COMMENTARY

Limitations of the Method of Integration in Astro- and Fundamental Physics

Yang Cao[1]

1 Communication University of China, China

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

I take a reflection of the mathematical method of integration applied in physics and astrophysics in the research. I examine the theoretical premise of integration entailed in its applications in the fields, and with qualitative comparative analysis, regard the inconsistency of the mathematical method in physical and astrophysical theories. I seek to uncover the formal science's affinity to the natural sciences in the research, and assert that number theory and set theory are better substitutes in modern physics and astrophysics. With a relativistic (astro-)physics perspective, I discuss and compare the representations of causality, capacities for deviations, and error tolerance with the methodological approach. I discuss the implications with the example of the Cosmic Microwave Background, and conclude with the teleology of the (astro-)physical sciences.

Corresponding author: Yang Cao, ypach@yangpachankis.us

1. Introduction

There is a common scientific consensus that Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems (GITs) falsify any possible theory of everything in physics. It is believed that for the descriptive and causally deterministic theories in physics, the GITs imply that they are consistent but incomplete, inconsistent but complete, or inconsistent and incomplete[1]. Andréka, Madarász, and Németi[2] proved, with first-order logic, that the relativity theories can be complete, i.e., determinable, but inconsistent. An example that falsifies the Minkowski spacetime prerequisite of the proof can be seen in the non-perturbative solution with the mathematical method element of integration[3]. Therefore, the case from the unquestionable laws in contemporary physics and astrophysics supports the corollary from Myers and Hadi Madjid[4] that

> *"There is no logical ground to exclude any of the uncountable set of potential explanations of given evidence prior to additional evidence not yet on hand."*

Or in the words of Stephen Hawking[5]:

> *"The theories we have so far, are ~both inconsistent, and incomplete."*

The commentary takes a theoretical advancement on the concept of time based on the limitations of the method of integration applied in physics and astrophysics. From the earth-moon-sun three-body definition of time based on the observations on the cyclic celestial motions to the current SI unit definition of time, the presumption of consistency in the concept of time is commonly implicit for the linearity of the evolution of life and death in the form known on earth; however, the SI unit definition of time is not consistent in an atomic and subatomic level, and neither is the definition from celestial motions on the large scale structure of the universe unless it is universally cyclic.

The mathematical basis for the cyclic presumptions in relativistic physics is the Fourier transform, which rests upon the unproved Riemann Hypothesis for the question on $tan\theta$ and the zeros in the formula

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{2i\pi \frac{n}{P} x}, \; x \in [-\frac{P}{2}, \frac{P}{2}].$$

The commentary takes the Fourier transform as an example to discuss the limitations of the method of integration in astro- and fundamental physics. The choice of the case depends upon the interferometric and spectrometric applications and the logical prerequisite of the element of consistency of the relativity theories[6]. The falsification of the Riemann Hypothesis can be seen in[7], and the statistical nature for light quanta gathering with the Fourier transform in interferometry is not affected from the perspective of special relativity. The only problem for the first-order logic on perturbative coupling though, as Hawking puts it, is that "it contains a prime number of blocks"[5]. Therefore, the second-order logic problem arises in the cosmic censorship hypothesis without non-perturbative inputs, and the contemporary approaches to the higher-order logic developments either involves the M theory or the spacetime continuum coupled with the Hamiltonian zero for the inseparable determination of matter contents from the observer's end[8][9][10][11][12][13].

The research behind the commentary[14] resolved the collapse of the wave function by the perturbative default of light quanta in the consistency of special relativity and the non-perturbative numerical analyses from the multi-wavelength data pieces. The higher-order logic presumes that instead of the degeneration of the system in question from the data pieces[15], the collapse of the wave function is the starting point for inference of the local bodies' morphology (how the numerical analyses started with the prime numbers in the gamma ray data can be seen in[16] and[17]). A conceptual distinction between the matter of time and the matter of space needs to be in place but in a future article. Gravitational propagation delay from mass centers are complementary with the basis for inference[18][19].

The scientific integrities of the empirical evidence and null results from the research, however, depend upon the unproven Goldbach's conjecture. The Goldbach's conjecture allows two sets of axioms to coexist and co-define a function of integration for a proliferative infinity, while deduction from the first-order logic would fail if and only if the Goldbach's conjecture is falsified. The higher-order logic of the commentary takes the latter scenario into consideration and into account in order to reevaluate the methodological integrities.

2. Methods

The counter-arguments in terms of astrophysics are laid out in the commentary that,

1. causality is a first-order logic arrangement from the perception of consistency by the observer;
2. amendments from the second-order logic always depend upon the first-order logic; and
3. detachment from the prior first-order logic displaces from the primary sets of deduction principles.

2.1. The Non-probable Causality

The theory of relativity is fundamentally the causal inference to Newton's Third Law. It is absurd to presume that the action of A caused the reaction of B if the forces of the action and the reaction are equivalent to one another. Equally absurd is that A's kinetic energy caused A's change of movement the moment it hit B.

In the simple example, both scenarios can be easily expressed with integrals with the element of movement according to the change in time

$$\int_{V_{A2}}^{V_{A1}} f(V_A)dV_A \equiv \int_{V_{B1}}^{V_{B2}} f(V_B)dV_B,$$

and

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{1}{2}(m_A V_{A1}^2 + M_B V_{B1}^2)dt = \int_{t_2}^{t_3} \frac{1}{2}(m_A V_{A2}^2 + M_B V_{B2}^2)dt,$$

if time were indeed continuous. But when examined closer, equations (2) and (3) don't state time in a continuous fashion. While equation (3) adhered to the continuity of time with the dissect from t_2, the instance of change in equation (2) with the basic variations of $f(V)$ was only stated in terms of the zero net change in general relativity. In other words, the causal inference provided by the combination of the two only stated the probabilities of cause in terms of effects at the instance of t_2.

Saving the phenomenon is still a significant part of science, and what I am proposing is the mathematical perspective of inquiry into the nature of physics or astrophysics. What I see about mass is a collection of atoms composed of different chemical bonds. The macroscopic phenomenon of mass ought to be able to be expressed by the microscopic behaviors. The photoelectric effects and dispersion in non-solids can both be explained by pair production, and why can't Newton's Third Law be expressed in terms of this?

For one, the expressions can take some long pages, and for two, there will be some significant discussions of consensus to satisfy the intersubjective domain in relation to different specialized disciplines. The adoption of set theory to the quantum realm was discussed by Hossenfelder and Palmer[20] with regard to superdeterminism, and both the continuous and non-continuous domains can be encompassed by set theory, that is, the rigid and non-rigid body versions of the example set[21].

2.2. Choice for Transitions

Number theory is a concrete complement for set theory. The theoretical premise for the method of integration is not only the presumption of continuity, but also the specific patterns in the continuum that can be summarized. The premise of integration's applicability in quantum physics followed the threshold of quantum jump in the electrons' behaviors so that the intervals can be summarized quantitatively before the next qualitative change[15]. An important detail, however, is neglected when applying integration to quantum physics, and that is the possible dimensional differences in the collection of signals received.

When it comes to relativistic physics, an important element of astrophysics nowadays, the elementary causal inference starts with the quantum systems, not ending with them. There is rarely any software that can provide the basis for numerical analysis in astrophysics, and the most that have been done are modeling off the original data and new commands of how to conduct the next observations. SAOImageDS9 is one of a kind I have seen with comprehensive documentation in the software with the numerical and algorithmic basis of operations on the data, apart from the numerical values in each pixel. Direct analysis for inductive functions off the original data is made possible in such an example, even though revisits on general relativity are necessary when it comes to coordinates and spacetime in a continuous or non-continuous fashion[22].

2.3. Robustness and Discreteness

With the development of machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence in the astronomical and physical sciences, the robustness of these models does not take into account the degrees of randomness. The implementations of randomness in ML were discussed by Vovk, Gammerman[23] for confidence levels, however, discrete algorithms only take into account the numerical likelihood and not the whole physical and astrophysical contexts like humans do. Besides, the approximation of confidence levels only originates from the Shannon entropy analyses for computability, that is, the reconfigurations of the continuity presumptions[23][24].

So, for the robustness (or say rigor) in the physical and astrophysical bases, the degrees of randomness from numerical analyses are essential with the relativistic prerequisites. The detection of a 1-KeV atom can either be from some near sources' photoelectric effect or the remainders from the sources after billions of light years' decay, and we can't even rule out the possibility of it being proportionally both. Therefore, the discreetness on a cosmological sense cannot be rightly achieved without assigning the degrees of randomness in observational results.

3. Result

Error tolerance is the unique strength in substituting the method of integration with number theory and set theory. Quantum indeterminacy is a concrete example on the strengths for quantitative research. The mathematical method's capacities for error tolerance are the phenomenological approach to causal inference. While integration deals with a limited numbers of sampled variables, set and number theories are capable of dealing with multiple variables. In this regard, error tolerance also means interpolatability.

Integration is a deductive mathematical method to (astro-)physics, and the mathematical languages of set and number theories lead to induction. The interlaced shifts may be different to fundamental research experiments and the other utilitarian approach to technologies. In a pragmatic perspective, the apparatus rationale in human science only detects the samples on a continuum of consciousness and then the samples are analyzed *post hoc*. So, measurement bias cannot be corrected by the analytic phase, but a deductive approach in such a phase can only widen the measurement bias, if at all measurable.

Functional analyses are still operable with the set theoretic and number theoretic approaches. The convenient tool of functional analyses, unless with strong evidence and argument for a causal inference, does not set a strong case for plausibility without analyzing into the degrees of randomness. Subjective bias in professionalism often occurs in the specific scenario and the method of integration is one of the causes from habit.

The study of randomness is the study of cosmology itself. The concept of entropy implies the classic physics expectations for order, and randomness itself is rarely acknowledged in the (astro-)physical sciences. It is worth noting that the sequence of prime numbers in mathematics is still random beyond current human summarization, and the differentiation between organic and inorganic chemistry that compose life from the lifeless is still a mystic domain.

4. Discussions

The randomness of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) is site-specific in the disciplinary corridor of discussion in the research, and may be an under-studied field of research. The Big Bang model takes the CMB's site specificity for mathematical summary, but neglects the causal inference construct for physical cosmology. Revisiting the CMB by the theoretical premise of randomness may further correct the measurement and subjective bias in the current organizational construct of the sociology of knowledge with the pragmatically organized scientific evidence.

Is it only a matter of associative thinking or the spirit of scientific integrity in the relationship between the linguistic matters of the formal sciences and the signified in the natural sciences? The unique characteristics of the formal sciences are stated to "transmute opinion about the base and contingent beings of this world into the necessary knowledge of pure reason", and simplicity is the elegant choice[25]. It is also stated, however, numerical experiments only "confirm to their affinity with pure mathematics", and their affinity with the natural world does not replace the laws of nature[25].

5. Conclusions

If physics and astrophysics is about achieving certainty, then rationalities on the uncertain are the prerequisites for discovery. The certainties of Newton's Third Law were uncertain, and it was by the collision experiments the certainties were revealed in the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics. There are, however, still large gaps to truly express

Newton's Third Law with the mathematical construct from the SM and non-SM particle physics, yet it does not imply they would not provide better approximations.

The contemporary purpose of (astro-)physics is concentrating on dark energy. The pattern of energy transfer during positron and electron annihilation, apart from the orbital paths of electrons that do not render a symmetric assumption, may be a microscopic clue to the cosmological phenomena[26]. Representing mass with the Bloch Sphere is the current apparatus rationale to bridge the certainties between the quantum realm and Newton's Third Law, and the probability density function to the method of integration is still a valid method not to be taken for granted.

Reexaminations of the causal chain presumptions are the assertions of the research. The exercise of consciousness may be the formal sciences' purpose for natural scientists. What the research has introduced to the natural sciences' scope is the validities of the social sciences' research methods to the former. The objectivity of knowledge is always a sociological construct instead of the subjective epistemology that is absolute in individual scientists.

Statements and Declarations

Funding

The research received no funding from the public or private sources.

Conflicts of Interest

The author has no competing interests perceived.

Data Availability

No data was used in the research.

References

1. ^*Ben-Ya'acov U. Gödel's incompleteness theorem and Universal physical theories. Journal of Physics: Conference Series. 2019; 1391(1): p. 012067.*
2. ^*Andréka H, Madarász J, Németi I. Decidability, undecidability, and Gödel's incompleteness in relativity theories. Parallel Processing Letters. 2012; 22(03): p. 1240011.*
3. ^*Calcagni G, Modesto L, Nardelli G. Non-perturbative spectrum of non-local gravity. Physics Letters B. 2019; 795: p. 391-397.*
4. ^*Myers JM, Madjid FH. Incompleteness theorem for physics. 2018. arXiv:1803.10589. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1803.10589.*
5. a, b*A. Gonzalo J. Hawking on "Gödel and the End of Physics", in Everything Coming Out of Nothing vs. A Finite, Open*

and Contingent Universe. 2012. p. 20-25.

6. ^*Frassetto F, et al. Static, refractive and monolithic Fourier transform spectrometer: development and prototyping. Scientific Reports. 2024; 14(1).*
7. ^*Pachankis YI. White Hole Observation: Quadrant Relations in Riemann Hypothesis. American Journal of Planetary and Space Science. 2023; 2(3).*
8. ^*Liao C, et al. Comparison of Variational and Perturbative Spin–Orbit Coupling within Two-Component CASSCF. The Journal of Physical Chemistry A. 2024; 128(12): p. 2498-2506.*
9. ^*Deur A, Brodsky SJ, de Téramond GF. On the interface between perturbative and nonperturbative QCD. Physics Letters B. 2016; 757: p. 275-281.*
10. ^*Trushechkin AS, Volovich IV. Perturbative treatment of inter-site couplings in the local description of open quantum networks. Europhysics Letters. 2016; 113(3): p. 30005.*
11. ^*Garbusi E, Osten W. Perturbation methods in optics: application to the interferometric measurement of surfaces. Journal of the Optical Society of America A. 2009; 26(12): p. 2538-2549.*
12. ^*Kofman AG, Ashhab S, Nori F. Nonperturbative theory of weak pre- and post-selected measurements. Physics Reports. 2012; 520(2): p. 43-133.*
13. ^*Ufrecht C. Theoretical approach to high-precision atom interferometry: Particle-particle interaction and the influence of gravity, in Institut für Quantenphysik, Fakultät für Naturwissenschaften. 2019, Universität Ulm.*
14. ^*Pachankis YI. A Multi-wavelength Data Analysis with Multi-mission Space Telescopes. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology. 2022; 7(1): p. 701-708.*
15. a, b*Hegerfeldt GC, Wilser TS. Ensemble or Individual System, Collapse or no Collapse: A Description of a Single Radiating Atom. in The Second International Wigner Symposium. 1991. Goslar, Germany: World Scientific.*
16. ^*Pachankis YI. Before or After: The Big Bang Paradox. Journal of Data Analytics and Engineering Decision Making. 2024; 1(1): p. 1-13.*
17. ^*Pachankis YI. Data-Driven Insights to Cosmology in the Dark Universe. Journal of Plasma Chemistry and Plasma Processing Research. 2022; 3(1): p. 43-50.*
18. ^*Gabriel MD, et al. Gravitational light deflection and propagation delay in nonsymmetric theories of gravity. Physical Review D. 1991; 43(2): p. 308-313.*
19. ^*Kornreich P. The Contribution of the Gravitational Propagation Delay to Orbital and Center of Mass Motions. Journal of Modern Physics. 2016; 07(14): p. 1909-1932.*
20. ^*Hossenfelder S, Palmer T. Rethinking Superdeterminism. Frontiers in Physics. 2020; 8.*
21. ^*Maddy P. Set-theoretic foundations, in Foundations of Mathematics. 2017. p. 289-322.*
22. ^*Pachankis YI. White Hole Observation: An Experimental Result. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology. 2022; 7(2): p. 779–790.*
23. a, b*Vovk V, Gammerman A, Saunders C. Machine-Learning Applications of Algorithmic Randomness, in Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Machine Learning. 1999, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. p. 444–453.*

24. ^*Shannon CE. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. Bell System Technical Journal. 1948; 27(3): p. 379-423.*
25. a, b*Franklin J. The formal sciences discover the philosophers' stone. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A. 1994; 25(4): p. 513-533.*
26. ^*Electron-positron Annihilation and Pair Creation. Available from: https://hst-archive.web.cern.ch/archiv/hst2002/bubblech/mbitu/electron-positron.htm.*