

Bootstrapping Noncommutative Geometry with Dirac Ensembles

Masoud Khalkhali¹ and Nathan Pagliaroli^{*2}

¹Department of Mathematics, The University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada

²Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, The University of Waterloo, Kitchener, ON, Canada

Abstract

This paper surveys a bootstrap framework for random Dirac operators arising from finite spectral triples in noncommutative geometry. Motivated by a toy model for quantum gravity to replace integration over metrics by integration over Dirac operators, we give an overview of multitrace and multimatrix random matrix models built from spectral triples and analyze them in the large N limit using positivity constraints on Hankel moment matrices. In this setting, the bootstrap philosophy, originating in the S-matrix program and revived in modern conformal bootstrap theory, reappears as a rigorous analytic tool for extracting spectral data from consistency alone, without solving the model explicitly. We explain how Schwinger-Dyson equations, factorization at large N , and the noncommutative moment problem lead to finite-dimensional semidefinite programs whose feasible regions encode the allowed pairs of coupling constants and moments. Connections with spectral geometry, in particular the study of Laplace eigenvalues, are also discussed, illustrating how bootstrapping provides a unified mechanism for deriving bounds in both commutative and noncommutative settings.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Origins of the Bootstrap Program	4
3	Dirac Ensembles	5
3.1	Path Integral Quantization and the Role of Noncommutative Geometry	5
3.2	Metric from Dirac Operators and the Spectral Formulation of Geometry	6
3.3	Fuzzy Spectral Triples	8
3.4	Dirac Ensembles	9
3.5	Multitrace and Multimatrix Dirac Ensembles	10
3.6	Large- N Limits and Eigenvalue Distributions	11

^{*}*Email addresses:* masoud@uwo.ca, npagliar@uwaterloo.ca

4	Bootstrapping Dirac Ensembles via Positivity	12
4.1	The Hamburger Moment Problem and Hankel Positivity	13
4.2	Schwinger–Dyson Equations	15
4.3	Search Space and Positivity Constraints	16
4.4	Example: The Cubic Type $(1, 0)$ Dirac Ensemble	16
4.5	Example: the Quartic Type $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ Dirac Ensembles	17
4.6	Asymmetric Solutions	18
4.7	Type $(2, 0)$ Dirac Ensembles	20
4.8	Random Metric Spaces and Quantum Gravity	22
5	Bootstrapping Multi-matrix Quantum Mechanics	23
6	A Tale of Two Cities	24
6.1	Reconstruction of the Standard Model	27
6.2	Towards a Noncommutative Connes–Lott Model	28
6.3	Building a Bridge	29
6.4	Fermionic Dirac Ensembles	31
6.4.1	Fuzzy Geometries and $(0, 1)$ Spectral Triples	31
6.5	The Quartic Model	33
6.6	Yang–Mills–Higgs Dirac Ensembles	35
7	Bootstrap Methods in Spectral Geometry	38
7.1	The Bootstrap Philosophy in the Geometric Setting	38
7.2	Bootstrap Bounds for Laplace Eigenvalues on Hyperbolic 3-Manifolds	39
7.3	The Eigenvalues of Random Hyperbolic Surfaces	39
8	Future Directions	41

1 Introduction

The past two decades have witnessed a remarkable connection between high-energy theoretical physics, noncommutative geometry, and random matrix theory. At the center of this convergence is a profound insight of Connes: in noncommutative geometry, the Dirac operator encapsulates the fundamental geometric data of a space. This idea reaches its full expression in the *spectral action principle*, in which the metric, gauge fields, and Higgs degrees of freedom arise from the spectral properties of the Dirac operator [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 21, 22]. Allowing this operator to fluctuate therefore amounts to quantizing geometry itself. In parallel, the revival of bootstrap philosophy in conformal field theory has demonstrated the power of positivity, symmetry, and spectral consistency to constrain a physical theory without the need for explicit dynamical solutions [77, 60]. These developments together suggest that fluctuating Dirac operators may be studied through a combination of spectral, geometric, and positivity-based methods, borrowing intuitions from both random matrix theory and modern bootstrap techniques.

This survey aims to present a unified view of these themes through the study of *Dirac ensembles*, in which the Dirac operator plays the role of the random geometric field. First initiated by the proposal of Barrett and Glaser to integrate over finite-dimensional Dirac operators [6, 7, 36], we examine how ideas from multitrace random matrix theory, spectral geometry, and moment-positivity methods can be adapted to analyze such ensembles [4, 42, 43, 44, 60, 12, 46, 53].

In their study, Barrett–Glaser used Monte-Carlo Markov chain simulations to investigate the phase structure of their random finite spectral triples. In a complementary direction, the approach taken in our work and related papers relies on analytic and probabilistic methods from random matrix theory, such as multitrace genus expansions, Coulomb-gas techniques, topological recursion, and bootstrap constraints, offering a more explicitly analytic perspective on the geometry of Dirac ensembles for certain families of models.

The philosophy is that, just as the spectral action expresses the classical dynamics of an almost-commutative geometry [21, 22, 82], a Dirac ensemble defines a non-perturbative measure on the space of geometries. In this approach the task is not to solve the model exactly, which is generally impossible for multitrace multimatrix ensembles, but rather to delimit the space of allowable moment data using positivity inherited from the Hilbert space representation and consistency inherited from the Schwinger–Dyson equations.

The analogy with bootstrap methods is not superficial. In spectral geometry, positivity of integrated eigenfunction correlations can be used to bound Laplace eigenvalues on surfaces and 3-manifolds [14, 15]. In conformal field theory, positivity of squared OPE coefficients constrains the allowed spectra of primary operators [77]. In random matrix theory, Hankel-matrix positivity restricts the eigenvalue distributions compatible with a given potential. Dirac ensembles provide a meeting ground for these ideas: the Schwinger–Dyson relations play the role of crossing symmetry, while moment positivity arises from the structure of finite noncommutative geometries [42, 43]. Together these yield a “spectral bootstrap” for noncommutative geometry.

Another central theme of the paper is the incorporation of gauge and Higgs degrees of freedom into Dirac ensembles. While the simplest ensembles fluctuate only the metric sector of a fuzzy spectral triple [6, 7], one can couple the fuzzy geometry to a finite spectral triple in the spirit of almost-commutative manifolds [31, 21, 82]. The result is a *Yang–Mills–Higgs Dirac ensemble* in which both geometry and gauge fields fluctuate through inner perturbations of the Dirac operator [28, 74]. The corresponding spectral action resembles a discretized Yang–Mills–Higgs Lagrangian [21, 74], and many aspects of Standard Model geometry can be emulated in this finite setting [56, 22]. These models are analytically challenging and provide fertile ground for applying the bootstrap and moment-positivity techniques introduced earlier.

This exposition is intended to be accessible, situating Dirac ensembles within the broader context of spectral geometry, fuzzy manifolds, and random matrix models. Here is a section-by-section overview of the paper.

Section 2 begins with a brief historical account of the bootstrap philosophy, starting from Chew’s S-matrix program [24], and continuing to modern developments in the conformal bootstrap [77]. This section sets the conceptual tone by illustrating how far-reaching constraints can be extracted from consistency and positivity alone.

Section 3 introduces Dirac ensembles as finite-dimensional models of fluctuating geometry. After reviewing fuzzy spectral triples and the Barrett–Glaser proposal [6, 7, 36], we describe the multitrace and multimatrix structures that naturally arise.

Section 4 develops a bootstrap framework for Dirac ensembles. Schwinger–Dyson equations are combined with positivity techniques [60, 12] to obtain constraints on allowable moment sequences. Several explicit models are worked out to illustrate both symmetric and symmetry-breaking behaviors [42, 43].

Section 5 considers the bootstrap analysis to multimatrix quantum mechanical models, drawing parallels with recent work on the bootstrap for matrix quantum mechanics and lattice gauge theories [23, 41, 59].

Section 6 studies Dirac ensembles formed by coupling a fuzzy spectral triple to a finite ones [31, 74]. After reviewing the finite geometry relevant to the Standard Model [22, 82], we describe

the structure of inner fluctuations [28], the emergence of Higgs-type fields [21, 74], and the coupling to fermions [9, 52].

Section 7 turns to spectral geometry and explains how bootstrap ideas manifest in the analysis of the eigenvalues Laplacian. By examining positivity properties of integrated eigenfunction correlations one can constrain spectral gaps on surfaces and three-dimensional manifolds [14, 15].

Section 8 concludes with open problems, conjectures, and future directions.

2 Origins of the Bootstrap Program

The word *bootstrap* first entered theoretical physics in the early 1960s, in the context of Geoffrey Chew’s S-matrix program for describing the strong nuclear force [24]. The central idea was radical for its time: rather than postulating a fundamental Lagrangian or a set of elementary fields, one should attempt to determine all observable quantities directly from general consistency principles such as unitarity, analyticity, and crossing symmetry of scattering amplitudes. Chew famously summarized this view by saying that “there are no elementary particles” and that the hadronic spectrum should be determined self-consistently, “particles pull themselves up by their own bootstraps.”

The S-matrix bootstrap achieved partial success: it correctly organized the hadronic resonance spectrum, led to Regge theory, and indirectly pointed the way to the discovery of the Veneziano amplitude, the first appearance of what later became string theory. But the program ultimately failed to produce a unique or predictive description of strong interactions. With the discovery of asymptotic freedom and the rise of quantum chromodynamics in the 1970s, the bootstrap ideology retreated from particle physics.

A major revival occurred in 1983, when Belavin, Polyakov, and Zamolodchikov (BPZ) introduced the *conformal bootstrap* in two dimensions [11]. There the space of local fields in a conformal field theory (CFT) is constrained by the Virasoro algebra, and the consistency of operator product expansions leads to exact non-perturbative solutions. For nearly twenty years the method remained confined to two dimensions, until the landmark work of Rattazzi, Rychkov, Tonni, and Vichi in 2008 [77], who demonstrated that a variant of the bootstrap based on convexity, positivity of operator coefficients, and numerical semidefinite programming could be used to extract rigorous bounds on operator dimensions in higher-dimensional CFTs. This initiated what is now called the *numerical bootstrap program*, a field that has rapidly developed into a central tool in modern conformal field theory and has inspired related bootstrap approaches in random matrix models, lattice gauge theories, matrix quantum mechanics and more [60, 46, 23, 61, 41, 47, 48, 62, 63].

A bootstrap problem can be expressed schematically as the task of finding a set of unknown spectral quantities $\{c_\alpha\}$ satisfying a consistency equation

$$\sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} F_{\alpha}(x) = 0,$$

together with positivity conditions $c_{\alpha} \geq 0$ coming from unitarity, measure positivity, or geometric constraints. The underlying question is then: *is the system solvable, and if so, is the solution unique?* If no solution exists under the assumed spectral ansatz, the corresponding theory is ruled out. If a solution exists, the theory is *bootstrapped* into existence.

This abstract formulation provides the conceptual bridge to the mathematical applications developed later in this paper. The central principle shared across these developments is that *positivity* and *consistency* constraints, when combined with symmetry, may be strong enough to determine or severely restrict the underlying theory. Just as the conformal bootstrap constrains

operator dimensions [11, 77], one may constrain the eigenvalue spectrum of random matrices or the Laplacian eigenvalues of negatively curved manifolds, or heat coefficients [60, 12, 14, 15, 42, 50].

3 Dirac Ensembles

3.1 Path Integral Quantization and the Role of Noncommutative Geometry

In the standard formulation of quantum field theory, the expectation value of a classical observable \mathcal{O} is defined by the Feynman path integral

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \int D[\varphi] \mathcal{O}(\varphi) \exp\left(\frac{i}{\hbar} S(\varphi)\right),$$

where the integral ranges over all field configurations φ and $S(\varphi)$ denotes the classical action functional. Although this expression is formally ill-defined as written, it provides the conceptual foundation for perturbative quantization, Wick rotation, and Euclidean functional integrals.

In gauge theories such as Yang–Mills, the divergence of the functional integral can be controlled by renormalization: after introducing a regularization scheme such as a momentum cutoff, Pauli–Villars regulator, heat kernel cutoff, dimensional regularization, etc. where the ultraviolet divergences can be absorbed into a finite number of counterterms. This is the reason that quantum electrodynamics and the Yang–Mills sector of the Standard Model are mathematically consistent quantum field theories: the renormalized action contains only finitely many independent parameters, and the perturbation series remains predictive.

The situation is quite different for gravity. If one attempts to quantize the metric field $g_{\mu\nu}$ using the Einstein–Hilbert action

$$S(g) = \int_M R(g) \, \text{dvol}_g,$$

one finds that the resulting quantum field theory is non-renormalizable. That is, at each order of perturbation theory, new counterterms of increasingly high dimension appear, and no finite parametrization of the theory exists. From the viewpoint of perturbative quantum field theory, this is the fundamental obstruction to a quantization of classical general relativity.

