

From Kinematics to Interference: Operational Requirements for the Quantum Principle of Relativity

Mikołaj Sienicki* and Krzysztof Sienicki†

December 8, 2025

Abstract

The “quantum principle of relativity” (QPR) puts forward an ambitious idea: extend special relativity with a formally superluminal branch of Lorentz-type maps, and treat the resulting consistency constraints as hints about why quantum theory has the structure it does [1]. The discussion that followed has emphasized a basic point: writing down coordinate maps is not the same thing as providing a physical theory. In particular, quantum superposition is not operationally defined by drawing multiple “paths on paper”: it is defined by what happens when alternatives *recombine* in an interference loop [2, 3]. In parallel, careful 1+1 analyses have clarified how sign conventions and time-orientation choices enter the superluminal formulas [4]. Finally, tachyonic QFT proposals suggest a possible mathematical “bridge” via an enlarged (twin) Hilbert space [5], although this proposal remains contested (e.g. on commutator covariance and microcausality grounds) [6].

The aim of this short note is organizational. We keep three layers separate: (K) kinematics (which maps exist and what they preserve), (O) operational content (what an experiment must actually reproduce, especially closed-loop interference), and (D/B) dynamics and bridges (how amplitudes and probabilities are generated, and how subluminal and superluminal sectors might be linked). The goal is not “relativity derives quantum theory,” but a clear checklist of what must be added for that ambition to become a well-posed programme.

Keywords: Quantum principle of relativity; superluminal Lorentz maps; operational completeness; Mach–Zehnder interference; complex amplitudes

1 Introduction

It is easy to see why QPR is appealing. Special relativity is driven by a crisp invariance idea: the form of the laws should not depend on which inertial frame you use. QPR asks whether one can push that mindset further by allowing “superluminal” descriptions, and then reading any resulting tensions as clues about quantum structure [1].

The main criticism is just as straightforward. A new class of coordinate maps, by itself, does not tell you what a detector records, what counts as an outcome, or why an

*Polish–Japanese Academy of Information Technology, ul. Koszykowa 86, 02–008 Warsaw, Poland, European Union

†Chair of Theoretical Physics of Naturally Intelligent Systems (NIS[©]), Lipowa 2/Topolowa 19, 05–807 Podkowa Leśna, Poland, European Union; E-mail: niskrissienicki@gmail.com

interferometer produces fringes. Those are operational questions, and they are exactly where quantum theory earns its keep. In particular, “superposition” is not a slogan about having several pictures of one trajectory; operationally it is about *recombination* and *phase dependence* in closed loops [2]. This is why several comments insist that any claimed “derivation” must be explicit about which extra assumptions are being introduced [3].

This paper does not try to settle the debate, and it does not defend the strong claim that relativity alone implies quantum theory. Instead, it tries to do three practical things:

- keep the 1+1 kinematics tidy (including sign and orientation choices that are easy to gloss over);
- state operational requirements in a way that cannot be evaded by coordinate relabeling;
- spell out what a genuine “bridge” would have to provide if one wants more than a suggestive narrative.

The overall message is constructive. One can write down a coherent programme (call it “QPR+”)—but it needs deliberate additions. Kinematics alone will not produce loop interference; and a serious superluminal sector requires an explicit dynamical framework that outputs observable statistics.

2 Programme statement: kinematics, operations, dynamics

Writing Lorentz-like formulas for $|V| > c$ is the easy part. The hard questions are different:

- Do such maps correspond to anything like physical “frame changes” in 1+3?
- Even if we accept them as auxiliary redescrptions, do they force genuinely quantum phenomena, such as loop interference, rather than merely suggestive stories?

To keep these issues from being mixed together, we separate three layers.

Definition 1 (Kinematic layer). A kinematic layer specifies a class of affine linear maps between coordinate systems (including translations) used to relate descriptions of events and worldlines, together with their algebraic properties and stated domain of use. A kinematic map need not be a physical symmetry of Minkowski spacetime.

Definition 2 (Operational layer). An operational layer specifies preparations, measurements, and outcome statistics, and states what is required to count as a successful reproduction of an effect (for example, closed-loop interference).

