Quantum Indeterminacy as Gödelian Epistemic Limitation: Implications of Relational Mathematical Realism for Quantum Foundations

Jason Merwin

Independent Researcher

February 2026

Abstract

In a companion paper [1], we established the Theorem of Temporal Necessity within the framework of Relational Mathematical Realism (RMR), demonstrating that a sufficiently complex, locally consistent mathematical structure cannot exist as a static object but must undergo a non-terminating sequence of state extensions—identified with physical time. In this paper, we extend the framework to quantum mechanics. We argue that quantum indeterminacy is not a fundamental property of nature but an epistemic consequence of observers being embedded subsystems within an evolving relational structure. The "hidden variable" determining quantum outcomes is the global relational topology of the present state S_t, which is non-local by definition and inaccessible to any embedded observer. We show that this framework survives Bell's theorem by violating measurement independence through synchronic topological constraint rather than diachronic conspiratorial fine-tuning, and we resolve the measurement problem by identifying wave-function collapse with the topological update of the observer's local subgraph. We further conjecture that the Born rule ($P = |\psi|^2$) arises as a geometric property of the Gödelian boundary—specifically, that probability scales with the combinatorial cross-sectional area of relational bundles at the logical horizon, unifying quantum probability with Bekenstein-Hawking entropy under a single geometric principle. Finally, we propose that the renormalization group flow of quantum field theory is the graph-theoretic coarse-graining of the universal relational structure, and that the hierarchy between gravitational and gauge force strengths reflects the ratio of global connectivity to local clustering density in the universal graph.

1 Introduction

The interpretive foundations of quantum mechanics remain unsettled nearly a century after the theory's formulation. The measurement problem—the question of how and why a superposition of states reduces to a definite outcome upon observation—has generated a proliferation of interpretive frameworks (Copenhagen, Many-Worlds, Bohmian mechanics, decoherent histories, among others), none of which commands universal assent. The Born rule, which assigns probabilities as the squared modulus of the wavefunction amplitude, remains an axiom rather than a derived result in every major formulation. And the apparent tension between quantum entanglement and relativistic locality, while experimentally resolved in favour of quantum mechanics by Bell test experiments [3, 4], continues to provoke foundational discomfort.

In a companion paper [1], we introduced the framework of Relational Mathematical Realism (RMR) and derived the Theorem of Temporal Necessity: if physical existence is identical to relational mathematical structure (Axiom 1, Monist Ontology), and if that structure is sufficiently complex and locally consistent, then Gödel's First Incompleteness Theorem renders a static Block Universe logically impossible. The resolution requires the structure to evolve via a non-terminating sequence of state extensions $S_t \to S_{t+1} \to S_{t+2} \to \cdots$, which we identified with physical time.

The present paper extends this framework to quantum mechanics. Our central thesis is that the interpretive puzzles of quantum theory—indeterminacy, the measurement problem, entanglement, and the Born rule—are not fundamental features of reality but consequences of the structural position of observers within an evolving, incomplete mathematical structure. Just as Gödelian incompleteness generates temporal passage when viewed globally (Paper 1), it generates quantum indeterminacy when viewed locally—from the inside.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 establishes the epistemic horizon: why embedded observers necessarily experience indeterminacy in a deterministic relational structure. Section 3 conjectures a geometric origin for the Born rule based on the combinatorial properties of the Gödelian boundary. Section 4 reinterprets renormalization as graph-theoretic coarse-graining. Section 5 proposes a resolution to the hierarchy problem based on the distinction between local and global network properties. Section 6 concludes.

Throughout, we adopt the axiomatic framework established in [1]: Axiom 1 (Monist Ontology), Axiom 2 (Local Consistency), Axiom 3 (Complexity Threshold), and Axiom 4 (Relational Determination), together with Lemma 1 (the Realization Principle). Familiarity with these definitions is assumed.

2 The Epistemic Horizon: Indeterminacy as Structural Blindness

2.1 The Observer as Subsystem

In the RMR framework established in [1], the universe evolves via a recursive sequence of state extensions $S_t \to S_{t+1}$, driven by the logical necessity of resolving undecidable propositions. A crucial corollary of Axiom 1 (Monist Ontology) is that any observer O is necessarily a proper subsystem of the current universal structure: $O \subset S_t$.