This difficulty motivates the search for alternative formulations of quantum gravity in which the action is regularized at small scales or replaced by a more geometric object with better ultraviolet behavior. One such proposal, developed by Connes and collaborators, is the *spectral action principle* in noncommutative geometry [21, 22, 29], in which the classical Einstein–Hilbert action is replaced by the trace of a function of the Dirac operator on a noncommutative space. In this framework, the analog of the path integral is not a functional integral over metrics but a spectral partition function depending on the eigenvalues of a generalized Dirac operator. The ultraviolet divergences are then controlled by heat kernel asymptotics rather than perturbative counterterms, and the Standard Model of particle physics emerges from the geometry of an “almost commutative” space [31, 32, 82].

In the finite-dimensional setting of noncommutative geometry, this analogy leads naturally to the notion of a *Dirac ensemble*, where the role of the field configuration is played by a fluctuating finite Dirac operator. This idea was first explored numerically in the Monte Carlo studies of Barrett and Glaser [7, 36, 38, 39], and later developed analytically through random matrix and probabilistic techniques such as Coulomb-gas methods and topological recursion [49, 50, 44, 1]. In this framework the path integral becomes a matrix integral over Dirac operators, with geometry encoded in their spectra. We should also mention that within the Wulkenhaar-Grosse program for defining quantum

field theory on noncommutative spaces, the formalism inherently involves random matrices in the analysis of the effective action. We refer to [84] and references therein for more details. It is an interesting problem to find a bridge between the Dirac ensemble approach and the noncommutative quantum field theory.

The remainder of the paper will return to this analogy: just as renormalization corresponds to subtracting divergent terms in a heat kernel expansion, the bootstrap method of Sections 4 and 7.1 may be viewed as a way of constraining spectral data without reference to a Lagrangian. In both cases, the basic objects are not fields but eigenvalues, and the central constraints arise from positivity.

3.2 Metric from Dirac Operators and the Spectral Formulation of Geometry

One of the central insights of noncommutative geometry is that the Riemannian metric of a spin manifold can be completely recovered from the spectral properties of its Dirac operator. Let (M, g) be a compact Riemannian spin manifold, let D denote the Dirac operator acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(M, S)$ of square-integrable spinors, and let $C^\infty(M)$ act on \mathcal{H} by pointwise multiplication. Connes' distance formula expresses the geodesic distance between points $p, q \in M$ as

$$d(p, q) = \sup \{ |f(p) - f(q)| : f \in C^\infty(M), \|[D, f]\| \leq 1 \}.$$

Since the commutator $[D, f]$ is Clifford multiplication by ∇f , the condition $\|[D, f]\| \leq 1$ is equivalent to $|\nabla f| \leq 1$. Thus the spectral expression reproduces the classical Kantorovich–Rubinstein dual formulation of geodesic distance. In this sense, the Dirac operator encodes not only the Laplace spectrum but the full Riemannian metric i.e. distance, volume, dimension, and eventually curvature can all be recovered from D . This reformulates the Riemannian distance in a path-free manner by writing in terms of the Lipschitz bound

$$\|[D, f]\| \leq 1 \iff |\nabla f| \leq 1,$$

so the right-hand side is the same as the classical dual formulation of the geodesic distance:

$$d(p, q) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_{\gamma} \sqrt{g_{\mu\nu} dx^{\mu} dx^{\nu}},$$

where the infimum ranges over all smooth paths γ from p to q . In this sense, the Dirac operator encodes all information about the underlying metric, not only the spectrum of the Laplace operator but the actual point-to-point distance.

This leads to an operator-theoretic reformulation of Riemannian geometry. The triple (A, \mathcal{H}, D) where A is a $*$ -algebra of “coordinates,” \mathcal{H} a Hilbert space carrying a representation of A , and D a self-adjoint operator with bounded commutators $[D, a]$ and compact resolvent, is called a *spectral triple*. When $A = C^\infty(M)$, one recovers ordinary spin geometry. When A is noncommutative, one obtains geometries with noncommuting coordinates. Spectral triples were introduced by Connes in [27] (see also [32]) as the fundamental objects of noncommutative Riemannian geometry.

A fundamental result is Connes' *Reconstruction Theorem*, proved in [29]. To fully reconstruct a Riemannian spin manifold from a spectral triple, some additional structure is required. A *real spectral triple* is a spectral triple equipped with two additional operators: an anti-unitary map $J : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, called the *real structure* and a self-adjoint operator γ on \mathcal{H} with $\gamma^2 = 1$, called the *chirality operator* or *grading*. The chirality operator and real structure must satisfy the order-zero condition

$$[a, JbJ^{-1}] = 0, \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A},$$

and the order-one condition

$$[[D, a], J^{-1}b^*J] = 0$$

for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. We further require that:

- $J^2 = \varepsilon$
- $JD = \varepsilon' DJ$
- $J\gamma = \varepsilon'' \gamma J$

where the choice of signs $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$, and ε'' is dependent on the KO dimension via Table 1 in the even case and in the odd case they are trivial.

$s \bmod 8$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ε	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+
ε'	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+
ε''	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+

Table 1: The standard choices of the signs associated to a KO -dimension [26].

These conditions generalize the relations of the same objects in the case of spin^c manifolds. More generally, real spectral triple can be viewed as a noncommutative analogue of a compact spin^c Riemannian manifold. Connes' reconstruction theorem asserts that, conversely, any commutative real spectral triple satisfying mild regularity conditions is uniquely equivalent to the spectral triple of a spin^c manifold. Thus, spectral triples extend the notion of Riemannian geometry to genuinely noncommutative spaces.

Theorem: *Every commutative, real, p -summable, regular, oriented spectral triple satisfying the first-order condition, finiteness, absolute continuity, and Poincaré duality is isomorphic to the canonical spectral triple of a compact oriented smooth Riemannian spin manifold. Thus the data $(C^\infty(M), L^2(M, S), D)$ is not only an example but the unique commutative solution to the axioms of noncommutative geometry.*

This provides the conceptual justification for treating spectral triples as generalized noncommutative manifolds: the axioms recover classical spin geometry exactly when the algebra is commutative.

Example 1: The Two-Point Space

The simplest noncommutative geometry is the discrete space $X = \{p, q\}$ with algebra $A = \mathbb{C}^2$. The Hilbert space is \mathbb{C}^2 and the algebra acts diagonally. A Dirac operator is chosen as

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m \\ m & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad m > 0.$$

For $f = (f_p, f_q)$, the commutator is

$$[D, f] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m(f_p - f_q) \\ -m(f_p - f_q) & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\|[D, f]\| = m|f_p - f_q|$. The condition $\|[D, f]\| \leq 1$ becomes $|f_p - f_q| \leq 1/m$. Connes' distance formula therefore gives

$$d(p, q) = \frac{1}{m}.$$

Thus the single parameter m encodes the metric on a two-point space. In the Connes–Lott model of the Standard Model, this finite geometry becomes the “internal space,” with m replaced by matrices related to the Yukawa couplings. The Higgs field then emerges naturally from inner fluctuations of the metric, demonstrating how algebraic data can produce physically measurable quantities.

Example 2: The Noncommutative Two-Torus.

The noncommutative 2-torus \mathbb{T}_θ^2 is generated by two unitaries U, V with

$$VU = e^{2\pi i\theta}UV, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}.$$

The smooth algebra A_θ consists of rapidly decaying Fourier series

$$a = \sum_{m,n} a_{mn} U^m V^n.$$

Derivations play the role of coordinate vector fields:

$$\delta_1(U) = 2\pi iU, \quad \delta_1(V) = 0, \quad \delta_2(U) = 0, \quad \delta_2(V) = 2\pi iV.$$

The Dirac operator is modeled on the flat Dirac operator:

$$D = \sigma^1 \delta_1 + \sigma^2 \delta_2.$$

The triple $(A_\theta, \mathcal{H}, D)$ is a genuine noncommutative spin geometry. It reproduces the same metric dimension and heat-kernel asymptotics as the ordinary torus but yields a genuinely quantum metric on the state space when θ is irrational. This spectral triple also appears in the Connes–Douglas–Schwarz matrix model, encoding T-duality and the geometry of D-branes in a nontrivial B -field background.

The examples above illustrate that once geometry is encoded spectrally, the Dirac operator becomes a natural dynamical variable. In classical geometry the metric g varies in the Einstein–Hilbert functional; in the spectral formulation, D plays this role. In both the spectral action principle and the Dirac ensemble framework, one integrates over families of Dirac operators, treating geometry (or micro-geometry) as a fluctuating quantity. This observation provides a conceptual bridge between noncommutative geometry, matrix models, and random geometry: the Dirac operator contains the metric, curvature, and gauge structure, and so fluctuating D means fluctuating geometry.

The next sections will build on these examples to develop Dirac ensembles, fuzzy spectral triples, and spectral action functionals as tools for both Euclidean quantum gravity and noncommutative geometric models of particle physics.

3.3 Fuzzy Spectral Triples

A spectral triple is said to be *finite* if both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{H} are finite-dimensional. The question of classifying finite real spectral triples was fully answered by Krajewski in [56]. We are interested in a particular distinguished type of real finite spectral triples known as fuzzy spectral triples or fuzzy geometries, introduced by Barrett in [6]. Morally, fuzzy geometries should be thought of as finite-resolution approximations to classical spin^c manifolds. The algebra of functions is replaced by a matrix algebra and the Dirac operator is replaced by a finite dimensional matrix.

Let us now recall the explicit algebraic form of fuzzy spectral triples. Consider the real Clifford algebra $\mathcal{Cl}_{p,q}$ associated to \mathbb{R}^{p+q} equipped with a quadratic form of signature (p, q) . Its complexification $\mathbb{C}\ell_n := \mathcal{Cl}_{p,q} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ where $n = p + q$, has the standard basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}\ell_n$ be the chirality element defined by

$$\Gamma = i^{\frac{1}{2}s(s+1)} e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n, \quad s \equiv q - p \pmod{8}.$$

The integer s is called the KO-dimension. Consider the unique irreducible Hermitian $\mathbb{C}\ell_{p,q}$ -module $V_{p,q}$. When $n = p + q$ is odd, γ acts on it trivially. Additionally, the Clifford module $V_{p,q}$ has a natural charge conjugation operator $C : V_{p,q} \rightarrow V_{p,q}$.

A *fuzzy geometry* of signature (p, q) is a real spectral triple of KO-dimension $s \equiv q - p \pmod{8}$ of the form

$$(M_N(\mathbb{C}), M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes V_{p,q}, D; 1 \otimes J_V)$$

where J_V is the real structure of $V_{p,q}$. When $p + q$ is even, the fuzzy geometry has the grading $\Gamma = 1 \otimes \Gamma_V$. Many so called “fuzzy spaces”, such as the fuzzy sphere [66, 64] or fuzzy torus [79], can be realized as fuzzy geometries [10, 6, 37].

3.4 Dirac Ensembles

In [6], Barrett and Glaser study path integrals over fuzzy geometries as toy models of Euclidean quantum gravity. Their starting point is the observation, recalled in Section 3.2, that the Dirac operator plays the role of the metric in a spectral triple. If geometry is to be quantized, it is therefore natural to treat the Dirac operator as the fundamental dynamical variable, and to define the gravitational partition function by

$$Z = \int_{\text{metrics}} e^{-S(g)} \mathcal{D}g \quad \implies \quad Z = \int_{\text{Dirac operators}} e^{-S(D)} dD.$$

In the Barrett–Glaser formulation, this idea is implemented not on an infinite-dimensional space of Dirac operators on a manifold, but on the space of Dirac operators associated to a *finite real spectral triple*. As mentioned before, such triples arise naturally in the internal (noncommutative) part of the spectral model of the Standard Model, and have the form

$$(A, \mathcal{H}, D), \quad A \cong \bigoplus_i M_{n_i}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathcal{H} \cong \mathbb{C}^N, \quad D = D^* \in M_N(\mathbb{C}).$$

Together with a grading and real structure, they satisfy the axioms of noncommutative spin geometry. In this context, the space of admissible Dirac operators is a finite-dimensional real vector space, so the formal measure dD may be taken to be a Lebesgue measure, and the path integral becomes an honest finite-dimensional matrix integral.

More precisely, it was shown by Barrett [6], that the Dirac operator of any fuzzy geometries must necessarily be of the form:

$$D(M \otimes \psi) = \sum_I (K_I H + \epsilon' H K_I^*) \otimes \left(\prod_{i \in I} \gamma_i \right) \psi$$

where the sum is over specific subsets $I \subset \{1, \dots, p + q\}$ depending on the signature (p, q) , γ_i are the associated gamma matrices, and K_I are arbitrary skew- or self-adjoint matrices. See [6] for more details. This result is foundational in establishing probability distributions over spaces of

fuzzy geometries since it clearly parameterizes all the Dirac operators of fuzzy geometries as some finite sum of commutators or anti-commutators of skew- or self-adjoint matrices tensored to gamma matrices. We emphasize that the choice of skew- or self-adjoint matrices is completely arbitrary so that is free information we want to integrate over.