Definition 3 (Admissible redescrptions (for QPR+; null-structure level)). A redescription is called admissible if it is an affine map between coordinate systems on Minkowski space whose linear part is invertible, preserves inertial straight lines, and maps null lines to null lines (equivalently: it preserves the null cone as a set). In spacetime dimension

$N > 2$ (in particular 1+3), standard results imply that such linear null-cone-preserving maps are conformal Lorentz (proportional to Lorentz transformations) and therefore do not interchange timelike and spacelike directions; see, e.g., Lemma 4.3 of Bergqvist and Senovilla [7]. By contrast, in 1+1 there exist additional null-cone-preserving maps with “interval sign-flip” behaviour. In this paper we treat those 1+1 maps as auxiliary redescrptions for kinematic analysis, not as physical inertial-frame symmetries.

Definition 4 (Physical causal past). $J^-(e)$ denotes the physical causal past defined by the standard Minkowski lightcone (the one operationally fixed by light signals and preserved by Lorentz isometries). When we use non-isometric auxiliary redescrptions, we do *not* require them to preserve J^\pm ; they are introduced only to compare explanatory forms.

Definition 5 (Dynamical/bridge layer). A dynamical/bridge layer provides an evolution rule or QFT structure that generates measurable statistics, and, when needed, a precise mechanism connecting subluminal and superluminal sectors in one coherent mathematical representation.

Remark 1. A concise way to summarize the operational critique of Del Santo and Horvat [2] is this: QPR moves from (K) to (O)/(D) too quickly. A kinematic extension does not automatically deliver recombination interference.

3 Superluminal Lorentz extensions: what kinematics gives (and what it does not)

1+1 formulas and the extra sign choice. In 1+1 spacetime, standard Lorentz transformations between inertial coordinates (t, x) and (t', x') are

$$x' = \gamma(x - Vt), \quad t' = \gamma\left(t - \frac{V}{c^2}x\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - V^2/c^2}}, \quad |V| < c. \quad (1)$$

Under certain assumption sets (and in some “algebraic extension” discussions), one also writes a second branch, formally defined for $|V| > c$ (see also Damski 4):

$$x' = \eta(V) \tilde{\gamma}(x - Vt), \quad t' = \eta(V) \tilde{\gamma}\left(t - \frac{V}{c^2}x\right), \quad \tilde{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V^2/c^2 - 1}}, \quad |V| > c, \quad (2)$$

where $\eta(V) \in \{\pm 1\}$. Unlike the subluminal case, there is no $V \rightarrow 0$ limit that fixes η by continuity. So even in 1+1, the formulas themselves do not settle their physical interpretation.

Interval sign flip (so: not a Lorentz symmetry). Although (2) looks familiar, it does not preserve the Minkowski quadratic form. One finds

$$x'^2 - c^2 t'^2 = -(x^2 - c^2 t^2) \quad (\eta^2 = 1), \quad (3)$$

so timelike and spacelike separations are exchanged. In other words, (2) is an anti-isometry in 1+1. This is exactly why it is not, on its own, a standard SR “change of inertial frame.”

Why 1+3 is different. In 1+3, QPR’s key warning is that if one tries to treat subluminal Lorentz transformations and a superluminal branch on equal “relativity” footing, one is pushed toward non-isometric maps (e.g. anisotropic scalings) as putative symmetries, which is not empirically acceptable [1]. So in 1+3, superluminal maps should not be treated as physical observer equivalences. At most, they can serve as auxiliary redescrptions, typically with altered roles for time and space.

Role of Damski. Damski’s contribution is clean and kinematic: it clarifies parametrizations and sign/time-orientation conventions for 1+1 superluminal maps [4]. It does not (and does not claim to) produce operational predictions such as loop interference, nor a probability rule.

4 QPR, determinism, and what “indeterminism” means in this setting

The determinism assumption should be stated out loud. QPR’s “indeterminism” argument relies on a particular notion of determinism: roughly, that certain event parameters are fixed by data local to the emitter’s own past worldline [1]. Critics have stressed that this is a stronger requirement than textbook SR and should be stated explicitly [2, 3].

Definition 6 (Past-worldline data). Let S be an emitting system with timelike worldline Γ_S , equipped with an intrinsic time order (e.g. proper time τ). For an event $e \in \Gamma_S$, define

$$\Gamma_S^-(e) := \{e' \in \Gamma_S : \tau(e') < \tau(e)\}. \quad (4)$$

The past-worldline data at e is $\mathcal{I}_S^-(e)$, the restriction of the system’s classical state variables to $\Gamma_S^-(e)$.