This inclusion relation imposes a fundamental epistemic limit. By definition, the topological connectivity that determines the resolution of an undecidable statement φ involves the *entire* relational network of S_t, including the "severed strings" at the global boundary. However, an embedded observer O can only access the local topology within their observational horizon.

Consequently, while the extension $S_t \to S_{t+1}$ is ontologically determined by the global topology (Axiom 4), it is epistemically inaccessible to O. The observer sees the "dangling ends" of the relational strings but cannot see the global geometry that connects them. To the observer, the resolution of φ—the transition from S_t to S_{t+1}—appears discontinuous and probabilistic, not because the process is random, but because the determining variables are topologically global rather than locally hidden. Quantum indeterminacy, in this view, is the measure of the observer's structural blindness.

This constitutes an ontological shift of the first order. Standard quantum mechanics assumes that randomness is a fundamental property of nature [5]. RMR restores a form of structural determinism without invoking hidden variables in the traditional local sense. The "hidden variable" is simply the global relational topology of S_t—the rest of the mathematical structure that the observer, being a proper subsystem, cannot access.

2.2 Holistic Necessity vs. Conspiratorial Superdeterminism

This deterministic evolution naturally invites comparison to superdeterminism—the view that measurement settings and outcomes are correlated by conditions established at the Big Bang [9]. Standard superdeterminism is widely rejected because it appears to require a "conspiracy" of initial conditions fine-tuned to produce specific correlations billions of years later [16].

RMR proposes a distinct mechanism: *Holistic Logical Necessity*. Standard superdeterminism relies on a causal chain stretching from the remote past ($t = 0$) to the present. RMR rejects this "Block Universe" causality. In our framework, the correlations between a measurement setting at detector A and a particle state at detector B are not determined by a common cause in the deep past, but by their *simultaneous inclusion* in the single, unified relational graph of the present moment S_t.

Consider a jigsaw puzzle with a central gap. The shape of the gap's left edge (Alice) and right edge (Bob) are perfectly correlated. This correlation does not require the puzzle manufacturer to have "conspired" billions of years ago; it arises simply because the edges define the boundary of the *same* missing piece. The resolution of the gap (the transition to S_{t+1}) is a single topological event that simultaneously satisfies the boundary conditions at A and B.

The "conspiracy" vanishes when one recognizes that A and B are not independent systems communicating via signals, but boundary nodes of a single, interconnected relational structure. The correlation is not causal (diachronic); it is topological (synchronic). This distinction—between diachronic causation propagating from the past and synchronic constraint arising from simultaneous topological connectedness—is the central departure of RMR from standard superdeterminism.

2.3 Bell, Free Will, and Statistical Independence

This distinction provides a robust defence against Bell's Theorem [2] and the Conway-Kochen Free Will Theorem [15].

Bell's Theorem relies on three key assumptions: realism, locality, and measurement independence (often called "statistical independence" or "free choice"). RMR explicitly retains realism—the outcomes are determined by the underlying structure. However, it rejects the assumption of measurement independence, not as an *ad hoc* loophole, but as a structural necessity of the ontology.

In the standard view, measurement independence assumes that the experimenter's choice of setting is uncorrelated with the particle's hidden variables. RMR denies this independence because both the experimenter and the particle are subgraphs of the single, unified relational structure S_t. Their states are correlated by definition because they are components of the same instantaneous global topology. The failure of measurement independence is not a conspiratorial constraint imposed by the past, but a topological constraint imposed by the present.

Similarly, RMR accepts the contrapositive of the Conway-Kochen theorem: neither experimenters nor particles possess "free will" in the libertarian sense of independence from the state S_t. Both are subsystems whose interaction is determined by the global topology.

Crucially, this determination is not fatalistic. In a Block Universe, the outcome is fixed before the measurement occurs. In RMR, the outcome is determined *contemporaneously* with the resolution. The state S_{t+1} does not pre-exist; it is generated by the consistency resolution of S_t. Thus, the experimenter and the particle are not executing a predetermined script; they are structural participants in the instantaneous resolution of a globally underdetermined state. The determination is contemporaneous with the state transition itself.

2.4 The Measurement Problem: Topological Update vs. Wavefunction Collapse

This framework offers a natural resolution to the Measurement Problem without invoking non-unitary collapse (Copenhagen [6]) or ontological branching (Many-Worlds [7]).

In standard quantum mechanics, "measurement" is an ill-defined process where a superposition reduces to a single eigenstate. In RMR, a measurement is defined precisely as the topological event where an observer subsystem O becomes relationally coupled to the boundary strings associated with an undecidable proposition φ.

Before measurement, the observer's local subgraph $O \subset S_t$ is topologically distinct from the specific boundary conditions of φ. The observer cannot "see" the resolution because their relational structure does not yet include the relevant connections. This state of disconnection corresponds to the "superposition" relative to the observer—a state where multiple resolutions are compatible with the observer's limited local information. Crucially, the superposition exists only in the observer's description, not in the structure itself. The structure is always in a definite (though globally determined) state; the wavefunction's linearity reflects the observer's combinatorial uncertainty about which resolution the global topology has selected, not any genuine indefiniteness in the structure.

"Measurement" occurs when the system extends to S_{t+1}, and the new structure includes relations connecting O to the resolved value of φ. The "collapse" is not a physical reduction of a real wave; it is the update of the observer's local topology. The observer has simply transitioned from a state of epistemic isolation (where φ was undefined relative to O) to a state of structural inclusion (where φ is now a fixed part of O's relational history).

Thus, the wavefunction is not an independent physical object that collapses; it is a description of the observer's conditional probabilities given their specific location in the relational graph. When the graph updates, the probabilities update to certainty. There is no mystery to the transition—it is simply the observer catching up to the reality of the structure.

2.5 Decoherence as Topological Propagation

This account naturally accommodates environmental decoherence [17]. In RMR terms, decoherence is the progressive topological coupling of environmental subsystems to the resolved boundary structure. As the state extension S_{t+1} propagates relational updates through the graph, an increasing number of subsystems become structurally coupled to the resolution of φ.

This spreading of relational information renders the resolution effectively irreversible from the perspective of any local observer—not due to any fundamental irreversibility in the dynamics, but because reversal would require the coordinated decoupling of an astronomically large number of relational connections. The practical irreversibility of measurement thus emerges as a topological property of large relational networks, without requiring any modification to the unitary evolution of the underlying structure.

This decoherence-as-propagation picture aligns with the thermodynamic arrow of time derived in [1]: the past is "fixed" because the relational updates have propagated irreversibly through the graph, while the future remains "open" because the cross-boundary implications have not yet been resolved. The quantum arrow of decoherence and the thermodynamic arrow of entropy increase are thus revealed as two manifestations of the same underlying process—the progressive, irreversible knitting of resolved structure into the fabric of S_t.

3 The Holographic Born Conjecture: Geometry of the Logical Horizon

Having established that quantum indeterminacy arises from the observer's inability to access the global topology across the boundary of S_t, we must now address the specific form of that indeterminacy. Why does the probability of a specific resolution follow the Born rule ($P = |\psi|^2$) [5] rather than a linear scaling ($P = |\psi|$)?

We propose that the answer lies in the geometry of the boundary itself. In RMR, the set of undecidable propositions defines a "logical horizon"—a surface separating the computed past from the uncomputed future. This structure naturally invites comparison to the Holographic Principle [8, 10].

3.1 The Boundary as Holographic Screen

The Holographic Principle asserts that the information content (entropy) of a region of spacetime is determined not by its volume, but by the surface area of its boundary [11]. In the RMR framework, this is not a property of spacetime *per se*, but of the underlying relational graph.

The "boundary" of S_t consists of the set of "severed strings"—relational connections that have one endpoint in S_t and one in S_{t+1}. This boundary is not a one-dimensional line; it is a high-dimensional combinatorial structure. When an observer measures a quantum state, they are interrogating a specific bundle of these cross-boundary connections.

3.2 Linear Density vs. Combinatorial Area

Consider the "strength" of a logical implication crossing the boundary. In the relational graph, a connection between the observer and a future outcome is not a single thread, but a bundle of parallel relational paths.