To turn this into a dynamical model, one introduces an action functional $\mathcal{S}(D)$ depending on D and studies the resulting probability measure

$$\mu(D) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-\mathcal{S}(D)) dD.$$

A particularly simple example is the quartic spectral action

$$\mathcal{S}(D) = g \operatorname{Tr}(D^2) + \operatorname{Tr}(D^4),$$

where g is a real coupling constant. Since D is a finite self-adjoint matrix, this defines a probability distribution on a space of matrices that is reminiscent of random matrix models, but with the additional algebraic constraints imposed by the spectral triple axioms. Barrett and Glaser showed that for such models, one may study phase transitions, eigenvalue distributions, and emergent notions of geometry in a setting that lies halfway between matrix models and full noncommutative geometry.

The resulting objects have come to be known as *Dirac ensembles*: random matrix models in which the random variable is not a generic Hermitian matrix but one satisfying the structural constraints of a real spectral triple. From this point of view, the Barrett–Glaser model provides a matrix-regularized version of the spectral action for quantum gravity, in close analogy with the way ordinary Hermitian matrix models arise as discrete approximations to two-dimensional quantum gravity.

This finite-dimensional approach has two key advantages. First, unlike the continuum Einstein–Hilbert functional integral, the partition function is mathematically well-defined. Second, the probabilistic and spectral tools of random matrix theory become available, including moment methods, large deviation theory, and bootstrap constraints of the type that will be introduced in Section 4. The study of Dirac ensembles therefore lies at the intersection of noncommutative geometry, quantum gravity, and random matrix theory, and serves as a laboratory for testing ideas about the quantization of geometry itself.

3.5 Multitrace and Multimatrix Dirac Ensembles

The quartic spectral action introduced in the previous section becomes considerably more complicated when expressed in terms of the matrix variables that parametrize the space of Dirac operators. Even in the simplest nontrivial example studied by Barrett and Glaser, the action does not reduce to a single-trace polynomial in a single Hermitian matrix, but instead produces a combination of multitrace terms [72]. Consider A Dirac ensemble that corresponds to probability distribution over the space of all Dirac operators fuzzy geometries of type $(1, 0)$. By Barrett’s classification theorem, $D = \{H, \cdot\}$, where H is some Hermitian matrix. We assign the probability density

$$\frac{1}{Z} e^{-S(D)} dD$$

where

$$S(D) = 2N(g \operatorname{Tr}(H^2) + \operatorname{Tr}(H^4)) + 2g (\operatorname{Tr} H)^2 + 8 \operatorname{Tr}(H) \operatorname{Tr}(H^3) + 6 (\operatorname{Tr} H^2)^2, \quad (1)$$

and the measure $dD = dH$ is the Lebesgue measure on the space of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices:

$$dD = dH = \prod_{i=1}^N dH_{ii} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} d(\operatorname{Re}(H_{ij})) d(\operatorname{Im}(H_{ij})).$$

Barrett and Glaser analyzed this model and other quartic models of higher type numerically using Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods and observed phase transitions in the eigenvalue distribution as the coupling constant g varies. In general, the analytic study of such models is formidable. The difficulty arises from the fact that most classical results in random matrix theory apply only to single-trace, single-matrix models of the form

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{H}_N} \exp(-N \operatorname{Tr} V(H)) dH,$$

where V is a polynomial (or analytic) potential. Such models admit powerful methods such as orthogonal polynomials, Coulomb gas methods, and topological recursion, all of which rely critically on the existence of a single trace term. By contrast, the action (1) contains nonlinear interactions among traces of different powers of H , and can no longer be reduced to a one-body Coulomb gas model. In this sense, Dirac ensembles fall outside the standard universality classes of random matrix theory.

Moreover, in more elaborate spectral triples the Dirac operator decomposes not into a single matrix H but into several blocks, producing *multimatrix models* in addition to multitrace effects. Thus, the analytic study of Dirac ensembles requires tools capable of handling coupled matrix systems with nonlinear trace interactions; an area in which only partial results are known for very specific single trace multimatrix models, and where the bootstrap methods discussed later in this paper become relevant.

3.6 Large- N Limits and Eigenvalue Distributions

For a probability measure on matrices of the form

$$d\mu(H) = \frac{1}{Z_N} e^{-S(H)} dH,$$

a central object of study is the mean empirical eigenvalue distribution

$$\rho_N(x) = \int_{\mathcal{H}_N} \mu_N(H) d\mu(H)$$

where

$$\mu_N(H) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(x - \lambda_i(H)),$$

where $\lambda_i(H)$ are the eigenvalues of H . In classical random matrix ensembles (Gaussian, Wigner, Laguerre, etc.), this distribution converges as $N \rightarrow \infty$ to a deterministic limit such as the Wigner semicircle or Marchenko–Pastur law.

In practice, one studies the large- N limit through tracial moments:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr}(H^k) \right],$$

which often determine the limiting measure via its moment sequence whenever the problem is well-posed. Typically, such eigenvalue density functions are compactly supported, in which case the moments uniquely determine the distribution. For single-trace models, these moments can be computed using Schwinger–Dyson equations. For multitrace models, the moment equations couple nonlinearly, and the bootstrap approach introduced in later sections provides one of the few systematic methods for obtaining rigorous bounds.

The study of Dirac ensembles therefore poses two distinct mathematical challenges:

1. the absence of standard integrability techniques for multitrace and multimatrix models, and
2. the need to determine large- N spectral data without closed-form solutions.

Both challenges motivate the use of positivity constraints and bootstrap methods as a substitute for exact solvability.

4 Bootstrapping Dirac Ensembles via Positivity

Bootstrapping has re-emerged in recent years in a mathematical context quite far from its original domain in particle physics. The first appearance in a random matrix setting was in the work of Henry Lin [60], who formulated positivity-constrained spectral conditions for matrix ensembles. Further developments have been carried out in joint work of the authors and collaborators [50, 53], the work of Kazakov and Zheng [46], and the more recent work of Li and collaborators [62, 63]. Besides the work on matrix integrals, bootstrapping with positivity has been used in matrix quantum mechanics [12, 23], lattice Yang-Mills theory [41], lattice gauge theory [3, 61], and many more areas of theoretical physics. The extent of its widespread use warrants a review of its own.

Details of these constructions will be presented in this Section. The key point is that, just as in the conformal bootstrap, one imposes positivity and symmetry constraints on correlation data, now encoded in matrix moments or eigenvalue distributions, and derives sharp bounds on allowed spectral quantities.

The analytic study of multitrace and multimatrix Dirac ensembles is obstructed by the lack of closed-form methods such as orthogonal polynomials or topological recursion. The bootstrap approach provides an alternative route: instead of solving the model exactly, one derives consistency equations for the correlators and imposes positivity constraints that must be satisfied by any admissible solution. The method consists of four steps:

1. Derive the Schwinger–Dyson equations (SDE’s) and rewrite them in terms of polynomial relations among moments, often called *loop equations* in the large N limit.
2. Determine the dimension of the search space, i.e., the linear span of independent moments needed to generate all higher moments. Note that this space need not be finite-dimensional.
3. Construct the Hankel (or moment) matrix indexed by words in the matrix variables, and impose that it is positive semidefinite.
4. Choose a cutoff Λ and restrict attention to the tracial moments of words of length $\leq \Lambda$ in the alphabet of matrix variables; the resulting semidefinite feasibility problem yields bounds on the unknown moments.

This setup parallels the numerical conformal bootstrap, where crossing symmetry provides the linear relations and unitarity provides the positivity constraints; here the SDE's play the role of the crossing equations and the moment matrix replaces the conformal block matrix.

In practice, once one determines all moments, the density function of the measure can be recovered by taking the appropriate integral transform of the characteristic function or some generating function of all moments. However, in practice the bootstrap method is only used to approximate a finite set of moments. Such approximations could be used to conjecture the general formulae for moments, such as in an example we will discuss in a later section. Alternatively, it is possible to reconstruct an approximation to the density function given a sufficiently large enough sample of moments via numerical methods. The recent work of Kováčik, and Magdolenová reconstructs the eigenvalue distribution and free energy of several matrix models from bootstrapped data [55].

4.1 The Hamburger Moment Problem and Hankel Positivity

The mathematical foundation of the bootstrap method in random matrix theory is the classical *Hamburger moment problem*: given a sequence of real numbers

$$(m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots),$$

does there exist a positive Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} such that

$$m_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^k d\mu(x), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots?$$

The key result is that *moment realizability is equivalent to the positive semidefiniteness of an infinite Hankel matrix*. Define the Hankel matrix

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \cdots \\ m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & m_4 & \cdots \\ m_2 & m_3 & m_4 & m_5 & \cdots \\ m_3 & m_4 & m_5 & m_6 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The fundamental theorem (Hamburger, 1920, cf. [1]) states that

$$\exists \mu \geq 0 \iff \mathcal{H} \succeq 0,$$

meaning that all principal minors of \mathcal{H} are nonnegative. The implication “ \Leftarrow ” follows from the fact that for every polynomial $p(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k$,

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^n a_i m_{i+j} a_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |p(x)|^2 d\mu(x) \geq 0,$$

so \mathcal{H} acts as a Gram matrix with respect to the $L^2(\mu)$ inner product. By a theorem of Carleman ([1]) if the moments satisfy

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m_{2k}^{-\frac{1}{2k}} = \infty,$$

then the representing measure μ is unique.

Example: the Gaussian distribution. Let μ be the standard normal measure

$$d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx.$$

Its moments are

$$m_{2k} = (2k-1)!! = 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (2k-1), \quad m_{2k+1} = 0.$$

The truncated Hankel matrix of order 4 is

$$\mathcal{H}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 \\ 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 15 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its leading principal minors are

$$\det(1) = 1, \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1, \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix} = 2, \quad \det(\mathcal{H}_4) = 12,$$

all strictly positive, confirming realizability. In fact, every finite truncation \mathcal{H}_n of the Gaussian moment matrix is positive definite, reflecting the determinate (unique) nature of the Gaussian moment problem. Any Gaussian/normal distribution is in fact uniquely defined by its first two moments or equivalently first two cumulants. This fact can be readily observed from the form of its characteristic function.

In random matrix models, one studies the limiting spectral measure

$$m_k = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(H^k)],$$

and the requirement that this define a legitimate probability measure on \mathbb{R} imposes the *Hankel positivity constraint*

$$\mathcal{H}(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{2n}) \succeq 0.$$

In bootstrap applications, the moment sequence is not known a priori; instead, one solves a system of algebraic relations (Schwinger–Dyson equations) subject to the Hankel positivity condition. The feasible region in moment space is thus cut out by positivity of a semidefinite Hankel matrix, in direct analogy with the unitarity constraints of the conformal bootstrap.

In the context of Dirac ensembles, the situation is similar but the moments arise from tracial moments of the Hermitian matrices and of the Dirac operator itself:

$$d_\ell = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2 Z} \int_{\mathcal{D}_{(p,q)}} \text{Tr}(D^\ell) e^{-S(D)} dD,$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{(p,q)}$ denotes space of admissible Dirac operators associated to fuzzy geometries of a fixed signature. Just as before, these numbers assemble into a Hankel matrix

$$\mathcal{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & d_1 & d_2 & d_3 & \cdots \\ d_1 & d_2 & d_3 & d_4 & \cdots \\ d_2 & d_3 & d_4 & d_5 & \cdots \\ d_3 & d_4 & d_5 & d_6 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\text{Tr}(P^*P) \geq 0$ for all noncommutative polynomials $P(D)$, this matrix must be positive semidefinite for any admissible Dirac ensemble. The bootstrap procedure therefore imposes

$$\mathcal{D} \succeq 0$$

together with the loop equations of Section 4. The intersection of these two constraint sets defines the allowed region for the unknown moments.

In practice, one truncates the Hankel matrix to moments of degree $\leq \Lambda$, yielding a finite-dimensional semidefinite program. The feasible set in the (d_1, d_2, \dots) -space then gives rigorous upper and lower bounds on the low-degree moments as functions of the coupling constant g in the action. For example, using only moments of order ≤ 4 already produces nontrivial bounds on the second moment m_2 of the associated Hermitian matrix model.

