD; DESI (ongoing), Euclid, Roman Space Telescope.

Goal: Detect or constrain primordial power spectrum oscillations at high multipoles ($\ell \gtrsim 2000$) and measure the dark energy equation of state $w(z)$ with sub-percent accuracy.

LGR Signature: Geometric annihilation during inflation imprints oscillatory features in $P_R(k)$ with a characteristic scale-dependent amplitude (Eq. 4.2). Additionally, the conversion of latent capacity contributes an effective dark energy component that may exhibit a small, late-time deviation from $w = -1$ (Eq. 4.3).

Implications of Results:

- *Detection of oscillations:* Would provide strong evidence for a new scale Γ in the early universe, consistent with a finite rate of capacity actualization. The shape and amplitude would constrain Γ/H_{inf} , offering a direct window into pre-geometric dynamics.
- *Null result (upper limits $\delta n_s < 10^{-4}$):* Would push the fiducial conversion rate to values $\Gamma \ll 10^{-18} \text{ s}^{-1}$, suggesting that geometric annihilation either completed before observable inflation or proceeds at a rate too slow to leave a detectable imprint in the CMB.
- *Precision $w(z)$ measurements:* A detection of $\delta\Omega_{\text{top}} \sim 10^{-3}$ would favor LGR as a source of residual cosmic acceleration; conversely, a stringent bound $|\delta\Omega_{\text{top}}| < 10^{-4}$ would rule out the simplest bubble-wall models (Sec. 2.3) and require fine-tuning of the latent fraction.

8.2 Gravitational-Wave Population and Ringdown Spectroscopy

Experiment/Observatory: LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA (O5 and beyond), Einstein Telescope, Cosmic Explorer, LISA.

Goal: Perform hierarchical Bayesian population analysis of compact binary mergers to measure deviations from General Relativity in the quasinormal mode (QNM) spectrum.

LGR Signature: The presence of a latent geometric region fraction $|V_-|/V_+$ near black holes induces a fractional shift in QNM frequencies $\Delta f/f \sim |V_-|/V_+$ (Eq. 5.2). This shift is common to the entire black hole population if latent regions are universally present.

Methodology: Stacked analysis of $\mathcal{O}(1000)$ events (expected by O5) with a hierarchical model treating $|V_-|/V_+$ as a hyperparameter. This suppresses individual-event systematics and isolates the coherent deviation.

Implications of Results:

- *Detection of a non-zero $\Delta f/f$ at 10^{-4} level:* Would directly confirm the existence of negative-capacity domains in strong-gravity regimes and provide the first empirical measurement of $|V_-|/V_+$.
- *Null result at projected sensitivity:* Would constrain $|V_-|/V_+ < 10^{-5}$, placing severe limits on the abundance of coherent inverse-orientation domains and challenging the stability condition (1.4) unless latent regions are screened near compact objects.
- *Frequency-dependent shifts:* If LISA observes supermassive black hole ringdowns, a different scaling with mass could test the dimensional dependence of $|V_-|$.

8.3 Analog Quantum Simulation of Spin-Network Volumes

Platform: Superconducting qubit processors (IBM Quantum, Google Sycamore), trapped ions, or Rydberg atom arrays.

Goal: Emulate a small spin-network graph with tunable edge fluxes and measure the expectation value of the volume operator $\langle \hat{V}_\Omega \rangle$ in states containing coherent domains of inverse orientation.

LGR Signature: In a simplified few-vertex graph (e.g., a tetrahedron), preparing a superposition of gauge-inequivalent orientation sectors should yield a negative contribution to $\langle \hat{V}_\Omega \rangle$ proportional to the amplitude of the $\mu_v = -1$ cluster.

Proposed Experiment:

1. Encode flux operators \hat{J}_i^e as Pauli strings on qubits representing spin-1/2 representations.
2. Prepare the analog of a “single inverted vertex” state and a “coherent domain” state.
3. Measure the expectation value of the discretized volume operator (Eq. 2.1) via Hamiltonian averaging or iterative quantum phase estimation.

Implications of Results:

- *Observation of negative $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$* : Would validate the core quantum-gravitational premise that orientation reversal yields a physically distinct, negative volume phase—a direct confirmation of the LGR ontology.
- *Null result (only positive volume)*: Would suggest either that coherent domains do not survive quantum superpositions or that the volume operator’s negative spectrum is an artifact of the continuum limit, forcing a revision of Postulate 1.

8.4 High-Redshift Structure and Cross-Correlation Anomalies

Experiment/Observatory: JWST (high- z galaxy candidates), DESI, Euclid, Roman (galaxy clustering and weak lensing).

Goal: Search for correlated anomalies in the growth of structure that deviate from Λ CDM expectations at early times.

LGR Signature: If geometric annihilation is ongoing, the effective energy-momentum tensor (2.5) may induce scale-dependent growth modifications or a time-varying $\sigma_8(z)$. Current DESI hints of evolving dark energy and JWST observations of unexpectedly mature high- z galaxies could be early indicators of such modified dynamics.

Implications of Results:

- *Correlated deviations in $f\sigma_8(z)$ and $P_R(k)$* : Would motivate a joint fit to LGR parameters, potentially breaking degeneracies between Γ and $|V_-|$.
- *Consistency with Λ CDM at all scales*: Would constrain the magnitude of $|V_-|$ to be cosmologically negligible, relegating LGR effects to the very early universe or microscopic scales.

8.5 Summary of Experimental Targets

Observable	Experiment	LGR Parameter Constrained	Timeframe
CMB $P_R(k)$ oscillations	CMB-S4, Simons Obs.	Γ/H_{inf}	2030s
QNM population shift	LIGO O5, ET	$ V_- / V_+ $	2028–2035
Negative $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$	IBM/Google simulators	$\mu_v = -1$ amplitude	2026–2030
Growth of structure	DESI, Euclid, Roman	$\delta\Omega_{\text{top}}, \Gamma$	ongoing–2030s

Table 4: Summary of proposed experimental tests, the LGR parameters they constrain, and approximate timeframes.

The results of these experiments—whether positive or negative—will decisively shape the status of the LGR framework. A detection would elevate it from a heuristic proposal to a physically grounded theory; a robust null result would delineate the boundaries of its applicability and motivate deeper investigation into the quantum dynamics of orientation.

9 Conclusions

9.1 Summary of the Proposal

We have advanced the hypothesis that the orientation sign of quanta of space in Loop Quantum Gravity, and the negative tension of certain branes in M-theory, are manifestations of a single underlying entity: **latent geometric capacity**. In this view, the expansion of the universe is not a mere scaling of a pre-existing manifold, but the progressive actualization of pre-geometric potential — the filling of “rooms” that existed only as adjacency structure before being endowed with positive volume.

9.2 Principal Novelty

The core originality of this work resides in **reinterpreting established mathematical objects**. Neither the volume operator of LQG nor the effective action of orientifold planes is new. What is new is:

- The **ontological claim** that clusters of inversely oriented spin-network vertices constitute a physically distinct phase of geometry, not a gauge redundancy.
- The **categorical unification** of this LQG construct with negative-tension objects in string/M-theory under the shared concept of *capacity awaiting actualization*.
- The proposal that the interface dynamics of V_+ and V_- regions — geometric annihilation — provides a qualitatively new picture of cosmic expansion.

9.3 Status of Predictions

We have deliberately refrained from presenting firm numerical predictions. All quantities labeled as estimates — the characteristic anti-volume $|V_-|$, the conversion rate Γ , the fractional QNM shift $\Delta f/f$ — are **illustrative benchmarks**, not derived results. Their values were chosen to demonstrate the *scale* at which future experiments might become sensitive to the proposed effects, and to ensure compatibility with existing bounds. A first-principles calculation of these parameters remains an open problem, explicitly flagged in the Limitations section.

The observational status as of April 2026 is summarized below:

Proposed Signature	Status
Oscillations in $P_R(k)$ at high ℓ	Not detected; DESI DR2 hints at dark energy evolution but no primordial feature of this type.
QNM frequency shifts $\Delta f/f \sim 10^{-4}$	Unverified; LIGO O4 ringdown analysis ongoing, requires population stacking.
Quantum simulation of negative $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$	Proposed; not yet implemented on available platforms.

The theory is **falsifiable in principle** — improved CMB polarization data, next-generation gravitational wave detectors, and advances in analog quantum simulation can probe the parameter space where effects are expected. However, the current lack of a dynamical derivation for Γ and $|V_-|$ means that a null result would not yet exclude the conceptual core of the proposal; it would only constrain its unknown parameters.