Amplitude ($|\psi|$) as Linear Density. We identify the quantum amplitude with the linear relational density of this bundle—effectively, the number of independent relational paths composing the connection. This linear measure governs interference, just as the width of a slit governs diffraction.

Probability (P) as Combinatorial Cross-Section. The probability of a specific resolution corresponds to the number of distinct microstructural configurations (extensions) compatible with that bundle. In the graph-theoretic context, "cross-sectional area" is defined as the number of combinatorially independent configurations of the relational paths composing the bundle. For a bundle of linear connectivity $|\psi|$ (the number of independent relational paths), the space of distinguishable microstructural configurations at the boundary intersection scales quadratically, yielding the characteristic $|\psi|^2$ dependence.

If the relational bundle has a characteristic linear dimension $|\psi|$, and the space of possible resolutions scales with the combinatorial area of the bundle's intersection with the boundary, then the probability measure P must be proportional to the square of the linear dimension:

$$P \propto |\psi|^2. \tag{1}$$

3.3 Statement of the Conjecture

This reasoning suggests that the Born rule is a geometric necessity of measuring incomplete structures. We formalize this as follows:

Conjecture 1 (The Holographic Born Conjecture)**.** *The probability measure over the resolution of undecidable propositions in a relational structure scales with the combinatorial cross-sectional area of the associated boundary relations, measured in the natural metric of the relational structure. Since the quantum amplitude $|\psi|$ represents the linear relational density of the connection, the probability of realization is given by the quadratic relationship $P \propto |\psi|^2$.*

3.4 Unification with Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy

This conjecture offers a potential unification of quantum probability and black hole thermodynamics. The Bekenstein-Hawking formula ($S = A/4\ell_P^2$) states that the entropy of a black hole scales with the area of its event horizon [12, 13]. In RMR, an event horizon is a physical manifestation of a Gödelian boundary—a surface beyond which relational implications are undecidable for an external observer.

If Conjecture 3.1 holds, then the Born rule and Bekenstein-Hawking entropy are two instances of the same geometric fact: the "count" of possible logical resolutions scales with the combinatorial surface area of the boundary, while the "coherence" or "strength" of the connection scales with its linear dimension.

A further connection reinforces this unification. In quantum information theory, the entanglement entropy of a subsystem is computed by tracing over the degrees of freedom outside the subsystem's boundary [14]—which in RMR terms is precisely the procedure of "ignoring the strings that cross the boundary." The von Neumann entropy $S = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$ is the information-theoretic measure of the observer's ignorance of the cross-boundary topology. This suggests a three-way unification: entanglement entropy, Born rule probability, and Bekenstein-Hawking entropy are all instances of the same computation—counting the microstructural configurations of a Gödelian boundary at different scales.

Quantum mechanics is thus revealed as the statistical mechanics of the universe's logical horizon.

4 Renormalization as Relational Coarse-Graining

The final, and perhaps most physically concrete, implication of the RMR framework concerns the phenomenon of renormalization. In standard Quantum Field Theory (QFT), renormalization is a mathematical procedure used to handle infinities that arise when integrating over all energy scales [18]. The Renormalization Group (RG) flow describes how the values of physical constants (couplings) change as a function of the energy scale at which they are measured.

In RMR, "energy scale" has a direct topological interpretation: it corresponds to the *relational density* of the probed region. High-energy probes interact with the tightly knotted, high-density local structure of the graph; low-energy probes interact with the coarser, effective structure of larger regions. The infinities encountered in QFT loop calculations are, as argued in [1], the signatures of severed relational connections—the "strings" that cross the boundary imposed by the energy cutoff. Renormalization succeeds because it is a principled method of accounting for those severed connections without tracing each one to its endpoint.

4.1 The Logarithmic Running of Couplings

A striking feature of the Standard Model is that coupling constants (such as the fine-structure constant α) "run" logarithmically with energy scale [19, 20]. RMR posits that this logarithmic scaling is not accidental but is a signature of the underlying network topology.

Network theory establishes that for broad classes of scale-free or self-similar networks, structural properties (such as node degree distribution and average path length) scale logarithmically or by power law under coarse-graining [22, 23]. We propose that the RG flow equations of the Standard Model are, in fact, the *graph renormalization equations* of the universal relational structure.

Specifically, as one moves the "boundary" of observation from high connectivity (UV) to low connectivity (IR), the effective number of relational paths—and thus the effective strength of the interaction—scales according to the specific self-similarity class of the graph. If the universe is a scale-free relational network, logarithmic running is the expected behaviour of the coupling constants. This transforms the RG beta functions from empirical fits into potentially derivable consequences of graph topology.

4.2 The Target for Verification

A rigorous derivation would require specifying the precise self-similarity class of the universal relational graph and computing its coarse-graining behaviour. The testable prediction is specific: if the universal graph belongs to the correct physical universality class, its coarse-graining equations should reproduce the one-loop beta functions of the Standard Model gauge couplings—specifically, the coefficients $b_1 = 41/10$, $b_2 = -19/6$, and $b_3 = -7$ governing the running of the $U(1)$, $SU(2)$, and $SU(3)$ couplings respectively [21]. A match would constitute strong evidence that the RG flow is indeed a manifestation of graph-theoretic coarse-graining. This computation is beyond the scope of the present paper but represents a concrete and falsifiable target for future computational work.

5 The Hierarchy Problem: Local Density vs. Global Geometry

The "Hierarchy Problem"—the inexplicable gap of $\sim 10^{39}$ between the strength of gravity and the strength of the gauge forces—remains one of the deepest puzzles in physics [24]. RMR suggests this gap is not a tuning problem, but a category error. We are comparing two fundamentally different topological properties.

5.1 Gauge Forces as Local Clustering

The strong, weak, and electromagnetic forces govern the behaviour of particle interactions at small scales. In graph-theoretic terms, these forces emerge from the *local clustering* *coefficient* of the network—the density of "knots" and short-range loops [25]. This local structure is extremely dense, resulting in strong interactions.

5.2 Gravity as Global Efficiency

Gravity, by contrast, governs the large-scale structure of spacetime. As established in [1], the gravitational constant G is an emergent description of the global relational topology. In network theory, global connectivity (often measured by "global efficiency" or harmonic mean path length [26]) scales very differently from local clustering.

In a large scale-free network, the local clustering can be orders of magnitude higher than the global connectivity. Gravity is "weak" because it is a measure of the sparse, long-range connections that define the manifold's global shape, whereas gauge forces are "strong" because they are measures of the dense, local knots.

Furthermore, the universality of gravity (the Equivalence Principle) arises naturally in this picture because global efficiency is a topological property of the network as a whole, coupling to all nodes regardless of their local type. Diffeomorphism invariance corresponds to the gauge symmetry of the network description—relabelling nodes does not alter the global connectivity spectrum.

We conjecture that the hierarchy ratio ($\sim 10^{-39}$) emerges as the ratio between the *average global path length* and the *local clustering density* of the universal graph. This reframes the hierarchy problem: it is not that gravity is inexplicably weak, but that the universe is vast (global) compared to its knots (local). No extra dimensions, no supersymmetric partners, and no anthropic landscape are required [27, 28]—only the recognition that long-range and short-range connectivity are categorically different measures of the same network.

6 Conclusion

We have argued that the apparent indeterminacy of quantum mechanics is not an ontological feature of reality, but an epistemic necessity of embedded observers. By reinterpreting the "wavefunction" as a map of the observer's structural blindness, and the "collapse" as a topological update, we resolve the measurement problem without abandoning realism. We have shown that this framework survives Bell's theorem by violating measurement independence through synchronic topological constraint rather than diachronic conspiratorial fine-tuning, and we have given decoherence a precise ontological grounding as the progressive propagation of relational updates through the graph.

Furthermore, we have conjectured that the specific mathematical features of quantum mechanics—the Born rule, the logarithmic running of couplings, and the hierarchy of forces—are traceable to the combinatorial geometry of the underlying relational graph.

The Holographic Born Conjecture (Conjecture 3.1) proposes that quantum probability and Bekenstein-Hawking entropy are two instances of the same boundary-area scaling law, potentially unifying quantum mechanics, black hole thermodynamics, and entanglement entropy under a single geometric principle. The identification of renormalization with graph coarse-graining provides a concrete, falsifiable target: the reproduction of the Standard Model beta function coefficients from network topology.

The central contribution of this paper is to show that the interpretive problems of quantum mechanics—indeterminacy, the measurement problem, and the apparently conspiratorial nature of entanglement—dissolve naturally within an ontology that identifies reality with an open relational mathematical structure. If these conjectures hold, the "weirdness" of the quantum world is simply the shadow cast by the incompleteness of the classical worldview. Indeterminacy is just Incompleteness viewed from the inside.

References

[1] Merwin, J. (2026). "Temporal Necessity in Relational Mathematical Realism: A Gödelian Argument Against the Block Universe." viXra:2602.0071.

[2] Bell, J. S. (1964). "On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox." *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1(3), 195–200.

[3] Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., & Roger, G. (1982). "Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm *Gedankenexperiment*: A New Violation of Bell's Inequalities." *Physical Review Letters*, 49(25), 1804–1807.

[4] Hensen, B., et al. (2015). "Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres." *Nature*, 526, 682–686.

[5] Born, M. (1926). "Zur Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge." *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 37, 863–867.

[6] Bohr, N. (1928). "The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory." *Nature*, 121, 580–590.

[7] Everett, H. (1957). "'Relative State' Formulation of Quantum Mechanics." *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 29(3), 454–462.

[8] 't Hooft, G. (1993). "Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity." arXiv:gr-qc/9310026.

[9] 't Hooft, G. (2016). *The Cellular Automaton Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics.* Springer.

[10] Susskind, L. (1995). "The World as a Hologram." *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 36(11), 6377–6396.

[11] Bousso, R. (2002). "The Holographic Principle." *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 74(3), 825–874.

[12] Bekenstein, J. D. (1973). "Black Holes and Entropy." *Physical Review D*, 7(8), 2333–2346.

[13] Hawking, S. W. (1975). "Particle Creation by Black Holes." *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 43(3), 199–220.

[14] Calabrese, P. & Cardy, J. (2004). "Entanglement Entropy and Quantum Field Theory." *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, P06002.

[15] Conway, J. & Kochen, S. (2006). "The Free Will Theorem." *Foundations of Physics*, 36(10), 1441–1473.

[16] Shimony, A. (1984). "Controllable and Uncontrollable Non-Locality." In *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the Light of New Technology*, pp. 225–230.

[17] Zurek, W. H. (2003). "Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical." *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715–775.

[18] Wilson, K. G. (1971). "Renormalization Group and Critical Phenomena." *Physical Review B*, 4(9), 3174–3183.

[19] Gross, D. J. & Wilczek, F. (1973). "Ultraviolet Behavior of Non-Abelian Gauge Theories." *Physical Review Letters*, 30(26), 1343–1346.

[20] Politzer, H. D. (1973). "Reliable Perturbative Results for Strong Interactions?" *Physical Review Letters*, 30(26), 1346–1349.

[21] Georgi, H. & Glashow, S. L. (1974). "Unity of All Elementary-Particle Forces." *Physical Review Letters*, 32(8), 438–441.

[22] Song, C., Havlin, S., & Makse, H. A. (2005). "Self-similarity of complex networks." *Nature*, 433, 392–395.

[23] Radicchi, F., Ramasco, J. J., Barrat, A., & Fortunato, S. (2008). "Complex Networks Renormalization." *Physical Review E*, 78, 026102.

[24] 't Hooft, G. (1980). "Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking." In *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories*, NATO ASI Series, vol. 59, pp. 135–157.

[25] Watts, D. J. & Strogatz, S. H. (1998). "Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks." *Nature*, 393, 440–442.

[26] Latora, V. & Marchiori, M. (2001). "Efficient Behavior of Small-World Networks." *Physical Review Letters*, 87(19), 198701.

[27] Arkani-Hamed, N., Dimopoulos, S., & Dvali, G. (1998). "The Hierarchy Problem and New Dimensions at a Millimeter." *Physics Letters B*, 429(3–4), 263–272.

[28] Randall, L. & Sundrum, R. (1999). "Large Mass Hierarchy from a Small Extra Dimension." *Physical Review Letters*, 83(17), 3370–3373.