4.2 Schwinger–Dyson Equations

Let \mathcal{H}_N denote the space of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices, and consider a general multimatrix, multitrace model with m matrix variables:

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{H}_N^m} \exp(-S(H_1, \dots, H_m)) dH_1 \cdots dH_m,$$

where S is a polynomial in the matrices and their traces. For any word $W = H_{i_1} H_{i_2} \cdots H_{i_\ell}$ in the alphabet $\{H_1, \dots, H_m\}$, the corresponding moment is defined by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(W) \right] = \frac{1}{NZ} \int_{\mathcal{H}_N^m} \text{Tr}(W) e^{-S(H_1, \dots, H_m)} dH_1 \cdots dH_m.$$

The Schwinger–Dyson equations arise from the identity

$$0 = \sum_{a,b=0}^N \int_{\mathcal{H}_N^m} \frac{\partial}{\partial H_{ab}^{(i)}} (W_{ba} e^{-S(H_1, \dots, H_m)}) dH_1 \cdots dH_m,$$

and yield relations among correlators. In the simplest case of a one-matrix model with $W = H^\ell$ and $S(H) = \frac{N}{2} \text{Tr} H^2 - \sum_{j \geq 3} \frac{N t_j}{j} \text{Tr} H^j$, one obtains

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr}(H^{\ell-1-k}) \text{Tr}(H^k) \right] = N \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr}(H^\ell S'(H)) \right].$$

By taking the large N limit, the leading-order factorization property

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(H^a) \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(H^b) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(H^a) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(H^b) \right] + O(N^{-2})$$

allows the SDE's to be written solely in terms of the limiting single tracial moments:

$$m_k = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr}(H^k) \right], \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

When the model is treated as a formal matrix integral the factorization of moments follows from the genus expansion of moments, see for example Appendix of [50]. Otherwise, for convergent integrals, the factorization of moments can be proven using properties of the convergence of the

empirical eigenvalue distribution [45, 52]. In the above single single trace one-matrix model the loop equations for $\ell \geq 0$, can be written as

$$m_{\ell+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} m_{\ell-1-k} m_k + \sum_{j \geq 3} t_j m_{\ell+j-1}.$$

As we will see in subsequent sections, for multi-tracial models additional products of moments will appear.

4.3 Search Space and Positivity Constraints

Given the loop equations, the next task is to determine the *search space*: the smallest finite-dimensional vector space of low-degree moments that linearly generates all other moments through the SDE's. For instance, in the example of the one-matrix single trace model, all of the loop equations, can be written in terms of m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{d-2} , and the coupling constants, so the dimension of the search space is said to be $d - 2$. In multi-matrix models it is in general much more difficult to determine the search space dimension.

Once the search space is known, one forms the Hankel (moment) matrix

$$M_\Lambda = (m_{u^*v})_{u,v},$$

indexed by all words u, v in the matrix variables of length $\leq \Lambda$. By construction, this matrix must be positive semidefinite, since for any noncommutative polynomial P one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(P^* P) \right] \geq 0.$$

Together, the loop equations and the positivity of M_Λ define a semidefinite feasibility problem, whose solution space consists of all possible large- N moment sequences consistent with the model. In this way, one obtains rigorous upper and lower bounds on the moments without solving the model exactly.

The bootstrap method therefore provides a non-perturbative analytic tool for Dirac ensembles, playing the same role that conformal bootstrap methods play in CFT: instead of solving the theory, one cornerstones the space of possible solutions using symmetry and positivity alone.

So far all works that the authors are aware of have restricted their attention to bootstrapping Hermitian matrix integrals in the large N limit. The factorization of moments discussed in the previous section allows for the above Hankel matrix to be the only required constraints to solve the system. If one were to consider bootstrapping matrix ensembles for finite N or even subleading contributions, additional constraints would be required to be derived from Hankel matrices with multi-tracial moments.

4.4 Example: The Cubic Type $(1, 0)$ Dirac Ensemble

A simple, yet analytically rich model arises when the action is cubic. In the signature $(1, 0)$ case, the Dirac operator reduces to a single Hermitian matrix variable H , and the partition function takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(D^2) - \frac{g}{6} \text{Tr}(D^3) \right) dD \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}_N} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (N \text{Tr} H^2 + (\text{Tr} H)^2) - \frac{g}{3} (N \text{Tr} H^3 + 3 \text{Tr} H^2 \text{Tr} H) \right) dH. \end{aligned}$$

This model is not convergent for any nonzero value of g , so must be interpreted as a formal matrix integral. For $\ell \geq 0$, the loop equations of the model are of the form

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} m_k m_{\ell-k-1} = m_{\ell+1} + m_1 m_\ell + g(m_{\ell+2} + 2m_1 m_{\ell+1} + m_2 m_\ell).$$

From the loop equations it is clear that all moments can be written in terms of m_1 , so the search space has dimension one. The bootstrap method provides a way to determine the allowed pairs (g, m_1) in the large N limit by imposing positivity of the (noncommutative) moment matrix associated with the tracial sequence (m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots) . By enforcing positivity of progressively larger principal minors, one obtains a nested family of feasible regions in the (g, m_1) -plane. As the number of imposed constraints increases, these regions shrink, revealing a nonlinear relation between the coupling g and the first moment m_1 . See Figure 1.




Figure 1: Bootstrapped regions of possible solutions to the loop equations for the cubic type $(1, 0)$ Dirac ensemble [43]. Each colour corresponds to a different number of constraints derived from positivity of some principal minors of the specified size. The analytic solution found in [44] is plotted in red for comparison.

Where the analytic solution stops near ± 0.2 , are two critical points where the free energy fails to be analytic in g . The critical phenomenon around these points has been related to the $(3, 2)$ minimal model from Liouville quantum gravity [44]. In general, bootstrapping with positivity can be used to estimate the location of a critical point as well as its critical exponents. See for example the recent work of the authors and collaborators [53].

4.5 Example: the Quartic Type $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ Dirac Ensembles

The type $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ fuzzy geometries have Dirac operators of the form

$$D_{(1,0)} = \{H, \cdot\} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{(0,1)} = [H, \cdot],$$

respectively, where H is Hermitian N by N . The Dirac quartic Dirac ensemble considered is

$$\frac{1}{Z} e^{-g \text{Tr} D^2 - \text{Tr} D^4} dD.$$

In terms of H , it can be written as

$$\frac{1}{Z} \exp\{-2g(N \text{Tr } H^2 + \varepsilon(\text{Tr } H)^2) - 2(N \text{Tr } H^4 + \varepsilon 4 \text{Tr } H \text{Tr } H^3 + 3(\text{Tr } H^2)^2)\} dH, \quad (2)$$

where $\varepsilon = 1$ for type $(1, 0)$ and $\varepsilon = -1$ for type $(0, 1)$. In the case of the type $(0, 1)$ geometry there are some additional nuances to defining the integral, see [52] for details.

The loop equations are of the form:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} m_k m_{\ell-k-1} = t_2 (4m_{\ell+1} + 4\epsilon m_1 m_{\ell}) + 8m_{\ell+3} + 8\epsilon m_3 m_{\ell} + 24\epsilon m_1 m_{\ell+2} + 16m_2 m_{\ell+1}.$$

Note that by the symmetric of the matrix integral $H \rightarrow -H$, all odd moments are zero when considering either a formal or convergent matrix integral. As a consequence, both models have the same loop equations since all terms with an ϵ are zero. From the above formula it is clear that all moments can be written in terms of m_2 , so the search space dimension is one.




Figure 2: Bootstrapped region of solution space for the type $(1, 0)$ quartic Dirac ensemble [42]. The different coloured regions denote different combinations of constraints applied.

The analytic solution was found in [49] for the convergent case and [44] for the formal case. These models also have critical points like the cubic model, however, since we only have a coupling in front of the Gaussian term, it is not immediately visible until one rescales D and g to include a redundant coupling in front of $\text{Tr } D^4$ in the potential.

4.6 Asymmetric Solutions

By the symmetry of the quartic type $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ ensembles, for either formal or convergent matrix integral, all odd moments must be equal to zero. However, what is interesting is that if one does not restrict all odd moments to being zero, asymmetric solutions appear when bootstrapping. What is even more remarkable is that bootstrapped solution of type $(0, 1)$ case still only produces symmetric solutions, while the type $(1, 0)$ produces genuine asymmetric solutions. All moments can be written in terms of m_1 and m_2 , so the search space has dimension two. See Figure 3 and Figure 4 for the results. These phenomena will be investigated in an upcoming work [20] and serves as an

interesting example of a bootstrapping problem with multiple solutions. The authors believe that more than two asymmetric solutions are possible, so if given sufficient computational resources we expect the asymmetric subspaces of the solution space to fork again.




Figure 3: Bootstrapped region of solution space for the type $(1, 0)$ quartic Dirac ensemble, allowing for asymmetric solutions. This plot was generated using ten SDE's and a submatrix of the Hankel matrix of size ten. There is a clear fork in the solutions space, where each outer prong corresponds to a subspace of possible asymmetric solutions.




Figure 4: Bootstrapped region of solution space for the type $(0, 1)$ quartic Dirac ensemble, allowing for asymmetric solutions. These were found using eight SDE's and a submatrix of the Hankel matrix of size 8.

Such solutions as mentioned before cannot belong to any matrix model as discussed in this paper. It is an open question to find what type of mathematical object asymmetric solutions to the SDE's represent. It is also worth noting that asymmetric solutions of even models do not exist in single trace matrix models since they are in fact a result of multi-tracial terms. Such asymmetric solutions appear in fuzzy field theories [65, 54], and were studied in the recent work [19].

4.7 Type $(2,0)$ Dirac Ensembles

The Dirac operator of type $(2,0)$ Dirac ensemble can be written in block form in terms of two Hermitian $N \times N$ matrices A and B :

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \{A, \cdot\} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \{B, \cdot\}.$$

The spectral action then becomes a multitrace, multimatrix polynomial in A and B . For instance, one computes

$$\text{Tr}(D^2) = 4N \text{Tr}(A^2) + 4N \text{Tr}(B^2) + 4(\text{Tr } A)^2 + 4(\text{Tr } B)^2,$$

and the quartic term expands as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(D^4) = & 4N \text{Tr}(A^4) + 4N \text{Tr}(B^4) + 16N \text{Tr}(A^2 B^2) - 8N \text{Tr}(ABAB) \\ & + 16 \text{Tr}(A) \text{Tr}(A^3) + 16 \text{Tr}(A) \text{Tr}(B^2 A) + 16 \text{Tr}(B) \text{Tr}(B^3) \\ & + 16 \text{Tr}(B) \text{Tr}(A^2 B) + 16 (\text{Tr } AB)^2 + 12 (\text{Tr } A^2)^2 + 12 (\text{Tr } B^2)^2 \\ & + 8 \text{Tr}(A^2) \text{Tr}(B^2). \end{aligned}$$

Let us take the partition function for the $(2,0)$ Dirac ensemble as

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{D}_{(p,q)}} e^{-t_2 \text{Tr } D^2 - t_4 \text{Tr } D^4} dD.$$

The resulting model is therefore a multimatrix multitrace random matrix ensemble, lying well outside the usual one-matrix polynomial potential framework of classical random matrix theory. In [51], a solution in the large N limit of the quartic type $(2, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ Dirac ensembles was proposed and proved using the bootstrapped solution found in [42] as guidance. Unfortunately, later an error was found in the proof. However, the result is still conjectured to be true based off of bootstrapped data. It is still true and was proven in [52] that any unique symmetric solution is the same for all three signatures since the loop equations are the same. For simplicity we have only discussed the type $(2, 0)$ case.

Conjecture: The second moment of the formal and convergent type $(2, 0)$ quartic Dirac for t_2 and t_4 in a sufficiently small enough neighbourhood of zero, can be written as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr } D^2] = \frac{1}{8t_4} \left(\sqrt{t_2^2 + 8t_4} - t_2 \right).$$

It was proven that if a solution exists that entire hierarchy of moments can be expressed recursively in terms of these quantities, showing that the algebra of relations among moments is one-dimensional in the large N limit assuming there is indeed a solution. Once the potential is rescaled, the conjectured solution has a critical point whose critical exponent corresponds to the universality class of the Continuum Random Tree.

To study the large N limit, we introduce the notation

$$m_{a,b,c,d} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} (A^a B^b A^c B^d) \right],$$

and similarly write m_k for single-matrix moments such as $\text{Tr}(A^k)$ or $\text{Tr}(B^k)$ where no ambiguity exists since the action is symmetric in A and B . Applying the Schwinger–Dyson equations to words of the form A^ℓ and using cyclicity of the trace, one obtains the SDE’s

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} m_k m_{\ell-k-1} &= (8g + 64m_2) m_{\ell+1} + 16 m_{\ell+3} \\ &\quad - 16 m_{\ell,1,1,1} + 32 m_{\ell+1,2}, \end{aligned}$$

For more examples of the loop equations and moments formulae based on the conjecture, see the Appendices of [51].




Figure 5: Bootstrapped region of solution space for the type $(2,0)$ quartic Dirac ensemble [42]. The different coloured regions denote different combinations of constraints applied. The red curve is the conjectured analytic solution.

4.8 Random Metric Spaces and Quantum Gravity

Single trace formal matrix models enumerate isomorphism classes graphs embedded onto surfaces of various genus, called *maps*. One can construct discrete probability distributions using these generating functions of maps, and it can be shown that the random metric spaces constructed from such considerations converge in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense to random fractal surface. For a very general class of such maps the limiting surface is the Brownian map [57, 70]. The Brownian map is the prime example of a Liouville quantum gravity surface [40]. For an accessible review of the construction of such objects see [58] and for a review of applications to two dimensional quantum gravity and Liouville quantum gravity see [18].