Definition 7 (Local determinism (QPR sense)). A process involving an event e on Γ_S is locally deterministic if there exists a function F such that an operational parameter of the event (for example, its proper-time location $\tau(e)$, or a binary occurrence indicator $\chi(e) \in \{0, 1\}$) is determined by $\mathcal{I}_S^-(e)$:

$$\tau(e) = F(\mathcal{I}_S^-(e)) \quad \text{or} \quad \chi(e) = F(\mathcal{I}_S^-(e)). \quad (5)$$

QPR as a programme-level requirement. Because superluminal maps are not physical symmetries in 1+3, treating them “like” frame changes is ultimately a normative move: it states what the programme *wants* to be true, rather than what SR already guarantees.

Postulate 1 (QPR (invariance of local-deterministic admissibility)). For any process P in the theory’s domain, the statement “ P admits a locally deterministic description” has the same truth value under all admissible redescrptions within the regime where the programme claims to apply.

Proposition 1 (Conditional tension result (informal)). *Assume (i) physically meaningful processes exist that are described as superluminal exchanges, and (ii) local determinism is taken in the “past-worldline sufficiency” sense without using information*

outside the physical causal past $J^-(e)$ of the emission event. Then different admissible descriptions can disagree on whether a locally deterministic causal explanation exists that uses only $\mathcal{I}_S^-(e)$ and data supported in $J^-(e)$. Under QPR, one must then either give up this form of local determinism (for that class of processes) or introduce preferred structures.

Remark 2. This is a conditional conclusion tied to a specific determinism notion. It is not the claim that SR alone implies quantum theory. This is consistent with the more modest tone of the reply [8].

Why “superposition from coordinate maps” overreaches. A coordinate change cannot literally turn a single continuous worldline into a branching “Y” curve. So if one wants a “many paths” picture, that is extra structure; it does not follow from relabeling events alone [2].

Definition 8 (Classical trajectory). A classical trajectory is the image of a continuous injective map $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1+1}$ (or \mathbb{R}^{1+3}), up to reparametrization.

Lemma 1 (No branching under homeomorphisms). *Let h be a homeomorphism of space-time. If $\gamma([0, 1])$ is homeomorphic to an interval, then $h(\gamma([0, 1]))$ is also homeomorphic to an interval and cannot be homeomorphic to a “Y” graph.*

Sketch. Removing an interior point of an interval yields two connected components; removing the branching point of a Y-graph yields three. Homeomorphisms preserve this invariant. \square

5 Operational completion: interference is the real test (and it forces amplitudes)

Interference loops are the benchmark. If one wants to talk about superposition in an operational sense, the key benchmark is closed-loop interference: alternatives must be able to recombine, and the output statistics must depend continuously on a tunable phase (as in a Mach–Zehnder interferometer) [2]. We treat this as non-optional: any “quantum-like” account has to get this right.

Postulate 2 (O1: Detector-model neutrality). Any “quantum-like” claim should be robust across reasonable detector models, including non-demolishing and absorb-and-reemit devices [2].

Postulate 3 (O2: Loop completeness). A framework that claims to recover superposition must reproduce closed-loop interference (e.g. Mach–Zehnder recombination) with a continuous dependence of output statistics on a tunable relative phase or delay, in setups where the alternatives are operationally indistinguishable at recombination [2].

Postulate 4 (O3: Statistics invariance under physical symmetries (optional strengthening omitted)). If probabilistic predictions are made for an operationally specified experiment in one physical inertial frame, then any other physical inertial frame related by a Lorentz isometry must yield the same measurable statistics.

Definition 9 (Probability rule (minimal)). A probability rule is a functional $P(\cdot)$ mapping amplitudes (or equivalence classes thereof) to outcome weights interpretable as probabilities, subject at minimum to: (i) invariance under global phase $P(uA) = P(A)$ for the action $A \mapsto u(\phi)A$ of Postulate A4, and (ii) operational normalization and additivity for mutually exclusive outcomes. To match O2 one also assumes that there exist setups in which P depends continuously and nontrivially on a relative phase parameter for operationally indistinguishable alternatives. No specific choice such as $P(A) = |A|^2$ is assumed.

Remark 3. O3 enforces invariance under physical (Lorentz) frame changes. It is not, by itself, a derivation of the Born rule. This matches the incompleteness concerns emphasized in [3].

Why kinematics plus classical mixtures cannot pass O2. Once O2 is taken seriously, a story that only uses coordinate maps, worldlines, and classical mixture rules cannot do the job.

Definition 10 (Kinematics-only model (event structure + classical mixtures)). A kinematics-only model is one in which (i) the ontology consists of classical events and worldlines, (ii) admissible transformations are coordinate maps, and (iii) experiment probabilities are computed by a classical mixture rule over alternatives (adding non-negative weights), without introducing a separate phase-like quantity whose relative value changes recombination statistics for operationally indistinguishable alternatives.

Proposition 2 (No-go for kinematics-only loop completeness). *No kinematics-only model (in the above sense) can satisfy O2 for a Mach–Zehnder-type interferometer. To reproduce continuous interference fringes for operationally indistinguishable alternatives, one must leave the classical mixture rule and introduce a phase-sensitive composition rule (amplitudes) at recombination.*

Proof sketch. In a Mach–Zehnder interferometer, changing a relative phase ϕ in one arm can continuously move probability weight between the output ports, including destructive cancellation at one port in an idealized setup. A classical mixture over alternatives has the schematic form

$$P = \sum_k w_k P_k, \quad w_k \geq 0, \quad \sum_k w_k = 1, \quad (6)$$

and it cannot produce phase-controlled cancellation between indistinguishable alternatives.

One quick way to see the limitation is to block one arm. Unconditioned on loss, a 50/50 first beam splitter sends half the intensity (or probability weight) into the blocked arm and removes it; the remaining half reaches the second beam splitter and splits again, giving $P(D_0) = P(D_1) = 1/4$ and a loss channel $P(\text{absorb}) = 1/2$. Conditioned on detection at the outputs, one gets $P(D_0 | \text{detected}) = P(D_1 | \text{detected}) = 1/2$, still with no dependence on ϕ . Either way, the mixture description stays phase-independent. To get cancellation as ϕ varies, one needs a signed or complex composition law, i.e. amplitudes that depend on relative phase [2]. \square

Remark 4. This proposition forces a phase-sensitive (wave-like) composition structure, but not yet uniquely a quantum one. Classical wave optics also uses phase-sensitive

addition. “Quantum” enters once one supplies a probability map (Born-type or equivalent) and a consistent account of measurement/which-way information in line with O1–O3.

Minimal amplitude calculus. QPR naturally points toward amplitudes as a convenient way to build a covariant, phase-sensitive calculus, while also noting that kinematics alone does not fix the phase scale or the dynamics [1, 8]. Here we simply make explicit the minimal structural assumptions needed once O2 is treated as a hard requirement.

Remark 5. Postulates A1–A2 are assumptions about how alternatives and concatenations compose. They are not consequences of kinematics alone.

Postulate 5 (A1: Sum rule for indistinguishable alternatives). If γ_1 and γ_2 are alternatives that are not distinguished (no which-way information) and can later recombine, then there exists an assignment $A(\gamma)$ such that

$$A(\gamma_1 \text{ or } \gamma_2) = A(\gamma_1) + A(\gamma_2). \quad (7)$$

Postulate 6 (A2: Product rule for concatenation). For sequential concatenation $\gamma = \gamma_{AB} \circ \gamma_{BC}$,

$$A(\gamma) = A(\gamma_{AB}) A(\gamma_{BC}). \quad (8)$$

Postulate 7 (A3: Nontrivial interference exists). There exist alternatives for which observed recombination statistics are not reducible to a classical mixture; operationally, this is exactly what O2 demands in suitable setups.

Postulate 8 (A4: Continuous phase symmetry). There exists a continuous one-parameter multiplicative group action $u(\phi)$ on amplitudes such that global $A \mapsto u(\phi)A$ leaves probabilities invariant, while relative phases can change recombination statistics.

Proposition 3 (Minimal carrier (two real dimensions; complex numbers as a standard realization)). *Under A1–A4 and mild regularity assumptions (continuity; non-degeneracy of the phase action), a one-dimensional real scalar carrier is insufficient once one asks for a continuous phase action as in A4. The minimal workable carrier is two-dimensional over \mathbb{R} with a unit-circle subgroup acting multiplicatively. With standard algebraic coherence conditions for composition (associativity, distributivity, identity), this structure is naturally realized as \mathbb{C} with $u(\phi) = e^{i\phi}$ (equivalently, a 2D real representation of $U(1)$).*

Remark 6. This explains why complex amplitudes (or an equivalent 2D real phase structure) are the simplest upgrade once one insists on loop interference and composition. It does not derive the Born rule. The constant \hbar appears only when mapping dynamics to phase; QPR is right that kinematics alone cannot fix it [1].

6 Bridge and outlook: the “no footbridge” objection

Horodecki’s diagnosis is that without a concrete structure connecting subluminal and superluminal sectors, QPR remains incomplete [3]. A programme can respond in two ways: either narrow the claim (QPR as a heuristic) or propose an explicit bridge and then test it.

A candidate bridge is the twin-Hilbert-space tachyon QFT suggested by Paczos et al. [5]. The intended role is structural: provide a representation in which Lorentz covariance, commutators, and a vacuum state can be handled in an enlarged state space. Note that “tachyonic” in QFT often refers to instabilities (negative m^2); here “tachyon” is used in the superluminal-sector sense of Paczos et al. 5. Also note that the proposal concerns covariance under the standard Lorentz group; connecting that to QPR’s auxiliary superluminal redescrptions would require an additional, explicit identification step.

Postulate 9 (B1: Twin-space bridge (candidate target properties)). A candidate bridge aims to realize an enlarged state space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{twin}} = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}^*$ together with a unitary representation U of the standard Lorentz group (or a specified subgroup) acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{twin}}$ such that: (i) commutation relations are preserved under $U(\Lambda)$; (ii) an invariant vacuum-like state exists on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{twin}}$; and (iii) amplitudes for processes are computed as a c -number functional (for example, trace-type) on a suitable subspace, yielding an operationally meaningful amplitude calculus.

Remark 7 (Status and limitations of B1). Paczos et al. propose a construction intended to meet B1 [5], but it has been challenged. For example, Jodłowski [6] argues that (as formulated) the commutator is not Lorentz invariant and that microcausality fails except in a limiting case. Also, B1 by itself does not guarantee operational adequacy: one must still show explicitly how measurement models and interferometric loops are represented so that O2 (loop completeness) and O3 (statistics invariance) hold in the proposed formalism.

One-line summary. Kinematics can point to a conditional tension with a strong form of local determinism; operational adequacy forces a phase-sensitive composition rule (amplitudes); and any serious “derivation” programme needs an explicit dynamical bridge—not just coordinate maps.

References

- [1] Andrzej Dragan and Artur Ekert. Quantum principle of relativity. *New Journal of Physics*, 22:033038, 2020. doi: 10.1088/1367-2630/ab76f7. URL <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1367-2630/ab76f7/pdf>.
- [2] Flavio Del Santo and Sebastian Horvat. Comment on “Quantum principle of relativity”. *New Journal of Physics*, 24(12):128001, 2022. doi: 10.1088/1367-2630/acae3b. URL <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1367-2630/acae3b/pdf>.
- [3] Ryszard Horodecki. Comment on “Quantum principle of relativity”. 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07802>. arXiv:2301.07802v3 [quant-ph], 19 Jan 2024.
- [4] B. S. Damski. Lorentz transformations in 1+1 dimensional spacetime: Mainly the superluminal case. *Acta Physica Polonica A*, 148(1):22, 2025. doi: 10.12693/APhysPolA.148.22. URL <https://www.if.pw.edu.pl/~appa/appa148z1.html>.
- [5] Jerzy Paczos, Kacper Dębski, Szymon Cedrowski, Szymon Charzyński, Krzysztof Turzyński, Artur Ekert, and Andrzej Dragan. Covariant quantum field theory of

- tachyons. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2308.00450. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00450>. arXiv:2308.00450v2 [quant-ph], 25 Jun 2024.
- [6] Krzysztof Jodłowski. Covariant quantum field theory of tachyons is unphysical. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2406.14225. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.14225>. arXiv:2406.14225v5 [quant-ph], 9 Dec 2024.
- [7] Göran Bergqvist and José M. M. Senovilla. Null cone preserving maps, causal tensors and algebraic Rainich theory. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 18(23): 5299–5325, 2001. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/18/23/323. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0104090>.
- [8] Andrzej Dragan and Artur Ekert. Reply to the comment on “Quantum principle of relativity”. *New Journal of Physics*, 25(12):128002, 2023. doi: 10.1088/1367-2630/ad100e. URL <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1367-2630/ad100e/pdf>.