9.4 Limitations and Open Directions

The framework faces several outstanding challenges:

- **Microscopic origin of inverted domains:** The probability $P(\mu_v = -1)$ in physical spin-network states must be computed from spin-foam amplitudes or canonical LQG dynamics.
- **Stability of negative-capacity regions:** Configurations with $T_{\mu\nu}^{(V^-)}$ violate the null energy condition. A complete analysis of quantum vacuum decay is required.
- **Specific compactification realizations:** The link to M-theory is currently schematic. Explicit flux compactifications yielding negative-tension contributions without destabilizing moduli are needed.
- **Cosmological embedding:** A full history from a pre-geometric phase through geometric annihilation to late-time acceleration requires solving the modified Einstein equations in a realistic cosmological setting.

9.5 Closing Remarks

This document is intended as a **programmatic sketch**, not a definitive theory. Its value lies in proposing a shift of perspective: from asking “what is the equation of state of dark energy?” to asking “what is the geometric status of unoccupied adjacency?” We suggest that the orientation degrees of freedom present in canonical quantum gravity may carry physical meaning beyond gauge choice, and that this meaning could connect, at a deep level, to the very fact that the universe is larger today than it was yesterday.

We invite the community to criticize, refine, or refute the specific conjectures advanced here. Even their refutation would serve the broader goal of clarifying the physical interpretation of the mathematical structures that arise when spacetime is quantized.

A Formula Summary

Core Operators

$$\hat{V}_\Omega = \sum_{v \in \Omega} \mu_v \sqrt[3]{\frac{i}{48} \sum \epsilon^{ijk} \hat{j}_i^{(e_I)} \hat{j}_j^{(e_J)} \hat{j}_k^{(e_K)}} \quad [\text{large-scale limit}]$$

$$\delta V_{4D} = -\kappa |T_p| \int_{CY_3} \star_6 \left(e^{-\phi} \text{Re } \Omega_3 \right)$$

Thermodynamic/Cosmological

$$S_{\text{BH}} = \frac{A}{4\ell_P^2} - \pi \ln \left| \frac{V_{\text{int}}}{\ell_P^3} \right|$$

$$P_R(k) = A_s \left(\frac{k}{k_0} \right)^{n_s - 1 + \frac{\Gamma^2}{H_{\text{inf}}^2} e^{-k^2/k_\Gamma^2}} \quad [\text{sign under review}]$$

Gravitational

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G \left(T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{std}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{(V^-)} \right)$$

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(V^-)} = \text{diag}(-\rho, -\rho, 0, 0) \quad [\text{bubble wall model}]$$

Note: Expressions intentionally semi-phenomenological. Operator ordering, exact calibrations, and prefactors require embedding in chosen regularization/compactification. Terminology “Latent Geometric Region” (LGR) preferred over “negative volume” to emphasize topological rather than metric interpretation. All numerical estimates are illustrative placeholders unless explicitly derived; see Section 3.2 and Revision Notes in Sections 2.2, 4.2, 5.2.

References

- [1] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [2] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, “Quantum theory of geometry. I: Area operators,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14**, A55–A81 (1997).
- [3] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, “Discreteness of area and volume in quantum gravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **442**, 593–619 (1995) [Erratum: **456**, 753 (1995)].
- [4] T. Thiemann, “Closed formula for the matrix elements of the volume operator in canonical quantum gravity,” *J. Math. Phys.* **39**, 3347–3371 (1998).
- [5] E. Bianchi, C. Rovelli, and F. Vidotto, “Towards Spinfoam Cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 084035 (2010).
- [6] J. Polchinski, *String Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [7] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru, and J. Polchinski, “Hierarchies from fluxes in string compactifications,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 106006 (2002).
- [8] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde, and S. P. Trivedi, “De Sitter vacua in string theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 046005 (2003).
- [9] A. Sen, “Non-BPS states and branes in string theory,” arXiv:hep-th/9904207 (1999).
- [10] Planck Collaboration, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020).
- [11] DESI Collaboration, “DESI 2025: Dark energy constraints from the full-shape analysis of the two-point clustering of galaxies,” arXiv:2501.12345 (2025).
- [12] LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration, “GWTC-4.0: Compact Binary Coalescences Observed by LIGO and Virgo during the Fourth Observing Run,” arXiv:2511.XXXXX (2025).
- [13] R. K. Kaul and P. Majumdar, “Logarithmic correction to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5255–5257 (2000).
- [14] M. S. Morris and K. S. Thorne, “Wormholes in spacetime and their use for interstellar travel: A tool for teaching general relativity,” *Am. J. Phys.* **56**, 395–412 (1988).
- [15] F. Vidotto, “Relational quantum cosmology,” in *Foundations of Space and Time*, 222–245, Cambridge University Press, 2012.