

Geometric Cancellation of Cavity–Atom LPI Signals in Density Field Dynamics: A Formal Proof

Gary Alcock
Independent Researcher

February 25, 2026

Abstract

We prove that in Density Field Dynamics (DFD), the tree-level response of electromagnetic cavity resonances and atomic transition frequencies to the scalar field ψ cancel in their ratio, reducing the measurable Local Position Invariance (LPI) violation parameter from $\xi_{\text{LPI}} \sim 1$ to $\xi_{\text{LPI}} = k_{\alpha}^{\text{eff}} \cdot \Delta S^{\alpha} \sim 10^{-5}$. Three independent empirical checks confirm this cancellation. The BACON optical clock network (Nature 591, 564, 2021) further constrains the screening regime, requiring that k_{α}^{eff} be evaluated at the local gravitational environment rather than the source field. This erratum strengthens the theory’s consistency with all existing clock data while preserving the ROCIT 13.5 σ detection as the primary experimental signature.

1 Statement of the Problem

DFD replaces curved spacetime with a scalar refractive field ψ on flat \mathbb{R}^3 , with optical metric

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = -\frac{c^2}{n^2} dt^2 + d\mathbf{x}^2, \quad n = e^{\psi}. \quad (1)$$

An earlier version of the theory (Sec. 10, DFD v3.1) claimed that the cavity–atom frequency ratio $R = f_{\text{cav}}/f_{\text{atom}}$ responds to ψ with $\xi_{\text{LPI}} \approx 1-2$, by assigning $K_{\gamma} = 1$ (photon sector) and $K_{\text{atom}} \approx 0$ (atomic sector).

This note proves that the optical metric’s constitutive relations *require* both sectors to respond identically at tree level, reducing ξ_{LPI} by a factor $\sim 10^5$.

2 The Constitutive Chain

Step 1: Tamm–Plebanski formalism. The optical metric (1) determines, via the Tamm–Plebanski

construction, the vacuum constitutive relations:

$$\varepsilon_{\text{eff}} = \varepsilon_0 e^{+\psi}, \quad \mu_{\text{eff}} = \mu_0 e^{+\psi}. \quad (2)$$

This is an impedance-matched medium: $Z = \sqrt{\mu_{\text{eff}}/\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}} = Z_0$. The phase velocity is $v_{\text{ph}} = 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{eff}}\mu_{\text{eff}}} = c e^{-\psi}$, consistent with $n = e^{\psi}$.

Step 2: Coulomb potential. Virtual photons propagate on the same optical metric. The static Coulomb potential between charges is:

$$V(r) = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_{\text{eff}} r} = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r} e^{-\psi}. \quad (3)$$

The fine-structure constant, measured in coordinate frame units, becomes:

$$\alpha(\psi) = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \hbar c_{\text{local}}} = \alpha_0 \frac{e^{-\psi}}{e^{-\psi}} = \alpha_0. \quad (4)$$

The $e^{-\psi}$ from ε_{eff} and the $e^{-\psi}$ from c_{local} cancel, so α is ψ -independent at tree level.

Step 3: Atomic structure. With α constant, the Bohr radius scales as:

$$a_0(\psi) = \frac{\hbar}{m_e c_{\text{local}} \alpha} = a_0^{(0)} e^{+\psi}. \quad (5)$$

Atoms expand in stronger fields. The Rydberg energy:

$$E_R = \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 m_e c_{\text{local}}^2 \propto e^{-2\psi}. \quad (6)$$

For a general transition with relativistic correction ϵ_A :

$$f_{\text{atom}} \propto e^{-(2+\epsilon_A)\psi}, \quad (7)$$

where ϵ_A depends on the transition (e.g., $\epsilon_{\text{Sr}} = 0.06$).

Step 4: Cavity frequency. A Fabry–Pérot cavity of material spacer length L , mode number m :

$$f_{\text{cav}} = \frac{m c_{\text{local}}}{2L(\psi)}. \quad (8)$$

The spacer is an electromagnetic solid: its lattice constant is set by the Bohr radius, so $L \propto a_0(\psi) \propto e^{+\psi}$. The local light speed is $c_{\text{local}} = c e^{-\psi}$. Therefore:

$$f_{\text{cav}} \propto \frac{e^{-\psi}}{e^{+\psi}} = e^{-2\psi}. \quad (9)$$

Both effects—slower light *and* longer spacer—contribute $e^{-\psi}$ each, compounding to $e^{-2\psi}$.

3 The Cancellation

From Eqs. (7) and (9):

$$R = \frac{f_{\text{cav}}}{f_{\text{atom}}} \propto \frac{e^{-2\psi}}{e^{-(2+\epsilon_A)\psi}} = e^{+\epsilon_A \psi}. \quad (10)$$

The leading $e^{-2\psi}$ factor—universal gravitational redshift—cancels exactly. The residual geometric variation is:

$$\xi_{\text{geom}} = \epsilon_A \approx 0.06 \quad (\text{for Sr/Si cavity}). \quad (11)$$

Why even ξ_{geom} is unphysical. The residual ϵ_A arises from relativistic corrections to atomic structure that depend on α . But we proved in Eq. (4) that α is ψ -independent at tree level. The $e^{-(2+\epsilon_A)\psi}$ scaling of atomic frequencies is an artifact of expressing frequencies in coordinate time; in proper time (what a local observer measures), $\alpha = \alpha_0$ exactly, and the ratio R is constant.

This is the Weak Equivalence Principle (WEP): in a local freely-falling frame, non-gravitational physics—including α —is position-independent. DFD satisfies WEP at tree level by construction (PPN: $\gamma = \beta = 1$).

4 The Physical Residual

WEP is broken at one loop by Unruh–de Sitter screening of quantum fluctuations. The screened effective coupling is:

$$k_{\alpha}^{\text{eff}}(a) = 2\sqrt{\alpha} \mu_{\text{LPI}}(a/a_0), \quad (12)$$

where $\mu_{\text{LPI}}(y) = (1+y)^{-1/2}$ and a is the local gravitational acceleration.

The measurable LPI violation in a cavity–atom comparison is:

$$\xi_{\text{LPI}} = k_{\alpha}^{\text{eff}} \cdot (S_A^{\alpha} - S_{\text{cav}}^{\alpha}), \quad (13)$$

where $S_A^{\alpha} \equiv d \ln \nu_A / d \ln \alpha$ is the transition’s α -sensitivity and $S_{\text{cav}}^{\alpha} \approx 1$ for an EM-bonded spacer.

5 Three Independent Confirmations

Check 1: Fine-structure splitting. If α varied as $\alpha_0 e^{-\psi}$ (geometric, unscreened), the ratio of two transitions in the same atom with different α -sensitivities would show annual modulation at amplitude $\Delta S^{\alpha} \times \delta\psi_{\text{annual}} \sim 10^{-10}$. Precision spectroscopy constrains such variation to $< 10^{-17}$. The geometric scenario is ruled out by $> 10^7$.

Check 2: PTB Yb⁺ E3/E2. The same-ion comparison $|K_{E3} - K_{E2}| < 10^{-8}$ (Lange et al. 2021). Geometric prediction: $|\Delta S^{\alpha}| \times \delta\psi_{\text{annual}} \approx 5.14 \times 1.65 \times 10^{-10} \approx 8.5 \times 10^{-10}$. Ruled out by $\sim 100\times$.

Check 3: BACON network (Beloy et al. 2021). Three species (Al⁺, Sr, Yb) compared at $6\text{--}8 \times 10^{-18}$ over 8 months spanning perihelion. Geometric prediction for Yb/Sr: $0.25 \times 1.65 \times 10^{-10} = 4.1 \times 10^{-11}$. Observed stability: $\sim 10^{-17}$. Ruled out by $\sim 10^6$.

All three checks independently confirm the geometric cancellation.

6 Screening Regime Constraint

The BACON data provide a further constraint. With solar-orbit screening ($a = 5.93 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m/s}^2$, $k_{\alpha}^{\text{eff}} = 2.4 \times 10^{-5}$), the predicted Yb/Sr annual signal is:

$$\delta R/R = 0.25 \times 2.4 \times 10^{-5} \times 1.65 \times 10^{-10} = 1.0 \times 10^{-15}. \quad (14)$$

The BACON Yb/Sr weighted standard deviation is 1.1×10^{-17} , ruling out this scenario by $\sim 100\times$.

With Earth-surface screening ($a = 9.8 \text{ m/s}^2$, $k_{\alpha}^{\text{eff}} = 6.0 \times 10^{-7}$):

$$\delta R/R = 0.25 \times 6.0 \times 10^{-7} \times 1.65 \times 10^{-10} = 2.5 \times 10^{-17}. \quad (15)$$

This is comparable to the BACON between-day variability ($\xi_{\text{Yb/Sr}} = 10.8 \times 10^{-18}$, $\chi_{\text{red}}^2 = 6.0$) and therefore *consistent* with the data.

Conclusion: Screening must be evaluated at the *local* gravitational environment, not at the source of the perturbation. Physically, the Unruh–de Sitter mechanism depends on the total local $|\nabla\psi|$, which at Earth’s surface is dominated by Earth’s own field.

7 Implications

1. **Section 10 erratum:** $\xi_{\text{LPI}} \approx 1\text{--}2$ is replaced by $\xi_{\text{LPI}} = k_{\alpha}^{\text{eff}}(a_{\text{local}}) \cdot \Delta S^{\alpha} \sim 10^{-7}$ at Earth’s

surface.

2. **ROCIT detection preserved:** The 13.5σ ion-neutral modulation uses a different channel (cavity-atom with ionic transition) where $\Delta S^\alpha \sim 6$, giving signals at $\sim 10^{-5}$ —unaffected by this revision.
3. **Nuclear clocks become paramount:** With $S_{\text{Th}}^\alpha \approx 5900$ (Beeks et al. 2025), the Th-229/Sr annual signal from α -coupling alone is:

$$\delta R/R \approx 6 \times 10^{-7} \times 5900 \times 1.65 \times 10^{-10} \approx 5.8 \times 10^{-13}, \quad (16)$$

detectable at current nuclear clock precision ($\sim 10^{-12}$).

4. **Height tests require space:** The height-separated test needs $\sim 10^{-20}$ precision for $\Delta h = 100$ m, pushing it to future space missions.
5. **Theory becomes cleaner:** The “why hasn’t anyone noticed 10^{-10} drift?” problem disappears. All existing null results are naturally explained.

8 Summary

The optical metric $d\tilde{s}^2 = -c^2 e^{-2\psi} dt^2 + d\mathbf{x}^2$ uniquely determines constitutive relations $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 e^\psi$, $\mu = \mu_0 e^\psi$. These modify the Coulomb potential, causing cavity spacers to expand by $e^{+\psi}$ while light slows by $e^{-\psi}$. The compound effect gives $f_{\text{cav}} \propto e^{-2\psi}$, identical to the atomic scaling, so the ratio is constant at tree level.

The physical LPI violation is a one-loop quantum correction, screened by the local gravitational environment to $k_\alpha^{\text{eff}} \sim 10^{-7}$ at Earth’s surface. Three independent empirical checks confirm this picture. The nuclear clock transition in ^{229}Th , with $S^\alpha \approx 5900$, amplifies this residual to $\sim 10^{-13}$ —within reach of current experimental programs.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks the BACON collaboration, Jun Ye, and Nils Huntemann for the precision data that constrain these predictions.