In [44], it was shown that that single trace matrix models are non-trivially inside several type $(1,0)$ Dirac ensembles, which then implies that the associated random metric spaces converge to the Brownian map at certain critical points. What is more interesting is that there are critical points in such Dirac ensembles that have no known random metric space when tuned to criticality. Multi-tracial matrix ensembles enumerate *stuffed maps*, these are a generalization of the maps such that generalize the type of embedding of the graph. They contain bridges between graph connected components which are viewed as “wormholes between baby universes” in the physics literature and are believed to be associated duality to Liouville quantum gravity based on heuristics [78]. In the case of the Brownian map and analogous results, the proof relies on a bijection between maps and labeled plane trees called mobiles [17]. Thus, a first step towards finding the limiting random metric space for stuffed maps is to construct an analogous bijection which has been done in the recent work of the second author [71]. Future work will aim to establish such convergence results for stuffed maps and thus give a random metric space associated to Dirac ensembles. Note that the critical exponents of the conjectured solution to the type $(2,0)$ quartic Dirac ensemble are associated with the Random Continuum Tree which is more common in tensor models than matrix models. Based on Monte Carlo simulations it is also very likely that there are other solutions to the type $(2,0)$ quartic Dirac ensemble that have different critical exponents.

5 Bootstrapping Multi-matrix Quantum Mechanics

In this section we briefly review the recent work of Lin and Zheng [59], who apply the bootstrap philosophy to multi-matrix quantum mechanics arising from the dimensional reduction of Yang–Mills theories. Their goal is to determine ground state correlation functions of large N bosonic matrix models with high numerical precision by imposing only consistency, symmetry, and positivity.

The authors consider traceless Hermitian matrices (with noncommutative operator entries)

$$X^I, \quad P^I, \quad I = 1, \dots, D,$$

transforming in the adjoint of $SU(N)$, such that

$$[(X_I)_{ij}, (P_J)_{kl}] = \sqrt{-1} \delta_{il} \delta_{jk} \delta_{IJ}.$$

The Hamiltonian is defined as

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{I=1}^D \text{Tr}(P^I P^I) + \frac{M^2}{2} \sum_{I=1}^D \text{Tr}(X^I X^I) - \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{4} \sum_{I,J=1}^D \text{Tr}([X^I, X^J]^2). \quad (3)$$

The massless case $M = 0$ corresponds to the bosonic part of the BFSS matrix model [5]. In the large N limit correlators factorize, for example

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X^I X^J) \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X^K X^L) \right] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X^I X^J) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(X^K X^L) \right].$$

Let W denote a word in the D matrices X^I . Define the large N moment

$$m_W := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr} W(X^1, \dots, X^D)].$$

The basic observable of interest is the second moment

$$m_2 = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{I=1}^D m_{X^I X^I},$$

which physically corresponds to the “size” of the matrix under confinement. Higher moments such as m_4 , m_6 , and mixed moments $m_{X^I X^J X^K X^L}$ also enter into the bootstrap constraints.

Insertions of matrix polynomials into the path integral yield Schwinger–Dyson equations. For example, for a word W one obtains schematically

$$\sum_{\substack{W=U(I)V \\ \text{splitting}}} m_U m_V = \sum_J m_{\partial_J W} - g_{\text{YM}}^2 \sum_{J,K} m_{\partial_{J,K} W}, \quad (4)$$

where the right-hand side comes from the variation of the action (3) above. In practice one truncates to all words of length $\ell \leq L$ for some bootstrap level L (Lin–Zheng push this to $L = 14$).

The crucial bootstrap input is positivity of the ground state Ω : for any operators O_i ,

$$\langle \Omega | O_i^\dagger O_j | \Omega \rangle \geq 0.$$

Choosing O_i to be all words of length $\leq L$ yields a positive semidefinite moment matrix,

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij} = \langle \Omega | W_i^\dagger W_j | \Omega \rangle \succeq 0. \quad (5)$$

This is the analogue of the Hankel matrix in the classical Hamburger moment problem.

Now the system consisting of all SDE's (4) for words of length $\leq L$ and the positivity of constraints from the moment matrix (5). These defines an admissible region in the space of moments (notably the parameter m_2). Lin and Zheng solve this system using nonlinear relaxation methods to obtain precise two-sided bounds. At each level L the allowed region shrinks, and the authors observe rapid convergence.

To give an example, let us consider the Bosonic BFSS model ($D = 9$, $M = 0$). At bootstrap level $L = 10$, the allowed region for m_2 collapses to a narrow interval matching and improving existing Monte Carlo estimates. Their main graphical output is a “bootstrap island”: it contains all consistent solutions and shrinks as the level increases.

This work demonstrates that large N multi-matrix quantum mechanics can be analyzed to high precision using only: symmetry, loop equations, and positivity. The technique bypasses Monte Carlo extrapolations and provides a non-perturbative tool potentially relevant for matrix-based models of quantum gravity such as models studied in this paper based on noncommutative geometry.

There is a close relation to Dirac ensembles and finite noncommutative geometries. Mathematically, matrix quantum mechanics lives in the free $*$ -algebra generated by the X^I , and bootstrap constraints define a noncommutative moment problem. This is directly parallel to the Dirac ensemble program, where finite real spectral triples (A, H, D, J, γ) generate a noncommutative probability distribution for the Dirac operator D , and one studies expectations of traces of D^k subject to:

- Clifford algebra relations,
- KO-dimensional constraints,
- positivity of the noncommutative measure,
- loop equations coming from the spectral action.

In particular, the Hankel matrix for Dirac moments plays the role analogous to the moment matrix (5) in the Lin–Zheng bootstrap. The Barrett classification of fuzzy spectral triples supplies the “kinematic” space in which the bootstrap occurs, while polynomial potentials in $\text{Tr}(D^k)$ play the role of matrix model actions.

Thus multi-matrix quantum mechanics and Dirac ensembles can be viewed as two manifestations of a single bootstrap paradigm: *positivity + loop equations determine spectra without a Lagrangian*. This connection provides a conceptual justification for applying bootstrap ideas to the Connes–Lott and Connes–Chamseddine spectral action, after a suitable truncation, and it shows that random Dirac operators can be studied using exactly the same positivity-based machinery that now governs modern large N matrix mechanics.

6 A Tale of Two Cities

The Connes–Chamseddine spectral action principle [21, 32, 22] and the Dirac ensemble quantization program [7, 43] both arise from the idea that geometry may be encoded in the spectrum of a Dirac operator. Moreover, there are definite benefits in working over a noncommutative space. However, they interpret the Dirac operator in fundamentally different ways, and the resulting theories have distinct mathematical structures and physical interpretations.

It is important to note that, despite its remarkable unifying power, the spectral action remains essentially a *semiclassical* theory. The bosonic part of the action is given by a high-energy expansion

of a spectral functional, and the fermionic action is classical. A full quantum version of the spectral action has not yet been achieved: there is no fully established path-integral quantization of the spectral action, and it is not clear what the appropriate configuration space of metrics or spectral data should be in such a quantization scheme. Several other approaches to quantizing the spectral action include [80, 81, 33, 75, 76]. Developing a genuinely quantum theory based on the spectral action remains an open and a very interesting problem [83]. Related to this issue is the fact that, in the spectral action approach to the Standard Model, gravity enters only through the classical Einstein–Hilbert term and its higher-derivative corrections. Quantum gravitational degrees of freedom are, in a sense, absent from the framework.

The situation is almost reversed in the Dirac ensemble approach. There, the Dirac operator itself is promoted to a dynamical random variable, and the ensemble defines a fully quantum theory of fluctuating geometries. In this setting, gravity is naturally quantized through the statistical distribution of spectra. However, so far the theory we have discussed contains no fermionic degrees of freedom and there is no analogue yet of the finite noncommutative space underlying the Standard Model. Moreover, Dirac ensembles typically describe finite noncommutative geometries, so developing a realistic continuum limit, i.e. one that incorporates both fluctuating metrics and a finite internal geometry to account for fermions is a major challenge. We will discuss efforts in recent works [9, 74, 52] to add such features to Dirac ensembles.

In this last section we would like to compare these two applications of NCG to physical problems and explore whether there is any potential for merging the two. We start this section with a quick review of the spectral action principle.

The Spectral Action Principle

The Connes–Chamseddine spectral action principle [21] provides a geometric framework in which both gravitational and gauge interactions arise from the spectral properties of a single operator: the Dirac operator of a real spectral triple. As given more detail in previous sections, recall that a real even spectral triple consists of

$$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, D; J, \gamma),$$

where \mathcal{A} is a $*$ -algebra represented on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , D is a self-adjoint operator with compact resolvent, J is the real structure (charge-conjugation operator), and γ is the grading. These data satisfy a set of compatibility axioms determined by the KO-dimension.

The bosonic action associated to a spectral triple is defined by

$$S_{\text{bos}}(D, \Lambda) = \text{Tr}(f(D/\Lambda)),$$

where f is a positive even cutoff function and Λ is a physical energy scale. Fermionic matter fields are incorporated through

$$S_{\text{ferm}}(\psi, D) = \langle \psi, D\psi \rangle, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{H}.$$

A key ingredient of the framework is the notion of *inner fluctuations* of the Dirac operator:

$$D \longmapsto D_A = D + A + JAJ^{-1}, \quad A = \sum a_i [D, b_i], \quad a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{A},$$

which play the role of gauge and Higgs fields. In this viewpoint, bosonic fields arise not as independent dynamical variables but as generalized connections on the noncommutative space.

A canonical example is afforded by a Riemannian spin manifold. For a compact Riemannian spin manifold (M, g) , the associated canonical spectral triple is

$$\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(M), \quad \mathcal{H} = L^2(M, S), \quad D = D_M,$$

where S is the spinor bundle. Connes' distance formula reconstructs the geodesic distance from D , demonstrating that the Dirac operator encodes the full Riemannian geometry.

A noncommutative example is the so called almost commutative geometries. To describe internal symmetries and particle content, one considers the tensor product of a manifold with a finite noncommutative space:

$$\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(M) \otimes \mathcal{A}_F, \quad \mathcal{H} = L^2(M, S) \otimes H_F, \quad D = D_M \otimes 1 + \gamma_5 \otimes D_F.$$

Here \mathcal{A}_F is a finite-dimensional algebra and (H_F, D_F) encodes internal degrees of freedom such as Yukawa couplings, fermion mixing matrices (CKM and PMNS), and Majorana mass terms. Inner fluctuations of D now generate simultaneously:

- gauge potentials A_μ associated to the unitary group of \mathcal{A}_F ,
- the Higgs field, which appears as the finite part of the fluctuation.

This structure underlies the reconstruction of the Standard Model, treated in the next subsection.

Let us next discuss the heat-kernel expansion and emergence of physics. The bosonic action is evaluated using the heat-kernel asymptotics of D^2 . For large Λ ,

$$\text{Tr}(f(D/\Lambda)) \sim \sum_{k \geq 0} f_k \Lambda^{4-k} a_k(D^2),$$

where the coefficients $a_k(D^2)$ are the Seeley–DeWitt invariants. In four dimensions, one finds the hierarchy

- Λ^4 term: cosmological constant,
- Λ^2 term: Einstein–Hilbert action and scalar curvature,
- Λ^0 term: Yang–Mills kinetic terms and the Higgs kinetic term,
- Λ^{-2} and lower: higher-curvature corrections.

The fermionic term,

$$S_{\text{ferm}}(\psi, D_A) = \langle \psi, D_A \psi \rangle,$$

contains the usual Dirac kinetic terms, the Yukawa couplings determined by the finite Dirac operator D_F , and the Majorana masses permitted by the KO-dimension.

In the spectral action approach the Dirac operator is a fixed geometric object: its dynamics do not arise from a functional integral over the space of operators, but from the asymptotic expansion of a spectral functional. Thus the spectral action is a *semiclassical* theory: it produces classical gravitational and gauge actions unified at a geometric level, but does not provide a quantization scheme for the full spectral data. Quantization issues and the status of gravity in this framework will be addressed later, after the reconstruction of the Standard Model.

6.1 Reconstruction of the Standard Model

Almost-commutative geometries of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(M) \otimes \mathcal{A}_F, \quad \mathcal{H} = L^2(M, S) \otimes H_F, \quad D = D_M \otimes 1 + \gamma_5 \otimes D_F,$$

provide the geometric setting for the spectral reconstruction of the Standard Model. Here M is a compact four-dimensional Riemannian spin manifold and \mathcal{A}_F is the internal algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_F = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{H} \oplus M_3(\mathbb{C}),$$

whose unitary group reproduces, up to a finite quotient, the gauge group

$$U(1)_Y \times SU(2)_L \times SU(3)_c.$$

The Hilbert space H_F encodes the fermionic content of one generation, and the finite Dirac operator D_F contains the Yukawa couplings, Majorana mass terms, and inter-generational mixing matrices. The inner fluctuations of the Dirac operator,

$$D \mapsto D_A = D + A + JAJ^{-1},$$

generate both gauge and scalar fields. In this way the fluctuated operator produces the gauge bosons associated with $U(1)_Y$, $SU(2)_L$ and $SU(3)_c$, together with the Higgs field arising from the off-diagonal part of the finite fluctuation. Nothing is introduced by hand: the full field content of the Standard Model emerges from the geometry.

The bosonic spectral action,

$$S_{\text{bos}}(D, \Lambda) = \text{Tr}(f(D/\Lambda)),$$

admits an asymptotic heat-kernel expansion that reproduces the complete Lagrangian of the Standard Model coupled to gravity. The expansion yields the Einstein–Hilbert term with cosmological constant, the Yang–Mills actions for the gauge fields, and the entire Higgs sector including kinetic, mass, and quartic terms. Fermion masses and Yukawa couplings are encoded in the eigenvalues of D_F , and the presence of right-handed neutrinos in H_F leads naturally to the seesaw mechanism. A geometric unification relation follows:

$$g_3^2 = g_2^2 = \frac{5}{3}g_1^2 \quad \text{at the unification scale,}$$

capturing the origin of the gauge couplings from the internal algebra.

On the gravitational side, the expansion

$$S_{\text{bos}}(D_M, \Lambda) = \Lambda^4 f_4 a_0 + \Lambda^2 f_2 a_2 + f_0 a_4 + \dots$$

shows that the coefficient a_2 contains the scalar curvature and reproduces the Einstein–Hilbert action. The higher coefficients generate curvature-squared terms, which become important in the ultraviolet regime and play a significant role in early-universe cosmology.

The Higgs potential also arises geometrically. The Λ^0 term of the expansion produces the quartic potential

$$V(H) = \lambda |H|^4 - \mu^2 |H|^2,$$

where the coefficients are determined by traces of powers of D_F . This provides a conceptual shift: the Higgs potential is not inserted into the Lagrangian but derived from the internal geometry of the spectral triple.

In the two-sheet structure underlying the finite noncommutative space, the fluctuated Dirac operator takes the block form

$$D_A = \begin{pmatrix} D_M + A_\mu \gamma^\mu & \Phi + H \\ (\Phi + H)^* & D_M + B_\mu \gamma^\mu \end{pmatrix},$$

where A_μ and B_μ are gauge fields on each sheet, and H is a complex scalar field. The diagonal components correspond to the Standard Model gauge bosons, while the off-diagonal component yields a Higgs-type field. Geometrically, the Higgs field measures the failure of the two sheets to remain decoupled, and the distance in the discrete direction of the internal space is inversely proportional to $|\Phi|$. The spectral action automatically produces a potential of the form

$$V(\Phi) = \lambda |\Phi|^4 - \mu^2 |\Phi|^2,$$

leading to spontaneous symmetry breaking. Thus the Higgs mechanism is the manifestation of the finite noncommutative geometry encoded in $(\mathcal{A}_F, H_F, D_F)$.

Higher-order terms in the spectral action expansion introduce curvature-squared corrections that have been shown to give rise to viable inflationary potentials [67, 68, 69]. This demonstrates that the same geometric framework that reconstructs particle physics and gravity also yields a natural setting for early-universe cosmology.

Finally, while the spectral action provides a remarkably unified classical description of matter and geometry, the Dirac operator remains a fixed geometric object, and a full theory of quantum fluctuations of D compatible with the axioms of noncommutative geometry is still lacking. Recent work on random Dirac operators and ensembles of finite spectral triples suggests a possible route toward quantizing geometry by replacing a single Dirac operator with a probability measure on the space of operators. How such ensembles can incorporate the almost-commutative structure \mathcal{A}_F and reproduce the Standard Model sector remains an intriguing and promising direction.

6.2 Towards a Noncommutative Connes–Lott Model

The Connes–Lott model [31, 25, 32] provides the earliest and simplest realization of the idea that the internal symmetries of particle physics arise as noncommutative directions of space-time. It serves as a conceptual and mathematical precursor to the full Chamseddine–Connes spectral action formulation of the Standard Model. In particular, it offers a geometric justification for coupling a fluctuating Dirac operator—or, in the probabilistic setting, a Dirac ensemble—to the finite noncommutative space encoding the internal degrees of freedom.

The underlying noncommutative space is the product

$$X = M \times \{0, 1\},$$

where M is a smooth compact four-dimensional spin manifold (space-time), and $\{0, 1\}$ is a discrete two-point space. The algebra of “functions” on X is

$$\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(M) \otimes (\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}) \cong C^\infty(M) \oplus C^\infty(M),$$

whose elements have the form

$$a(x) = \begin{pmatrix} f(x) & 0 \\ 0 & g(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad f, g \in C^\infty(M).$$

The Hilbert space is the direct sum of two copies of the spinor space,

$$\mathcal{H} = L^2(M, S) \oplus L^2(M, S).$$

The Dirac operator on X takes the form

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} D_M & \Phi \\ \Phi^* & D_M \end{pmatrix},$$

where D_M is the usual Dirac operator on M , and $\Phi: L^2(M, S) \rightarrow L^2(M, S)$ is a scalar field on M . In the full noncommutative Standard Model, Φ becomes the Higgs field. A straightforward computation shows

$$[D, a] = \begin{pmatrix} [D_M, f] & \Phi g - f \Phi \\ \Phi^* f - g \Phi^* & [D_M, g] \end{pmatrix}.$$

The off-diagonal components measure the interaction between the two sheets: they represent a parallel transport in the discrete direction and therefore encode a scalar field. This is the geometric origin of the Higgs field in the Connes–Lott model.

The Connes–Lott picture shows in a simple but concrete setting how internal symmetries can be understood as noncommutative directions of space-time, and how scalar fields such as the Higgs arise from the geometry of a finite spectral triple. This provides the natural bridge to the Dirac ensemble approach, where the finite Dirac operator is allowed to fluctuate, and the finite noncommutative geometry becomes a dynamical—indeed probabilistic—internal space. In particular, a key insight of the Connes–Lott construction is that the finite Dirac operator Φ is not fixed by symmetry and thus carries physical information such as Yukawa couplings. There is no geometric or physical reason for Φ to remain classical. This observation motivates the Barrett–Glaser program of integrating over the space of all finite Dirac operators,

$$Z = \int \exp(-S(D)) dD,$$

leading naturally to the notion of a *Dirac ensemble*: a probability measure on the space of finite Dirac operators that describes quantum fluctuations of the internal geometry. Since the Higgs field and Yukawa couplings appear as components of Φ , integrating over Φ amounts to integrating over an extended class of geometries. The Connes–Lott model thus provides a simple but meaningful geometric example illustrating why such an approach is natural.

6.3 Building a Bridge

The finite noncommutative space appearing in the full Chamseddine–Connes model has the algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_F = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{H} \oplus M_3(\mathbb{C}),$$

together with a finite-dimensional Hilbert space carrying the fermionic degrees of freedom and a finite Dirac operator whose components encode Yukawa couplings, mixing angles, and mass matrices. Although this finite geometry is considerably more intricate than the two-point example, the conceptual mechanism remains identical: the off-diagonal entries of the finite Dirac operator give rise to the Higgs field, the diagonal entries determine fermion masses, gauge fields arise through inner fluctuations, and the bosonic sector is obtained from the spectral action.

In this sense, the Connes–Lott model is the simplest prototype of the finite geometry underlying the Standard Model. The idea that the Higgs field appears as a connection in a discrete internal direction survives unchanged in the full theory.

A different perspective is provided by the Dirac ensemble approach, in which the Dirac operator itself becomes a fluctuating variable. Starting from a set of fuzzy geometries, one considers a statistical partition function

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(-S(D)) dD,$$

where \mathcal{D} is the space of all Dirac operators compatible with the given finite spectral triple structure. The action is typically chosen to be a polynomial so that the model becomes a multi-matrix integral in which different Dirac operators represent different geometries. The partition function thus defines a probability measure on the space of geometries, yielding a genuine quantization of finite noncommutative spaces. Large- N limits, universality properties, and phase transitions can be analyzed using methods from random matrix theory.

From a conceptual standpoint, the two frameworks differ in significant ways. In the spectral action approach, geometry is fixed and enters as a background structure, whereas in the Dirac ensemble picture geometry becomes dynamical because one integrates over the space of Dirac operators. The spectral action is defined through the nonlocal spectral functional $\text{tr}(f(D/\Lambda))$, whose asymptotic expansion produces curvature invariants, while Dirac ensembles employ polynomial potentials resembling matrix-model actions. The geometric settings also diverge: the spectral action lives on smooth or almost-commutative manifolds, whereas Dirac ensembles begin with fuzzy geometries in which the Dirac operator encodes all geometric information. Gauge fields arise from inner fluctuations in the spectral action, while in the Dirac ensemble framework no separate gauge sector is introduced—everything is contained within the fluctuating Dirac operator.

The mathematical techniques used in each setting reflect the same contrast. The spectral action relies on heat-kernel expansions, Seeley–DeWitt coefficients, and analytic tools from spectral geometry, whereas Dirac ensembles employ Schwinger–Dyson equations, Coulomb-gas methods, topological recursion, and bootstrap techniques.

A similar distinction appears in their physical interpretations. The spectral action provides a classical unified Lagrangian for gravity and the Standard Model, with all bosonic fields emerging from geometry. Dirac ensembles instead offer a statistical, non-perturbative model of quantum geometry in which the Dirac operator fluctuates and different geometries contribute probabilistically. The two perspectives are therefore complementary: one geometric and deterministic, the other quantum and statistical.

Regarding spectral geometric properties, the heat kernel expansion is the basic tool for analyzing the Dirac operator of spectral triples. For a Dirac operator on a manifold of dimension d , one has the asymptotic expansion

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec}(D)} e^{-t\lambda^2} \sim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-d/2} (a_0 + a_2 t + a_4 t^2),$$

where the coefficients a_i encode geometric invariants such as the volume and the Riemann curvature [35]. This allows one to associate classical geometric quantities to spectral triples.

In contrast, the spectrum of Dirac operators in fuzzy settings typically decays super-exponentially, so such an asymptotic expansion is unavailable. In the large- N limit the spectrum is often compact. Instead one considers the normalized heat kernel

$$K_{D^2}(t) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{Z} \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr} e^{-tD^2}],$$

from which one may compute the spectral dimension

$$d_s(t) := -2t \frac{d}{dt} \log(K_{D^2}(t)),$$

and the spectral variance

$$v_s(t) := 2t^2 \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \log(K_{D^2}(t)).$$

Both quantities were introduced in [8] and relate to the metric dimension in deterministic fuzzy geometries. As noted in [8], the development of notions such as random volume and random curvature would be very interesting.

One may also imagine combining the two frameworks. Formally inserting the spectral action into a Dirac ensemble,

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{D}} \exp(-\text{tr}(f(D/\Lambda))) dD,$$

would produce a fully non-perturbative model of geometry and matter. Such a theory remains far beyond current analytic control, but the idea hints at a deep structural connection between spectral geometry and probabilistic models of noncommutative spaces.

Feature	Spectral Action	Dirac Ensembles
Geometry	fixed background	fluctuating
Dirac operator	geometric input	random variable
Action	$\text{tr}(f(D/\Lambda))$	polynomial in D
Physics	gravity + SM	quantum geometry
Methods	heat kernel	random matrices
Goal	classical unification	nonperturbative quantization

The spectral action provides a unified geometric action for known physics, while Dirac ensembles offer a statistical description of fluctuating noncommutative geometries. Together, they illustrate two complementary ways in which noncommutative geometry may illuminate the structure of fundamental interactions.

6.4 Fermionic Dirac Ensembles

Adding fermions to path integrals over finite spectral triples was explored in generality setting in [9]. In this section we focus on and summarize the main results of Khalkhali–Pagliaroli–Verhoeven [52], which develops a nonperturbative large- N theory for quartic fuzzy Dirac ensembles coupled to fermions. These ensembles arise from $(0,1)$ fuzzy spectral triples and constitute single-matrix multi-trace random matrix models whose spectral properties encode the geometry of the underlying finite noncommutative space. The paper establishes the existence of a large- N spectral density for a broad class of multi-trace, non-polynomial matrix models and studies properties such as spectral dimension, spectral variance, and phase transitions. In theory, this framework for adding fermions with mass works for other signatures, but our attention is restricted to analytically tractable models.

6.4.1 Fuzzy Geometries and $(0,1)$ Spectral Triples

For type $(0,1)$ fuzzy geometries, the Clifford module is one-dimensional and the Dirac operator takes the form

$$D = [H, \cdot], \quad H = H^* \in M_N(\mathbb{C}).$$

Thus the spectrum is given by the eigenvalue differences

$$\text{spec}(D) = \{\lambda_i - \lambda_j : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}, \quad (6)$$

each appearing with multiplicity one. This doubling phenomenon reflects a familiar feature of finite spectral triples [25, 32]. The space of Dirac operators of the $(0, 1)$ fuzzy geometry thus reduces to

$$D_N = \{[H, \cdot] : H \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{\text{Herm}}\},$$

so Dirac ensembles correspond to random matrix ensembles for the matrix H . Because $D = [H, \cdot]$ is invariant under $H \mapsto H + cI$, to define a Dirac ensemble one introduces a Gaussian regularization on the trace part of H ,

$$\exp(-a \text{Tr}(H)^2),$$

yielding an absolutely continuous measure on the space of Hermitian matrices.

Pulling back the ensemble along $H \mapsto D = [H, \cdot]$ produces a multi-trace model of the form

$$p(H) \propto \exp(-S(D) - a \text{Tr}(H)^2),$$

where $D_H = [H, \cdot]$. Since

$$D_H^k = (H \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes H)^k,$$

the action contains traces of powers of $H \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes H$.

We take the complex Grassmann algebra generated by our Hilbert space of complex N by N matrices as our space of fermions. As discussed in [9] real or quaternionic algebras are also very possible, but for simplicity of presentation we restrict ourselves to the complex case. In this case the partition function of our Dirac ensemble is of the form

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}_N} e^{-S(D) - \langle \psi, D\psi \rangle} dH d\psi = \int_{\mathcal{H}_N} \det(D) e^{-S(D)} dH.$$

By first integrating out the fermionic action, we can define an honest probability distribution on D and use techniques from random matrix theory to compute random determinants. However, since $D = [H, \cdot]$ has a large kernel, $\det(D) = 0$ identically.

To obtain a nontrivial determinant, one couples the fuzzy spectral triple to a finite spectral triple describing a single massive fermion as is done in the noncommutative geometric approach to particle physics [82]. We accomplish this by considering models that come from type $(0, 1)$ fuzzy geometries with a finite spectral triple

$$(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}, m; J = \bar{\cdot})$$

with KO -dimension seven. The resulting product spectral triple is

$$(M_N(\mathbb{C}), M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2, D = D_{\text{fuzzy}} \otimes \sigma_1 + m \otimes \sigma_2; J, \Gamma = 1 \otimes \sigma_3), \quad (7)$$

with KO dimension zero and where each σ_i is a Pauli matrix. Note that naively adding a mass term to the Dirac operator i.e. $D + m$, does not satisfy the requirement of a type $(0, 1)$ fuzzy geometry that $JD = -DJ$. Its spectrum of $D = D_{\text{fuzzy}} \otimes \sigma_1 + m \otimes \sigma_2$ becomes

$$\text{spec}(D) = \left\{ \pm \sqrt{m^2 + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq N \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Hence, integrating out the fermions yields the effective contribution to the action of

$$\sum_{i,j} \log(m^2 + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2), \quad (9)$$

which produces eigenvalue repulsion.

Note that if we wanted to consider areal Grassmann algebra, in action would replace $\langle \psi, D\psi \rangle$ with $\frac{1}{2} \langle J\psi, D\psi \rangle$.

6.5 The Quartic Model

The main theoretical result of [52] is a proof of the existence and uniqueness of the eigenvalue density function in the large N limit. Under suitable convexity, symmetry, and growth hypotheses on the choice of $S(D)$, for a given coupling constant configuration, there exists a unique compactly supported measure such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(f(H)) = \int f(x) d\mu_E(x)$$

for all tracial observables f . This result extends classical logarithmic potential theory for single-trace models to multi-trace, non-polynomial interactions.

The quartic Dirac ensemble is defined by the probability density

$$p(D) = \frac{1}{Z_{D,\psi}} \exp \left(-\text{Tr} (g_4 D^4 + g_2 D^2) + \frac{\beta_2}{4} \sum_{i,j} \log (m^2 + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2) \right), \quad (10)$$

with $g_4 > 0$ to ensure convergence. Applying Weyl's integration formula gives the joint eigenvalue distribution density function as

$$p(\lambda) \propto \exp \left(-2g_4 \sum_{i,j} (m^2 + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2)^2 - 2g_2 \sum_{i,j} (m^2 + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \log(m^2 + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \log(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - a \left(\sum_i \lambda_i \right)^2 \right),$$

a highly non-polynomial multi-trace ensemble.

The quartic type $(0, 1)$ model indeed satisfies the conditions for uniqueness and the probability density function of the ensemble in the large N limit can be solved for as the solution of a complicated integral equation:

$$\text{P. V.} \int_{\Sigma} \frac{\rho(y)}{y - x} dy = -\frac{d}{dx} \int_{\Sigma} \left(2g_4(x - y)^4 + 2g_2(x - y)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \log(m^2 + (x - y)^2) + \frac{a}{2} xy \right) \rho(y) dy$$

The equation can be solved numerically, see Figure 6. One can see that just like in the non-fermionic case, there is a spectral phase transition where the support of the eigenvalue distribution splits into two intervals for H .




Figure 6: The positive part of the spectral density of H for the fixed couplings $g_2 = -3.99$, $g_4 = 1$, for various values of m . Observe that for $m = 0$, $m = 0.5$, $m = 8$, and $m = 16$ the model is in the one-cut phase, while for $m = 1$, $m = 2$, and $m = 4$ the model is in the two-cut phase. In these cases the repulsive effect of the fermions being is stronger between the two wells than within one well well if the mass is approximately the separation between the wells [52].




Figure 7: For the type $(0,1)$ fermionic Dirac ensemble, the distribution of eigenvalues of H and D , as well as the spectral variance for various values of g_2 and masses. The coupling g_4 is fixed at one. Negative values of g_2' (darker color) correspond to two-cut models, when the double well becomes more pronounced. The spectral gap for the eigenvalue distribution of the Dirac operator increases, which corresponds to the dip in the spectral variance, while the spacing between the phases increases.

Fermionic Dirac ensembles provide a promising bridge between noncommutative geometry and random matrix theory. They suggest a pathway toward a quantized version of the spectral action, in which both the metric and finite internal geometry fluctuate within a matrix ensemble framework. Coupling to richer finite spectral triples—such as those of the Connes–Chamseddine Standard Model—remains an important direction for future development.

Recent work of the authors and a collaborator has studied the SDE’s of type $(0,1)$ models coupled to fermions as well as bosons [34]. The loop equations can be solved recursively. In the Gaussian case of both, the solution can be explicitly written in terms elliptic integrals and the coupling constant. Additionally, the free energy of these models is related to the generating function of three-coloured triangulations of the 2-sphere.

6.6 Yang–Mills–Higgs Dirac Ensembles

In a fuzzy geometry, one can think of $V_{p,q}$ as a stand-in for a spinor module and of $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ as the analogue of square-integrable functions, so that together they form the simplest possible spinor bundle over a noncommutative space. But if the ultimate goal is to build models that resemble the gauge theories of physics, metric information alone is not enough: the geometry must also be able to carry gauge and Higgs fields.

A natural way to achieve this is to enlarge the fuzzy spectral triple by coupling it to a finite spectral triple, much in the spirit of almost-commutative manifolds [21, 22]. In this viewpoint the finite triple plays the role of an internal vector bundle on which a connection may act. This

philosophy underlies the Yang–Mills–Higgs fuzzy spaces introduced by Perez-Sanchez in [74], which we will now review.

We start with a fuzzy spectral triple

$$M_f = (M_N(\mathbb{C}), \mathcal{H}_N, D_f, J, \gamma),$$

and pair it with a finite spectral triple

$$F = (\mathcal{A}_F, \mathcal{H}_F, D_F, J_F, \gamma_F).$$

This second triple carries the additional degrees of freedom that will eventually manifest themselves as gauge bosons and Higgs fields. When $\mathcal{A}_F = M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathcal{H}_F = M_n(\mathbb{C})$, we obtain what is known as a Yang–Mills triple. The combined system is the product spectral triple

$$(M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_F, \mathcal{H}_N \otimes \mathcal{H}_F, D_f \otimes 1 + \gamma \otimes D_F, J \otimes J_F, \gamma \otimes \gamma_F).$$

In this description the role of D_F is to carry the gauge-theoretic data, while D_f continues to govern the underlying fuzzy geometry. As $N \rightarrow \infty$ the fuzzy geometry approaches a smooth space, while the internal dimension n remains fixed. Recalling that

$$D_f = \sum \gamma^I \otimes \{K_I, \cdot\}_{e_I},$$

the amplified operator $D_f \otimes 1$ becomes

$$D_f \otimes 1 = \sum \gamma^I \otimes \{K_I \otimes 1_n, \cdot\}_{e_I}$$

acting naturally on $V_{p,q} \otimes M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$.

A key mechanism that brings gauge fields into the picture is the inner fluctuation of the Dirac operator [28]. In any spectral triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, D, J, \gamma)$, the one-forms

$$\Omega_D^1(\mathcal{A}) = \left\{ \sum a_i [D, b_i] \mid a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \subset \text{End}(\mathcal{H})$$

parametrise infinitesimal deformations of D . A self-adjoint element $\omega \in \Omega_D^1(\mathcal{A})$ produces a new Dirac operator

$$D_\omega = D + \omega + J\omega J^{-1},$$

and this fluctuation is the noncommutative analogue of adding a connection to a bundle.

For the product fuzzy Yang–Mills–Higgs triple, one can distinguish two types of fluctuations: those coming from the fuzzy part and those coming from the finite part. Indeed, for $a, b \in M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$,

$$a[D, b] = a[D_f \otimes 1, b] + a[\gamma \otimes D_F, b].$$

The fuzzy fluctuations sit in

$$\Omega_{D_f}^1(M_N(\mathbb{C})) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}),$$

and modify the operators $K_I \otimes 1_n$ by adding terms T_I of the correct adjointness. The finite fluctuations, by contrast, leave the fuzzy sector untouched and produce a new operator

$$\Phi = 1_N \otimes D_F + \{\phi, \cdot\}_{e''}, \quad \phi \in M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \Omega_{D_F}^1(M_n(\mathbb{C})).$$

This Φ is the fuzzy incarnation of the Higgs field.

To make the geometric meaning more transparent, consider the Riemannian signature $(p, q) = (0, 4)$. Here one finds the representation

$$D_f = \sum_{\mu} \gamma^{\mu} \otimes [L_{\mu}, \cdot] + \gamma^{\hat{\mu}} \otimes \{X_{\mu}, \cdot\}.$$

The term $[L_{\mu}, \cdot]$ acts like a discrete partial derivative, while $\{X_{\mu}, \cdot\}$ resembles a symmetrised connection coefficient. When all X_{μ} vanish the geometry is naturally interpreted as flat.

The gauge group of a spectral triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, D, J, \gamma)$ is

$$G(\mathcal{A}, J) = \{uJuJ^{-1} \mid u \in U(\mathcal{A})\}.$$

For the Yang–Mills fuzzy triple this becomes $PU(N) \times PU(n)$, where the first factor acts on the fuzzy space and the second acts on the finite part, just as a classical Yang–Mills gauge group would act on an internal vector bundle.

In the flat $(0, 4)$ case the self-adjoint fluctuations may be written as

$$\sum_{\mu} \gamma^{\mu} \otimes A_{\mu}, \quad A_{\mu} \in \Omega_{L_{\mu}}^1(M_N(\mathbb{C})) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}),$$

and they modify L_{μ} via $L_{\mu} \mapsto L_{\mu} + A_{\mu}$. This is precisely the behaviour expected of a gauge connection. The corresponding field strength is defined by

$$F_{\mu\nu} = [[L_{\mu} + A_{\mu}, \cdot], [L_{\nu} + A_{\nu}, \cdot]],$$

mirroring the usual commutative expression.

If one considers the quartic potential

$$S(D) = g \operatorname{tr}(D^2) + \operatorname{tr}(D^4),$$

then for a fluctuated Dirac operator in the $(0, 4)$ case one finds [74]

$$S(D) = -2 \operatorname{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) + 4 \operatorname{Tr}(g\theta + \theta^2) + 4 \operatorname{Tr}(g\Phi^2 + \Phi^4) - 8 \operatorname{Tr}([L_{\mu} + A_{\mu}, \Phi][L^{\mu} + A^{\mu}, \Phi]),$$

with

$$\theta = \eta^{\mu\nu} [L_{\mu} + A_{\mu}, \cdot] \circ [L_{\nu} + A_{\nu}, \cdot].$$

Each of these contributions parallels a familiar term in classical Yang–Mills–Higgs theory:

- $\operatorname{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu})$ corresponds to the Yang–Mills action,
- $\operatorname{Tr}(g\theta + \theta^2)$ reflects geometric information in the spirit of a Laplacian and its heat-kernel expansion,
- $\operatorname{Tr}(g\Phi^2 + \Phi^4)$ yields the Higgs potential,
- $\operatorname{Tr}([L_{\mu} + A_{\mu}, \Phi][L^{\mu} + A^{\mu}, \Phi])$ represents the gauge–Higgs coupling.

Combining a fuzzy spectral triple with a finite one and allowing inner fluctuations thus provides a natural entry point for Yang–Mills and Higgs physics in the Dirac ensemble framework. In the $(0, 4)$ case, the space of Dirac operators \mathcal{D} contains the skew-adjoint matrices L_{μ} , their inner fluctuations $A_{\mu} \in \Omega_{L_{\mu}}^1(M_N(\mathbb{C}))$, and the Higgs-type elements $\phi \in M_N(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \Omega_{D_F}^1(M_n(\mathbb{C}))$, while

D_F itself is kept fixed. These variables are not freely independent—the A_μ arise from a single fuzzy one-form $\omega \in \Omega_{D_f}^1(M_N(\mathbb{C}))$ —which complicates any analytic attempts to study the ensemble.

Nevertheless, numerical explorations of Yang–Mills–Higgs Dirac ensembles, especially in lower-dimensional fuzzy settings, appear highly promising. Another natural direction would be the inclusion of fermions in the ensemble, for instance through an additional term of the form $\langle D\psi, \psi \rangle$ with $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_N \otimes \mathcal{H}_F$, thereby integrating fermionic and geometric degrees of freedom into a single probabilistic framework.

7 Bootstrap Methods in Spectral Geometry

7.1 The Bootstrap Philosophy in the Geometric Setting

As we already briefly explained above, the bootstrap philosophy originated in the study of conformal field theory (CFT), asserts that a theory may be determined not from a Lagrangian or geometric model, but from a set of algebraic consistency conditions. In CFT, these conditions take the form of the *crossing symmetry* of four-point correlation functions together with *unitarity* (positivity of norms), leading to nonlinear constraints on operator dimensions and OPE coefficients [11, 77]. In the geometric setting, an analogous structure emerges when studying Laplace eigenfunctions on a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) , or more generally on a quotient of a Lie group by a lattice $\Gamma \subset G$. The role of CFT correlation functions is played by integrated products of eigenfunctions, such as

$$\int_M \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x) \varphi_k(x) \varphi_\ell(x) d\text{vol}(x),$$

or, in the automorphic setting,

$$\int_{\Gamma \backslash G} F_1(g) F_2(g) F_3(g) F_4(g) dg.$$

These objects admit two algebraically distinct decompositions (e.g. into triple product coefficients or spectral channels), and equating them produces *bootstrap identities* formally parallel to the CFT crossing equations. The Laplace eigenvalues and triple product coefficients play the role of operator dimensions and OPE coefficients, and the positivity of the L^2 inner product supplies the analogue of unitarity.

Concretely, if $\{\varphi_k\}$ is an orthonormal basis of Laplace eigenfunctions with eigenvalues λ_k , one introduces the coefficients

$$C_{ijk} := \int_M \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x) \varphi_k(x) d\text{vol}(x),$$

and the spectral four-point function

$$\mathcal{G}_{ij,kl} := \int_M \varphi_i(x) \varphi_j(x) \varphi_k(x) \varphi_\ell(x) d\text{vol}(x).$$

Using completeness of the eigenbasis yields the decomposition

$$\mathcal{G}_{ij,kl} = \sum_m \frac{C_{ijm} C_{klm}}{\lambda_m - \lambda_0},$$

while permutation symmetry (e.g. $j \leftrightarrow k$) gives a second expansion. Equating the two yields an infinite family of algebraic relations among $\{\lambda_k\}$ and $\{C_{ijk}\}$, which serve as *bootstrap constraints*.

Positivity enters through Gram matrices of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij} = \int_M f_i(x) f_j(x) d\text{vol}(x) \geq 0,$$

for any chosen family of test functions $\{f_i\}$. Choosing f_i to be polynomials in eigenfunctions yields semidefinite constraints on the moments of the spectral measure, closely analogous to the Hankel positivity conditions of the Hamburger moment problem, which will be discussed in section 4. In this way, spectral geometry becomes a noncommutative moment problem governed by symmetry and positivity, and the bootstrap replaces explicit analytic bounds by algebraic feasibility.

7.2 Bootstrap Bounds for Laplace Eigenvalues on Hyperbolic 3-Manifolds

A new and unexpected application of bootstrap methods has recently appeared in spectral geometry, where positivity conditions on Laplace eigenfunctions can be used to bound spectral gaps. In the paper [16], Bonifacio, Mazáč, and Pal introduce a spectral bootstrap program for hyperbolic 3-manifolds, inspired by the conformal bootstrap in quantum field theory. The central idea is to derive consistency conditions on the spectrum of the Laplace–Beltrami operator by studying integral identities among automorphic forms, in a way directly analogous to crossing symmetry constraints in conformal field theory.

Let $\Gamma \subset \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ be a cocompact lattice, and let $M = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^3$ be the associated hyperbolic manifold. The Hilbert space $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G)$, where $G = \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, admits a decomposition into irreducible unitary representations, and the Laplace eigenvalues on M are parametrized by spectral parameters (t_k, J_k) arising from this decomposition. The key objects studied in [16] are integrated four-point functions of the form

$$\int_{\Gamma \backslash G} F_1(g) F_2(g) F_3(g) F_4(g) dg,$$

where each F_i is an automorphic eigenfunction. Representation theory yields two different expansions of this integral, and equating them produces a family of *bootstrap equations* relating the eigenvalues and triple product coefficients of Laplace eigenfunctions.

These equations impose nonlinear algebraic and positivity constraints on the spectrum, analogous to those appearing in the conformal bootstrap in [11, 77]. By combining them with the Selberg trace formula, the authors obtain rigorous numerical upper bounds on the first nonzero eigenvalue $\lambda_1(M)$ for many compact hyperbolic 3-manifolds. The method requires no geometric input beyond the group Γ itself: the bounds arise entirely from spectral consistency.

This work fits into a growing program in which bootstrap positivity replaces explicit geometric or analytic estimates. In particular, it extends to dimension three the earlier bootstrap bounds for hyperbolic surfaces and Einstein manifolds developed by Bonifacio and collaborators [14, 15], and it suggests the possibility of a fully non-perturbative spectral theory based solely on algebraic consistency conditions. The approach is expected to generalize to higher dimensions, orbifolds, and arithmetic manifolds, and it provides a striking parallel between spectral geometry and the modern bootstrap in quantum field theory [11, 77, 60, 12, 46].

7.3 The Eigenvalues of Random Hyperbolic Surfaces

We recall here a recent and closely related, though non-bootstrap, result of Anantharaman and Monk concerning the asymptotic spectral geometry of random hyperbolic surfaces [2]. Let \mathcal{M}_g

denote the moduli space of closed hyperbolic surfaces of genus g , equipped with the Weil–Petersson probability measure \mathbb{P}_g . For each surface $X \in \mathcal{M}_g$, let

$$0 = \lambda_0(X) < \lambda_1(X) \leq \lambda_2(X) \leq \cdots$$

be the eigenvalues of the Laplace–Beltrami operator $-\Delta_X$ on $L^2(X)$. A theorem of Anantharaman and Monk (2025) states that, for large genus, the first nonzero eigenvalue is generically bounded away from zero in a strong probabilistic sense i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}_g\left(\lambda_1(X) > \frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon\right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } g \rightarrow \infty.$$

In other words, with probability tending to one, the spectral gap of a random hyperbolic surface concentrates near the universal constant $1/4$, the threshold of the Selberg eigenvalue conjecture.

The proof combines several deep ingredients: the random Weil–Petersson geometry of moduli space, in particular Mirzakhani’s integration formulas for length statistics of simple closed geodesics log-concavity and measure concentration results for the systole distribution as $g \rightarrow \infty$, and spectral estimates relating short geodesics to small eigenvalues. Most notably a quantitative version of the *collar lemma* and a Selberg–Cheeger type inequality of the form

$$\lambda_1(X) \gtrsim \frac{1}{(\text{Area}(X))^2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{sys}(X)\right),$$

where $\text{sys}(X)$ denotes the length of the shortest closed geodesic. Since the Weil–Petersson measure forces $\text{sys}(X)$ to grow like $\log g$ with high probability, the right-hand side tends to $3/16$ in the limit, yielding the stated bound. Thus the mechanism behind the theorem is *geometric concentration* (typical surfaces have no very short geodesics) rather than positivity or functional analytic consistency, as in the bootstrap approach.

Whether a positivity-based bootstrap framework can reproduce, or possibly strengthen, this probabilistic phenomenon remains an open question. In particular, one may ask whether a system of spectral positivity constraints alone (without reference to geodesics or moduli space) can force $\lambda_1(X) \geq 3/16 - o(1)$ for all sufficiently large-genus surfaces, or whether the geometric input is essential.

It is worth emphasizing the contrast between the Anantharaman–Monk result and the bootstrap philosophy. The former is inherently geometric: the estimate on $\lambda_1(X)$ is derived from the statistical behavior of closed geodesics on a random surface, the geometry of collars, and the structure of the Weil–Petersson measure on moduli space. In particular, the proof exploits the fact that, with probability tending to one, a surface of large genus has no exceptionally short geodesics, which in turn prevents the spectrum from accumulating near 0. Thus, the argument depends crucially on the hyperbolic metric, the distribution of lengths in the mapping class group orbit, and geometric comparison inequalities relating eigenvalues to topology [13].

By contrast, the bootstrap framework for spectral problems is *non-geometric*: it does not rely on the length spectrum, injectivity radius, moduli space, or the hyperbolic metric itself. Instead, it treats the collection of Laplace eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}$ and triple products $\{C_{ijk}\}$ as abstract numerical data subject only to positivity and associativity constraints. No geometric interpretation of M is assumed: the method could theoretically be applied to any compact Riemannian manifold, or even to an abstract spectral triple in the sense of noncommutative geometry [25, 29].

In this sense, the two approaches sit at opposite ends of the spectrum. The Anantharaman–Monk theorem tells us what happens for “typical” hyperbolic metrics in high genus, whereas bootstrap bounds aim to determine what is *possible* for any manifold satisfying universal spectral axioms [14, 15].

8 Future Directions

Here we summarize open problems and directions for future research on Dirac ensembles and bootstraps:

1. Much more numerical work is needed to understand the distribution of eigenvalues and observables such as the spectral dimension and variance of Dirac ensembles with higher signatures (p, q) . Both Monte Carlo simulations [7, 36], functional group renormalization [73], and bootstraps, [42] in some combination can serve as the means to do so. As existing work has shown that type $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ models have connections to models of two dimensional quantum gravity, one would expect that higher signature models have connections to higher dimensional models of spacetime. Several random tensor models and models of dynamical triangulations are in fact multi-matrix models that have many of the same terms as the type $(2, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ Dirac ensembles. Additionally the spectral dimension of such Dirac ensembles of higher signatures was studied numerically in [8] and showed promise of producing higher dimensional geometries near spectral phase transitions.
2. Based on the work in [44], the authors have the following conjecture:

Conjecture: Any $(1, 0)$ or $(0, 1)$ Dirac ensemble of the form

$$Z = \int_{\mathcal{H}_N} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=2}^d t_i \text{Tr } D^i \right\} dD$$

has a critical point such that the double scaling limit of the model corresponds to the type $(d, 2)$ minimal model from conformal field theory when d is even and $(d+1, 2)$ minimal model if d is odd.

Such a relationship exists for single trace matrix models and holds in all the Dirac ensembles studied so far. We further conjecture that when $d = 4$, there is a critical point that corresponds to the type $(5, 3)$ minimal model. Other minimal models are expected for higher value of d , but further analytic results are required to make such conjectures.

We are also curious about studying the critical points of higher signature Dirac ensembles. Based on their critical exponents, we expect the one conjectured solution to the type $(2, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ quartic ensembles to be connected to the Random Continuum Tree.

3. A proof of the conjectured solution to the type $(2, 0)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ quartic ensembles, would be interesting from the perspective of RMT and map enumeration.

Conjecture: The second moment of the formal and convergent type $(2, 0)$ quartic Dirac for t_2 and t_4 in a sufficiently small enough neighbourhood of zero, can be written as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr } D^2] = \frac{1}{8t_4} \left(\sqrt{t_2^2 + 8t_4} - t_2 \right).$$

4. Are there asymmetric solutions to the SDE's or the saddle point equation for other even Dirac ensembles? Can anything in general be said about the asymmetric solutions of multi-tracial matrix integrals and are there new critical points associated to minimal models from conformal field theory? A mathematical or physical interpretation of asymmetric solutions would be very interesting.
5. Studying Dirac ensembles that come from fuzzy geometries tensored with other finite spectral triples in the manner done for adding the standard model to the spectral action would be interesting to study both analytically and numerically. A first step would be introducing Yang-Mills-Higgs Dirac ensembles with fermions.
6. A numerical study of eigenvalue distribution, spectral dimension, and spectral variance of Yang-Mills-Higgs Dirac ensembles or fermionic Dirac ensembles is needed.
7. Analytic results concerning Dirac ensembles that are multi-matrix models are scarce [50, 51]. Can anything be said for specific models?
8. Bootstrapping subleading order terms to the solutions fo Dirac ensembles or matrix models in general has not been attempted in any work that the authors are aware of. We expect that many of the solutions of Dirac ensembles with different signatures that overlap in the large N limit will not coincide at subleading corrections in $1/N$.
9. