

A Theoretical Assessment of a Multiversal Quantum-Computational Model for Deriving Cosmological Parameters

The Λ CDM Concordance Model: A Benchmark for New Physics

Any novel theoretical framework aiming to describe the cosmos must be measured against the prevailing standard model of cosmology. This model, known as the Lambda-Cold Dark Matter (Λ CDM) model, has achieved remarkable success in explaining a vast array of astronomical observations with a minimal set of parameters.¹ It stands as the benchmark against which new theories are tested. This section establishes the foundational principles, key parameters, and observational status of the Λ CDM model, thereby defining the precise empirical targets that any proposed alternative or extension must address. While the model is highly successful, persistent observational tensions provide a compelling motivation for exploring new physical paradigms.³

The Geometric and Dynamic Framework of Modern Cosmology

The standard model of cosmology is built upon the geometric framework of Albert Einstein's theory of general relativity. On the largest scales, the universe is observed to be both homogeneous (the same at every location) and isotropic (the same in every direction). This observational fact, known as the cosmological principle, allows for a significant simplification of Einstein's field equations.¹

The geometry of such a universe is described by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric, which characterizes an expanding spacetime. The dynamics of this expansion are governed by the Friedmann equations, which relate the rate of expansion to the energy content and curvature of

the universe.¹ The first Friedmann equation is central to this description:

$$H^2 = \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho - \frac{kc^2}{a^2} + \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3}$$

Here, H is the Hubble parameter, representing the expansion rate of the universe; $a(t)$ is the dimensionless scale factor, which describes the relative size of the universe over time; $\dot{a}$ is its time derivative; G is the gravitational constant; ρ is the total energy density of the universe; k is the curvature parameter, which can be +1 (closed universe), 0 (flat universe), or -1 (open universe); c is the speed of light; and Λ is the cosmological constant.¹

The total energy density, ρ , is the sum of the densities of the various components that fill the cosmos. Each component is characterized by an equation of state parameter, $w=p/\rho$, where p is the pressure. This parameter determines how the component's energy density evolves as the universe expands according to the fluid equation, $\dot{\rho}+3H(\rho+p)=0$.⁶ The primary components are:

- **Radiation:** Relativistic particles like photons and neutrinos, with $w=1/3$. Their energy density dilutes rapidly as the universe expands, $\rho_{\text{rad}} \propto a^{-4}$.⁶
- **Matter:** Non-relativistic particles, including baryonic matter (protons, neutrons, electrons) and cold dark matter (CDM), with $w \approx 0$. Their density dilutes with volume, $\rho_{\text{m}} \propto a^{-3}$.⁶
- **Dark Energy (Cosmological Constant):** A mysterious component with negative pressure, typically modeled with $w=-1$. Its energy density, ρ_{Λ} , remains constant as the universe expands, $\rho_{\Lambda} \propto a^0$.⁵

The interplay of these components, each dominating at different epochs, dictates the entire expansion history of the universe, from the hot, dense state of the Big Bang to the present era of accelerated expansion.¹

The Standard Cosmological Parameters: A Quantitative Inventory of Our Universe

The Λ CDM model is powerfully predictive, capable of fitting a wide range of cosmological data with just six fundamental parameters. These parameters are typically determined from high-precision measurements of the temperature and polarization anisotropies in the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB), the relic radiation from the early universe.⁸ The final results from the Planck satellite mission

provide the most stringent constraints on these values.⁸ Any theory that purports to derive the properties of our universe from first principles must ultimately be able to predict or explain the measured values of these six parameters.

Parameter	Symbol	Description	Planck 2018 Value (68% limits)
Physical baryon density	$\Omega_b h^2$	The present-day density of baryonic (ordinary) matter, scaled by the reduced Hubble constant squared.	0.0224 ± 0.0001
Physical cold dark matter density	$\Omega_c h^2$	The present-day density of cold dark matter, scaled by the reduced Hubble constant squared.	0.120 ± 0.001
Angular size of the sound horizon	$100\theta^*$	The angular size of the sound horizon at recombination, as seen on the CMB sky. This is a very precisely measured geometric parameter.	1.0411 ± 0.0003
Optical depth to reionization	τ	A measure of how opaque the universe was to CMB photons due to reionization by the first stars	0.054 ± 0.007

		and galaxies.		
Scalar spectral index	ns	Describes the initial density fluctuations from inflation. ns=1 would correspond to perfectly scale-invariant fluctuations.	0.965 ± 0.004	
Amplitude of primordial fluctuations	$\ln(10^{10} A_s)$	The natural logarithm of the amplitude of the primordial scalar power spectrum at a pivot scale of $k=0.05 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.	3.043 ± 0.014	
Table 1: The Six Core Parameters of the Base ΛCDM Model. These parameters, determined from Planck 2018 data combined with lensing and external data, form the empirical foundation of modern cosmology. The values represent the quantitative target for any fundamental theory of the universe.¹				

From this base set of six parameters, several other important cosmological quantities

can be derived. These include:

- **The Hubble Constant (H_0):** The present-day expansion rate of the universe. The Planck data infer a value of $H_0 = (67.4 \pm 0.5) \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.⁸
- **The Matter Density Parameter (Ω_m):** The fraction of the universe's critical energy density that is composed of matter (baryonic + dark). It is defined as $\Omega_m = \rho_m / \rho_c$, where $\rho_c = 3H_0^2 / (8\pi G)$ is the critical density required for a flat universe.¹² The Planck data infer $\Omega_m = 0.315 \pm 0.007$.⁸
- **The Dark Energy Density Parameter (Ω_Λ):** The fraction of the critical density composed of dark energy. For a flat universe, as strongly indicated by CMB observations ($\Omega_k \approx 0$), this is given by $\Omega_\Lambda = 1 - \Omega_m$.⁴ Planck data imply $\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.685$.¹⁶
- **The Matter Fluctuation Amplitude (σ_8):** A measure of the amplitude of matter density fluctuations on scales of 8 Mpc. Planck infers $\sigma_8 = 0.811 \pm 0.006$.⁸

This detailed inventory of our universe's properties, derived from decades of observation, transforms the abstract goal of "explaining the universe" into a concrete, quantitative challenge.

Observational Pillars and Enduring Tensions

The Λ CDM model is not merely a theoretical construct; its status as the standard model is built upon its remarkable success in explaining a wide range of independent observations. These include the precise pattern of anisotropies in the CMB⁸, the distribution of galaxies on the largest scales (LSS), including the characteristic scale of Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO)³, the observed abundances of light elements (hydrogen, helium, lithium) created in Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN)¹, and the apparent dimming of distant Type Ia supernovae (SNIa), which provided the first direct evidence for cosmic acceleration.³

Despite this resounding success, the concordance model is facing growing challenges from persistent tensions between different types of observational data. These discrepancies represent potential cracks in the Λ CDM framework and are a primary driver for the exploration of new physics.

The most significant of these is the **Hubble Tension**. There is a statistically significant disagreement, now exceeding a 5σ threshold, between the value of the Hubble

constant, H_0 , inferred from early-universe physics via the CMB (Planck: $H_0=67.4\pm0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$) and the value measured directly in the local, late-time universe using a "cosmic distance ladder" based on Cepheid variable stars and SNIa (SHOES collaboration: $H_0\approx73 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$).³ While some recent analyses using data from the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) have suggested that improved calibration might reduce or resolve this tension²⁰, other studies using different techniques and JWST data claim the tension is worsening, turning into a "crisis" for cosmology.²² This ongoing debate underscores the reality and severity of the problem.

A second, related issue is the **σ_8 Tension**. This refers to a milder ($\approx 2.5\sigma$) discrepancy between the amplitude of matter fluctuations, σ_8 , predicted from CMB data and the lower value measured more directly by large-scale structure surveys that map the clustering of galaxies, such as the Dark Energy Survey (DES) and KiDS.³

These tensions are not mere statistical flukes or minor anomalies. They represent fundamental disagreements between our best measurements of the early universe and the late universe. This state of affairs strongly suggests one of two possibilities: either there are subtle, unaccounted-for systematic errors in one or more of the measurement techniques, or the Λ CDM model itself is incomplete. The possibility that our theoretical understanding is lacking has opened a window of opportunity for new physics. Recent results from the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) have added fuel to this fire, hinting that dark energy may not be a simple cosmological constant ($w=-1$) but could be evolving over cosmic time.³ It is in this context—where the standard model, for all its success, shows signs of strain—that speculative new frameworks must be evaluated. A new theory is compelling not only if it is internally consistent, but especially if it can naturally resolve these observational tensions.

Deconstructing the Proposed Generative Principle: An Analysis of $E = mc^3$

The proposed framework introduces a novel physical relationship, $E=mc^3$, described as the "total generative energy of mass over all multiverse trajectories." This postulate is the most radical departure from established physics and requires careful scrutiny. This section will perform a rigorous physical and dimensional analysis of this equation, first by grounding the discussion in the well-established physics of mass-energy equivalence, then by examining the consequences of a literal interpretation, and

finally by exploring a more charitable reinterpretation of the postulate as an informational principle.

The Foundational Physics of Mass-Energy Equivalence

Before analyzing the proposed modification, it is essential to understand the precise meaning and context of Einstein's famous equation, $E=mc^2$. This relationship is a cornerstone of modern physics, derived from the principles of special relativity.²⁵

A fundamental check on any physical equation is dimensional analysis. Energy (E) has the physical dimensions of mass times velocity squared, or $[M][L]^2[-2]$. The term mc^2 , where m is mass and c is the speed of light (a velocity), has precisely these dimensions, making the equation dimensionally consistent.²⁸

The physical meaning of $E=mc^2$ is profound: it establishes an equivalence between mass and energy. It states that an object of mass m, even when at rest, possesses an intrinsic "rest energy" equal to mc^2 .²⁵ It does not mean that matter must travel at the speed of light squared to be converted to energy.³¹ Rather, mass itself is a highly concentrated form of energy.³² This equivalence is demonstrated in nuclear reactions, where a small loss of mass (

Δm) in an atomic nucleus results in the release of an enormous amount of energy ($E=\Delta mc^2$), powering stars and nuclear reactors.³⁰ Conversely, energy added to a system, whether kinetic, potential, or thermal, contributes to its total relativistic mass, increasing its inertia.²⁵

It is also crucial to recognize that $E=mc^2$ is a special case of the more general energy-momentum relation, which is valid for all objects, moving or at rest:

$$E^2=(m_0c^2)^2+(pc)^2$$

Here, E is the total relativistic energy, m_0 is the invariant rest mass (a fundamental property of a particle that is the same for all observers), and p is the relativistic momentum.³⁵ For a particle at rest (

$p=0$), this equation reduces to $E=m_0c^2$. For a massless particle like a photon ($m_0=0$), it gives $E=pc$, relating its energy directly to its momentum.³⁵ This full relation is fundamental to relativistic quantum mechanics and particle physics, and any proposed modification must contend with its comprehensive and empirically verified

success.³⁸

The Theoretical Consequences of a Literal $E = mc^3$

If the postulate $E=mc^3$ is interpreted as a literal statement about physical energy, it immediately encounters insurmountable obstacles.

First, as noted, the equation is dimensionally inconsistent. The quantity mc^3 has dimensions of $[M][L]^3\{-3\}$, which do not correspond to the dimensions of energy.²⁸ In physics, dimensional consistency is a basic requirement for an equation to be physically meaningful. An equation that equates entities with different physical dimensions is fundamentally incoherent.⁴⁰

Second, if one were to set aside this fatal dimensional flaw and consider the physical implications, the consequences would be catastrophic for the structure of the universe as we know it. The conversion factor between mass and energy would be altered by a factor of c , which is approximately 3×10^8 m/s. This would imply that the energy released in nuclear fusion, which powers the Sun, would be hundreds of millions of times greater than observed, leading to stellar evolution so rapid that life would be impossible. Alternatively, if interpreted as the energy required to create matter (e.g., in pair production), it would mean that the formation of matter in the early universe would have required vastly more energy, resulting in a universe with far less matter than is observed.⁴⁰ Every well-tested prediction of nuclear and particle physics would be invalidated. The stability of atoms, the lifetimes of particles, and the entire thermal history of the cosmos would be completely different. In short, a universe governed by a literal

$E=mc^3$ would bear no resemblance to our own.

Reinterpreting the Postulate: "Generative Energy" as an Informational Quantity

Given that a literal physical interpretation of $E=mc^3$ is untenable, a more productive approach is to analyze it based on the user's own definition. The proposal defines this E not as physical energy (measured in Joules), but as the "total generative energy of mass... relative to each other... represent[ing] its capacity to drive the branching of

the universal wavefunction." This is not a definition of energy in the physical sense, but rather a description of a process potential or a rate of information creation. This suggests the postulate should be interpreted metaphorically or informationally.

This reinterpretation finds resonance in several areas of theoretical physics that connect physical reality to information. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics posits that the universe constantly branches into a vast number of parallel, non-communicating worlds with every quantum event.⁴² The total number of branches can be seen as a measure of the complexity or information content of the entire multiverse. Concurrently, the "It from Bit" philosophy, championed by physicist John Archibald Wheeler, proposes that physical reality ("it") arises fundamentally from binary, yes-no informational choices ("bits").⁴⁴ This perspective elevates information from a mere description of reality to its fundamental constituent.⁴⁶

Within this context, the user's postulate can be salvaged from being a simple physical error and transformed into a speculative principle of "informational dynamics." The equation $E=mc^3$ can be read not as a physical law, but as a heuristic statement:

- The quantity E represents not energy, but the **information-generating potential** of the multiverse, perhaps measured in "bits per second" or some other unit of complexity growth.
- This generative potential is proportional to the total mass m of the multiverse. Mass, in this view, is the source of quantum events that drive the branching.
- The term c^3 is not a product of three velocities, but a very large scaling constant, intended to signify the immense capacity for complexity generation inherent in the system.

This reinterpretation reframes the postulate as a proposed link between the substance of the universe (its mass-energy content) and its computational behavior (the branching of the wavefunction). It proposes that the more massive the multiverse is, the faster it computes new realities, thereby increasing its own complexity. While this remains highly speculative and lacks a formal mathematical basis, it provides a conceptually coherent foundation that can be connected to the other postulates of the proposed framework.

Emergent Gravity in a Computational Multiverse

The second core tenet of the proposed framework is that gravity is not a fundamental force but an emergent phenomenon. Specifically, it is described as "shadow gravity" that arises from "computational latency" between an observer's world-line and the integrated gravitational influence of the entire multiverse. This section analyzes this proposal by situating it within the broader landscape of modern research into emergent gravity, deconstructing its terminology, and exploring its potential mechanisms.

The Landscape of Emergent Gravity Theories

The idea that gravity and spacetime are not fundamental but emerge from a deeper, microscopic theory is a vibrant and active area of research in theoretical physics.⁴⁷ It is motivated by the profound difficulties in unifying general relativity and quantum mechanics, and by intriguing connections between gravity, thermodynamics, and information theory.⁴⁷ Several distinct approaches to emergent gravity have been proposed.

Theory / Approach	Core Principle	Proposed Mechanism	Key Challenges
Entropic Gravity (Jacobson, Verlinde)	Gravity is a thermodynamic/entropic force, not a fundamental interaction.	The force of gravity arises from a system's statistical tendency to maximize its entropy ($F=T\nabla S$). It is driven by changes in information encoded on holographic screens.	Reconciling with quantum coherence, unphysical requirements for entropy in general cases, lack of a complete microscopic model. ⁵⁰
Gravity from Quantum Information	Spacetime geometry and gravity emerge	The "fabric" of spacetime is "stitched	Requires a deeper understanding

	from the entanglement structure of underlying quantum degrees of freedom.	together" by quantum entanglement. Gravitational dynamics are governed by the flow and properties of quantum information.	of how to derive a classical spacetime from a quantum substrate; theory is still in early development. ⁵³
Computational / Informational Gravity (Vopson)	Gravity is an emergent consequence of a universal computational optimization process.	The universe, acting like a computer, seeks to minimize its information content (entropy). This drive for data compression manifests as an attractive force (gravity).	Relies on the speculative "simulated universe" hypothesis; needs to be reconciled with the established geometric picture of general relativity. ⁵⁷
Causal Set Theory	Spacetime is fundamentally a discrete set of events with a causal order relation.	The continuum spacetime and its geometry are approximations that emerge from the underlying discrete causal set at macroscopic scales.	Defining dynamics (a "quantum for causal sets") is a major challenge; difficult to recover smooth manifold properties. ⁶¹
Loop Quantum Cosmology	A symmetry-reduced model of Loop Quantum Gravity.	Spacetime geometry is quantized. The Big Bang singularity is replaced by a "Big Bounce" due to repulsive quantum-geom	May not capture all features of the full theory; predictions are sensitive to quantization ambiguities. ⁶⁵

		etric effects at the Planck scale.		
Table 2: A Comparative Analysis of Emergent Gravity Theories. This table summarizes several leading approaches to emergent gravity, providing context for the user's proposal. Each theory attempts to derive gravity from more fundamental principles, whether thermodynamic, informational, computational, or discrete-structural. ⁵⁰				

The proposed model of "computational latency" shares conceptual ground with the computational and informational approaches, but suggests a specific, novel mechanism for how the emergent force manifests.

"Shadow Gravity" as Computational Latency

To analyze this postulate, it is necessary to deconstruct its two key terms: "shadow gravity" and "computational latency."

The term "**shadow gravity**" has a specific history in physics, referring to Le Sage's theory of gravitation.⁶⁸ This 18th-century model proposed that gravity results from objects shielding each other from an omnidirectional flux of tiny, fast-moving particles. Objects are pushed together because the space between them has a lower flux density than the space outside them. While this mechanical model was long ago falsified due to problems with drag and heat generation⁶⁹, the term is likely used here in a metaphorical sense. The gravitational influence felt within our single universe branch is a "shadow" cast by the total mass-energy of all other universes in the multiverse.⁷⁰ Our universe feels the collective presence of the others, but only through this indirect, gravitational effect.

The term "**computational latency**" is borrowed from computer science, where it signifies the time delay between a cause and its effect within a system.⁷¹ In the context of the proposed model, it implies that the propagation of gravitational information across the multiversal network is not instantaneous. An observer's experience of gravity is therefore a response to a time-delayed, integrated state of the entire system, rather than its instantaneous configuration.

The proposed mechanism can thus be synthesized as follows: An observer exists on a single, classical world-line that has emerged from the quantum multiverse through decoherence. The gravitational "force" this observer perceives is the result of a persistent lag between the continuously evolving mass-energy state of the *entire* multiverse and the delayed gravitational information from that multiverse reaching the observer. Gravity, in this view, is the physical manifestation of this computational processing delay.

This concept of latency in gravity is not entirely alien to physics; it is a central feature of general relativity. In contrast to Newtonian gravity, which acts instantaneously, general relativity dictates that changes in the gravitational field propagate at the finite speed of light, c .⁵⁵ Gravitational waves are ripples in spacetime that travel at this universal speed limit. The proposed model can be seen as a quantum-computational re-framing of this established principle. If the multiverse is viewed as a vast computational network, with mass-energy distributions as its nodes, then the constant

c can be interpreted as the maximum propagation speed for information within this network.

An observer in one branch is perpetually receiving outdated information about the state of all other branches. This creates a continuous tension or discrepancy between

the observer's local "present" and the integrated "past" of the information they are receiving from the rest of the multiverse. This tension could manifest as the persistent force we call gravity. Speculatively, one could even attempt to connect this to fundamental constants. The quantity G/c^3 has units of time per unit mass (s/kg), which could be interpreted as a fundamental "latency per unit mass" of the multiversal computational network.⁷³ This provides a potential, albeit highly conjectural, physical meaning for the gravitational constant

G within this informational framework.

The Multiversal Substrate: MWI as the Computational Arena

The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics provides the necessary "arena" for this computational process to unfold. In MWI, the universal wavefunction never collapses; instead, every quantum measurement or interaction causes the universe to split or "branch" into a superposition of non-interacting parallel worlds, each realizing one of the possible outcomes.⁴²

This process of continuous branching can be seen as the fundamental computation of the multiverse. Each new branch represents a new informational state, and the overall evolution of the multiverse corresponds to the parallel exploration of all possible computational pathways.⁴³ An observer, being a macroscopic quantum system, is also part of this branching process. Through decoherence, the observer experiences a single, consistent, classical-like reality, corresponding to one specific path through the branching tree. They cannot directly perceive the other branches. However, the proposed model of "shadow gravity" suggests that while the branches are informationally isolated in most respects, they remain part of a single computational system that is gravitationally integrated. The observer feels the collective, time-delayed influence of all the other branches, which they perceive as the force of gravity.

The Cosmological Constant as an Informational Parameter

The third postulate of the proposed framework asserts that the phenomenon we

perceive as "dark energy," represented by the cosmological constant Λ , is the macroscopic manifestation of the universe's overall rate of branching and its consequent increase in complexity. This is arguably the most compelling component of the model, as it attempts to provide a physical, mechanistic origin for one of the deepest mysteries in modern science.

The Enigma of Dark Energy and the Cosmological Constant (Λ)

The modern understanding of cosmology was revolutionized in 1998 with the discovery that the expansion of the universe is accelerating.¹⁹ Observations of distant Type Ia supernovae revealed that they were dimmer, and therefore farther away, than expected in a universe whose expansion was slowing due to gravity.⁷⁶ This acceleration implies the existence of a dominant component in the universe with strong negative pressure, which exerts a repulsive gravitational force. This component was named "dark energy".⁷⁷

According to the latest measurements, dark energy constitutes approximately 68-70% of the total mass-energy density of the universe.¹² The simplest and most widely accepted explanation for dark energy is the

cosmological constant, denoted by the Greek letter Λ (Lambda).⁸⁰ Originally introduced by Einstein to allow for a static universe, Λ was later abandoned by him but was resurrected to explain the observed acceleration.⁸⁰ In the context of general relativity, Λ can be interpreted as the intrinsic energy density of the vacuum of space itself,

p_{vac} .⁵ This vacuum energy has a negative pressure with an equation of state parameter

$w = p/\rho = -1$, which drives the accelerated expansion.¹

This explanation, however, leads to the **Cosmological Constant Problem**, one of the most severe fine-tuning problems in the history of physics. When physicists use Quantum Field Theory (QFT) to calculate the expected energy density of the vacuum arising from the zero-point fluctuations of quantum fields, the result is catastrophically large—approximately 120 orders of magnitude greater than the value of Λ observed astronomically.⁸⁰ This enormous discrepancy suggests a profound gap

in our understanding of the interplay between gravity and quantum mechanics.

One of the leading speculative solutions to this problem is the **anthropic principle within a multiverse context**. This idea posits that eternal inflation creates a vast landscape of "pocket universes," in which the laws of physics and fundamental constants, including Λ , take on different values.⁸⁷ Most of these universes would have a very large value of Λ , causing them to either recollapse instantly or expand so rapidly that no structures like galaxies, stars, or planets could form. Consequently, observers could only arise in the rare universes where, by chance, Λ is small enough to permit structure formation. Our observation of a small Λ is then explained as a selection effect: we couldn't exist in a universe where it was large.⁸⁵

Λ as a Manifestation of Universal Complexity and Branching

The framework under evaluation proposes a different kind of explanation, one that is mechanistic rather than anthropic. It suggests that Λ is not a random value selected by the conditions for our existence, but is instead a direct physical consequence of the fundamental computational dynamics of the multiverse—specifically, its rate of branching.

The connection between branching and complexity is straightforward. In the Many-Worlds Interpretation, the continuous branching of the universal wavefunction leads to an exponential increase in the number of distinct "worlds" or informational states.⁴³ This can be framed as a continuous increase in the total information content, or complexity, of the multiverse as a whole. In the language of information theory, entropy is a measure of the number of possible microstates corresponding to a given macrostate, or more generally, a measure of uncertainty.⁹¹ Therefore, a higher rate of branching corresponds directly to a faster rate of increase of the multiverse's total entropy or complexity.

This hypothesis creates a novel and provocative bridge between the microscopic formalism of quantum mechanics (specifically, the MWI) and a macroscopic parameter of cosmology (Λ). It posits a direct causal link:

Rate of quantum branching → Rate of increase in multiversal information/complexity
→ Manifests as dark energy (Λ)

This reframes the cosmological constant problem in a fundamental way. The question

is no longer "Why is Λ so small compared to the QFT prediction?" but rather "What governs the overall rate of wavefunction branching across the multiverse, and what is the physical mechanism that translates this informational rate into a stress-energy tensor component with negative pressure?"

This proposed connection is non-trivial. It implies that a fundamental parameter governing the large-scale evolution of our observable universe is determined by the collective rate of all quantum events occurring throughout the entire multiversal structure. This establishes a direct and dynamic link between the quantum and the cosmic, distinct from other quantum gravity approaches that typically attempt to quantize the gravitational field itself.⁹² Instead of gravity being quantized, the driver of cosmic expansion (Λ) is here proposed to be a quantum informational phenomenon.

From Branching Rate to Negative Pressure: The Quantitative Gap

While conceptually intriguing, the proposal faces a formidable challenge: bridging the gap from a qualitative idea to a quantitative, predictive theory. The central, unanswered question is: **How, precisely, does an informational "branching rate" manifest physically as an energy density with the property of negative pressure ($w \approx -1$)?**

Without a detailed mathematical formalism, any proposed mechanism remains purely speculative. One might conjecture that the creation of new informational "branches" in the abstract state space of the multiverse requires "space" to be made in the metric of our particular branch, thereby exerting an outward, repulsive force. This resonates with the idea that the expansion of the universe itself releases vacuum energy.⁸² Alternatively, perhaps the increasing complexity of the multiverse as a whole modifies the properties of the vacuum state within our local branch. This aligns with a growing field of research that seeks to derive gravitational phenomena, including dark energy, from deeper principles of information and entropy.⁵⁶

To transform this concept into a testable theory, a complete mathematical framework would be required. Such a framework would need to:

1. **Define the Branching Rate:** Formulate a precise mathematical definition for the rate of branching of the universal wavefunction.
2. **Establish the Driver of Branching:** Connect this rate to the matter and energy content of the multiverse, possibly through the proposed "generative energy"

relation, $E=mc^3$. This would quantify how mass drives the creation of new informational states.

3. **Link to Spacetime Dynamics:** Propose a new physical law or principle that links this informational branching rate to the stress-energy tensor ($T_{\mu\nu}$) in Einstein's field equations. This is the most critical and difficult step, as it must explain how an abstract rate of complexity growth can source a gravitational field as if it were an energy density with negative pressure.

Without this mathematical machinery, the proposal that Λ is a manifestation of branching complexity remains a compelling analogy rather than a predictive physical theory. It provides a new "why" for dark energy, but not yet a "how."

Synthesis, Evaluation, and Future Directions

This final section synthesizes the preceding analysis to provide a holistic evaluation of the proposed multiversal quantum-computational framework. The assessment will focus on the model's internal coherence, the significant challenges it faces in transitioning from concept to theory, and potential, albeit speculative, pathways toward making its claims more rigorous and ultimately falsifiable.

A Unified Conceptual Framework: Strengths and Coherence

The primary strength of the proposed model lies in its profound ambition and conceptual elegance. It attempts to construct a unified narrative that explains the fundamental nature of both gravity and dark energy from a single, coherent set of first principles rooted in quantum information and computation.⁹⁴ This is in stark contrast to the standard Λ CDM model, which treats cold dark matter and dark energy as separate, unexplained components added to fit observations.¹

The framework is notable for seeking *mechanistic* explanations for emergent phenomena. Rather than relying on anthropic selection principles to explain the value of the cosmological constant⁸⁵, it proposes that Λ arises dynamically from the branching rate of the multiverse. Similarly, it posits that gravity emerges from the specific mechanism of computational latency. This pursuit of underlying causal

mechanisms is a core objective of fundamental physics.⁶⁸

Furthermore, the three core postulates exhibit a compelling internal consistency, forming a self-contained conceptual loop.

1. The "generative energy" principle ($E=mc^3$) provides the engine, linking the mass content of the multiverse to its capacity for generating new states.
2. This generation of states occurs via the branching of the universal wavefunction, as described by the Many-Worlds Interpretation, which provides the computational arena.
3. The structure of this arena gives rise to an emergent gravitational force through computational latency.
4. The overall rate of this computational process—the branching itself—manifests macroscopically as the dark energy (Λ) that drives cosmic expansion.

This creates a narrative where matter and energy source the computation, the computation defines the geometry and forces, and the rate of computation drives the evolution of the geometry.

The Immense Gap: From Qualitative Concepts to Quantitative Predictions

Despite its conceptual appeal, the framework's greatest weakness is the immense gap that separates its qualitative, philosophical ideas from the quantitative, mathematical precision required of a physical theory.⁴⁷ At present, the model is more akin to a "worldview" or a metaphysical system than a testable scientific hypothesis.⁴⁴

This is a common challenge for many proposed "Theories of Everything." They often begin with a powerful central idea but lack the formal machinery to make concrete, numerical predictions that can be compared with experimental data. To transition from a conceptual framework to a scientific theory, the model would need to be expressed in a rigorous mathematical language. This would likely require the development of entirely new mathematical tools—perhaps a form of "Branching Relativistic Calculus" that could describe the dynamics of a branching spacetime¹⁰⁰, or a novel application of quantum information theory to cosmology.⁵³ Without such a formalism, its claims cannot be rigorously derived or tested.

Pathways to Falsifiability: Can This Model Make Testable Predictions?

A scientific theory must be falsifiable; it must make predictions that could, at least in principle, be shown to be wrong by an experiment or observation.¹⁰¹ While the proposed framework is far from this stage, it is possible to speculate on the kinds of unique observational signatures it might produce if it were to be developed into a full theory. Identifying such potential signatures is the first step toward bridging the gap between metaphysics and physics.

- **Evolving Dark Energy:** The model posits that Λ is proportional to the multiverse's branching rate, which is in turn driven by its mass-energy content. Since the density of matter and radiation changes dramatically over cosmic history, this framework might naturally predict that Λ is not a true constant. Instead, it would be a dynamical quantity, $\Lambda(t)$, whose energy density evolves over time. This would imply that the dark energy equation of state parameter, w , is not exactly -1 . This is a key prediction of alternative theories like quintessence⁷⁷, and is a primary target for next-generation cosmological surveys such as Euclid.²⁴ Recent hints from the DESI survey that w may indeed be evolving make this a particularly promising, though not unique, avenue for testing ideas of this nature.³ A definitive measurement of $w = -1$ would rule out the simplest Λ CDM model and provide support for models where dark energy is dynamic.
- **Anomalous Gravitational Noise:** If gravity is an emergent phenomenon arising from a vast number of underlying computational or quantum-informational processes, it may not be perfectly smooth. Just as the pressure of a gas exhibits tiny fluctuations around its average value, an emergent gravitational field might possess a fundamental "jitter" or noise that is not predicted by classical general relativity. This is a potential signature of various entropic and emergent gravity theories.⁵⁰ Such an effect would be incredibly subtle but could potentially be searched for in ultra-high-precision experiments, such as those monitoring the quantum states of neutrons in Earth's gravitational field¹⁰³ or in the noise spectrum of future gravitational wave observatories.
- **Subtle Violations of Known Physics:** The "generative energy" postulate, $E=mc^3$, if it has any physical manifestation at all, might lead to minuscule deviations from established laws at low energies. For example, it could imply a tiny, non-zero probability for processes that violate the conservation of baryon number or other symmetries of the Standard Model.³⁰ While highly speculative, searching for such forbidden processes in high-energy particle accelerators provides another

potential, albeit remote, point of contact with observation.

These potential predictions, while long-shots, are crucial because they outline conceivable observations that could, in principle, falsify the theory.

Conclusion: A Provocative Inquiry into the Informational Foundations of Reality

The conceptual framework presented for evaluation represents a bold and creative attempt to address some of the deepest questions in fundamental physics. While its central postulate of a physical energy described by $E=mc^3$ is untenable upon literal analysis, a reinterpretation of the framework's principles through the lens of information theory reveals a provocative and internally coherent narrative. This narrative seeks to unify the quantum and the cosmic by positing that gravity and dark energy are not fundamental entities, but rather emergent manifestations of a multiversal, quantum-computational process.

The model successfully reframes long-standing problems, such as the physical origin of the cosmological constant, in a new and compelling informational light. It replaces the anthropic argument for Λ with a mechanistic one, suggesting that cosmic acceleration is driven by the universe's ongoing generation of complexity.

Its primary and most significant limitation is the absence of a mathematical formalism capable of translating these qualitative ideas into quantitative predictions. Without this, it remains in the realm of philosophical speculation, unable to make contact with the empirical data that is the final arbiter of all physical theories.

Ultimately, the proposed framework serves as a powerful illustration of the kind of interdisciplinary, first-principles thinking that is necessary to make progress on the unresolved mysteries of cosmology and quantum gravity. It pushes the boundaries of theoretical physics by exploring the profound possibility that the universe is not merely described by information, but that information is the very substance from which spacetime, matter, and the laws that govern them emerge.

Works cited

1. Lambda-CDM model - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lambda-CDM_model
2. Status of the Λ CDM theory: supporting evidence and anomalies - Journals,

- accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsta.2024.0021>
3. arXiv:2503.02880v2 [astro-ph.CO] 12 Mar 2025, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.arxiv.org/pdf/2503.02880>
 4. Guide to Λ CDM | astrobites, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://astrobites.org/2025/01/06/lambda_cdm/
 5. Cosmological constant - Scholarpedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Cosmological_constant
 6. Cosmology Part III - Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, accessed on July 27, 2025,
http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/user/ep551/cosmology_my_lecture_notes.pdf
 7. Λ CDM Model of Cosmology - Nasa Lambda, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/education/graphic_history/univ_evol.html
 8. Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters - Caltech Authors, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://authors.library.caltech.edu/records/74pef-jas67>
 9. Parameters - Nasa Lambda, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/education/graphic_history/parameters.html
 10. (PDF) Planck 2018 results: VI. Cosmological parameters - ResearchGate, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344382189_Planck_2018_results_VI_Cosmological_parameters
 11. Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters | Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias • IAC, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.iac.es/es/ciencia-y-tecnologia/publicaciones/planck-2018-results-vi-cosmological-parameters>
 12. Lambda-CDM Model: Cosmology Insights - Number Analytics, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/lambda-cdm-cosmology-insights>
 13. Matter Density Parameter in Galactic Cosmology - Number Analytics, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/matter-density-parameter-galactic-cosmology>
 14. The Ultimate Guide to Matter Density Parameter - Number Analytics, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-matter-density-parameter>
 15. Understanding Density Parameters in Cosmology - Number Analytics, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-density-parameters-cosmology>
 16. 2. ASTROPHYSICAL CONSTANTS AND PARAMETERS - Particle Data Group, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://pdg.lbl.gov/2015/reviews/rpp2015-rev-astrophysical-constants.pdf>
 17. Planck 2018 - Antony Lewis, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://cosmologist.info/notes/Planck2018-Sesto.pdf>

18. Planck 2018 results - VI. Cosmological parameters, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://art.torvergata.it/bitstream/2108/264934/1/Planck-2018-results-VI-Cosmological-parameters2020Astronomy-and-Astrophysics.pdf>
19. Dark energy | Definition, Discoverers, & Facts | Britannica, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.britannica.com/science/dark-energy>
20. Is the Hubble Tension Resolved? - Astronomy Now, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://astronomynow.com/2025/06/09/is-the-hubble-tension-resolved/>
21. New measure of the universe's expansion suggests resolution of a conflict - UChicago News, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://news.uchicago.edu/story/new-measure-universes-expansion-suggests-resolution-conflict>
22. New Study Confirms Faster-than-Expected Universe Expansion, Deepening Hubble Tension - Modern Sciences, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://modernsciences.org/faster-than-expected-universe-expansion-hubble-tension-february-2025/>
23. The universe is expanding too fast to fit theories: Hubble tension in crisis | ScienceDaily, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2025/01/250117161235.htm>
24. Dark energy 'doesn't exist' so can't be pushing 'lumpy' Universe apart - study, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.ras.ac.uk/news-and-press/research-highlights/dark-energy-doesnt-exist-so-cant-be-pushing-lumpy-universe-apart>
25. Mass-energy equivalence - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass%E2%80%93energy_equivalence
26. The Equivalence of Mass and Energy - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/equivME/>
27. Special relativity explained — Einstein's mind-bending theory of space, time and light, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.space.com/36273-theory-special-relativity.html>
28. Why not $E=mc^3$??? - Why I hate physics, accessed on July 27, 2025, <http://marty-green.blogspot.com/2011/11/why-not-emc3.html>
29. $E = mc^2$: What Does Einstein's Famous Equation Really Mean? - Science | HowStuffWorks, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://science.howstuffworks.com/science-vs-myth/everyday-myths/einstein-formula.htm>
30. Mass-energy equivalence, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://energyeducation.ca/encyclopedia/Mass-energy_equivalence
31. Mass, Energy, and the Theory of Relativity | Astronomy - Lumen Learning, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-ncc-astronomy/chapter/mass-energy-and-the-theory-of-relativity/>
32. Mass-Energy Equivalence | Principles of Physics III Class Notes - Fiveable, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://library.fiveable.me/principles-physics-iii-thermal-physics-waves/unit-6/mass-energy-equivalence/study-guide/ruCBoBITYkUz6WNn>

33. Focus on Physics: How $E = mc^2$ Helps Us Understand Nuclear Fission and Fusion | NSTA, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.nsta.org/blog/focus-physics-how-e-mc2-helps-us-understand-nuclear-fission-and-fusion>
34. Energy-Mass Equivalence - YouTube, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hWcACTswM9A>
35. Know about the complete formula for energy in the theory of relativity - Britannica, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.britannica.com/video/equation-theory-energy-relativity-mc/-203897>
36. Is the equation " $E=mc^2$ " applicable to all spacetime scales including the whole universe and everything in it? | ResearchGate, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/post/Is_the_equation_Emc_squared_applicable_to_all_spacetime_scales_including_the_whole_universe_and_everything_in_it
37. Does $E = mc^2$ also work in quantum mechanics? - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/840943/does-e-mc2-also-work-in-quantum-mechanics>
38. Energy-momentum relation - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Energy%E2%80%93momentum_relation
39. The Simplest Derivation of $E = mc^2$ | CS Stanford, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://cs.stanford.edu/people/zjl/pdf/emc2.pdf>
40. What would our world be like if $e=m \cdot c^3$ [closed] - Worldbuilding Stack Exchange, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://worldbuilding.stackexchange.com/questions/39773/what-would-our-world-be-like-if-e-mc3>
41. worldbuilding.stackexchange.com, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://worldbuilding.stackexchange.com/questions/39773/what-would-our-world-be-like-if-e-mc3#:~:text=Matter%20is%20just%20a%20special,have%20a%20lot%20less%20matter>
42. Can someone please clearly explain how the many worlds interpretation explains entanglement? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/1jo4oig/can_someone_please_clearly_explain_how_the_many/
43. Many-worlds interpretation - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Many-worlds_interpretation
44. "Mathesis Universalis" Blog - It from bit? - Wheeler's and Dyson's opposite inspirations - Calculemus, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://calculemus.org/CA/sw-infor/it-from-bit.html>
45. It from Bit: Pioneering Physicist John Archibald Wheeler on Information, the Nature of Reality, and Why We Live in a Participatory Universe - The Marginalian, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.themarginalian.org/2016/09/02/it-from-bit-wheeler/>
46. Information could be Primary: Wheeler's It from Bit - YouTube, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fYZaiZvYpEE>
47. Dear Dr. B: What is emergent gravity? - Sabine Hossenfelder: Backreaction,

- accessed on July 27, 2025,
<http://backreaction.blogspot.com/2016/11/dear-dr-b-what-is-emergent-gravity.html>
48. Gravity as an Emergent Phenomenon | University of Kentucky College of Arts & Sciences, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://pa.as.uky.edu/gravity-emergent-phenomenon>
 49. Emergent gravity and the dark universe, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.quantumuniverse.nl/emergent-gravity-and-the-dark-universe?pdf=1113>
 50. Entropic gravity - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entropic_gravity
 51. Realize Emergent Gravity to Generic Situations - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8419215/>
 52. Is Gravity Just Entropy Rising? Long-Shot Idea Gets Another Look. | Quanta Magazine, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.quantamagazine.org/is-gravity-just-entropy-rising-long-shot-idea-gets-another-look-20250613/>
 53. Quantum-information methods for quantum gravity laboratory-based tests | Rev. Mod. Phys., accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.97.015006>
 54. Study Suggests Quantum Entanglement May Rewrite the Rules of Gravity, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://thequantuminsider.com/2025/05/11/study-suggests-quantum-entanglement-may-rewrite-the-rules-of-gravity/>
 55. Quantum Gravity and Quantum Information - Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://www.ipmu.jp/sites/default/files/imce/news/43E_Feature.pdf
 56. Gravity from entropy: New theory bridging quantum mechanics and relativity - FirstPrinciples, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.firstprinciples.org/article/gravity-from-entropy-new-theory-bridging-quantum-mechanics-and-relativity>
 57. Gravity is Result of Computational Process within Our Universe, Physicist Says | Sci.News, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.sci.news/physics/computational-universe-gravity-13861.html>
 58. New Study Suggests Gravity May Be an Optimization Process in a Computational Universe, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://thequantuminsider.com/2025/04/30/new-study-suggests-gravity-may-be-an-optimization-process-in-a-computational-universe/>
 59. Is gravity evidence of a computational universe? | AIP Advances, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://pubs.aip.org/aip/adv/article/15/4/045035/3345217/Is-gravity-evidence-of-a-computational-universe>
 60. Scientist suggests gravity further supports theory we are living in a simulated universe, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.port.ac.uk/news-events-and-blogs/news/scientist-suggests-gravity->

- [further-supports-theory-we-are-living-in-a-simulated-universe](#)
61. Cosmological Tests of Causal Set Phenomenology - UWSpace - University of Waterloo, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/items/fb57adaf-2d43-4f57-822d-5e62380661d7>
 62. The Causal Set Approach to Quantum Gravity - Imperial College London, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/research-centres-and-groups/theoretical-physics/msc/dissertations/2013/Yichao-Hu-Dissertation.pdf>
 63. The Ultimate Guide to Causal Set Theory - Number Analytics, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-causal-set-theory>
 64. Causal sets - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causal_sets
 65. Loop quantum cosmology - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loop_quantum_cosmology
 66. Loop Quantum Cosmology - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5255532/>
 67. Editorial: Loop Quantum Cosmology - Frontiers, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/astronomy-and-space-sciences/articles/10.3389/fspas.2022.845459/full>
 68. Lesage's Shadows - MathPages, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.mathpages.com/home/kmath131/kmath131.htm>
 69. Exact Formula for Shadow-Gravity, Strong Gravity - Scientific Research Publishing, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=64984>
 70. Multiverse Model: External Universe(s) as Source of Dark Energy - Scirp.org., accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=112004>
 71. Data & Latency: Key Considerations for Mission-Critical Workloads - GlassHouse Systems, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.ghsystems.com/blog/data-gravity-and-latency-key-considerations-for-moving-your-mission-critical-workloads-to-the-cloud>
 72. Computational Gravitational Dynamics with Modern Numerical Accelerators - arXiv, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1409.5474>
 73. Gravity as a consequence of latency? : r/AskPhysics - Reddit, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://www.reddit.com/r/AskPhysics/comments/20wylx/gravity_as_a_consequence_of_latency/
 74. What is Dark Energy? Inside Our Accelerating, Expanding Universe - NASA Science, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://science.nasa.gov/dark-energy/>
 75. Dark Energy Survey uncovers clues to universe's complexity | Penn Today, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/dark-energy-survey-uncovers-clues-universes-complexity>
 76. Hubble Dark Energy - NASA Science, accessed on July 27, 2025,

<https://science.nasa.gov/mission/hubble/science/science-behind-the-discoveries/hubble-dark-energy/>

77. Dark energy, explained - University of Chicago News, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://news.uchicago.edu/explainer/dark-energy-explained>
78. Dark Energy and Dark Matter - Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.cfa.harvard.edu/research/topic/dark-energy-and-dark-matter>
79. www.numberanalytics.com, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-density-parameters-cosmology#:~:text=The%20value%20of%20%CE%A9%CE%9B%20is,the%20univers e's%20total%20energy%20density.>
80. Cosmological constant - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cosmological_constant
81. Dark energy - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark_energy
82. Did Einstein really invent the cosmological constant to make the universe static in his 1917 paper?, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/696800/did-einstein-really-invent-t he-cosmological-constant-to-make-the-universe-static>
83. WMAP- Cosmological Constant or Dark Energy - NASA, accessed on July 27, 2025, https://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/uni_accel.html
84. The Cosmological Constant - Physics LibreTexts, accessed on July 27, 2025, [https://phys.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Astronomy__Cosmology/Supplemental_M odules_\(Astronomy_and_Cosmology\)/Cosmology/Carlip/The_Cosmological_Cons tant](https://phys.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Astronomy__Cosmology/Supplemental_M odules_(Astronomy_and_Cosmology)/Cosmology/Carlip/The_Cosmological_Cons tant)
85. Does the multiverse explain the cosmological constant? - Blank On The Map, accessed on July 27, 2025, <http://blankonthemap.blogspot.com/2014/02/does-multiverse-explain-cosmologi cal.html>
86. The Ultimate Guide to Cosmological Constant, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-to-cosmological-constan t>
87. Galaxy formation efficiency and the multiverse explanation of the ..., accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/477/3/3727/4963750>
88. Can/has string theory solved cosmological constant problem? - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/3141/can-has-string-theory-solved -cosmological-constant-problem>
89. Revisiting the Cosmological Constant Problem within Quantum Cosmology - Bohrium, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://www.bohrium.com/paper-details/revisiting-the-cosmological-constant-pr oblem-within-quantum-cosmology/812582925089374209-672>
90. Prediction and explanation in the multiverse | Phys. Rev. D, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.043526>
91. Information theory - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,

- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information_theory
92. How does Quantum Physics defends to solve the Cosmological Constant problem?, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_does_Quantum_Physics_defends_to_solve_the_Cosmological_Constant_problem
 93. Dark Energy: A Deeper Intuitive Framing With The Dual Kernel Theory Framework - Medium, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://medium.com/@bill.giannakopoulos/dark-energy-a-deeper-intuitive-framing-with-the-persistence-dual-kernel-theory-framework-cdc845d7455b>
 94. The Unified Theory of Informational Spin A New Approach to Coherence, Gravitation, and Cosmological Structures - Preprints.org, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://www.preprints.org/frontend/manuscript/40f0ce6f2091f8a4ce424d6e3e1da3f3/download_pub
 95. Unified Informational Field Dynamics: A Unified Theory of Reality - Medium, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://medium.com/@naddo1965/unified-informational-field-dynamics-a-unified-theory-of-reality-47d5f41e2767>
 96. Theory of everything - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory_of_everything
 97. www.numberanalytics.com, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/emergent-gravity-general-relativity#:~:text=What%20are%20the%20main%20challenges,rise%20to%20spacetime%20and%20gravity.>
 98. Multiverse - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiverse>
 99. Mathematical universe hypothesis - Wikipedia, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_universe_hypothesis
 100. Exploring Variations in the Cosmological Constant Through Perturbation Theory: A Hypothetical Multiverse Model - ResearchGate, accessed on July 27, 2025,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378942696_Exploring_Variations_in_the_Cosmological_Constant_Through_Perturbation_Theory_A_Hypothetical_Multiverse_Model
 101. How could the multiverse theory be disproven? - Physics Stack Exchange, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/126103/how-could-the-multiverse-theory-be-disproven>
 102. Would a scientific theory of everything be falsifiable? - Philosophy Stack Exchange, accessed on July 27, 2025,
<https://philosophy.stackexchange.com/questions/117117/would-a-scientific-theory-of-everything-be-falsifiable>
 103. Experiments Show Gravity Is Not an Emergent Phenomenon | Hacker News, accessed on July 27, 2025, <https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=2931446>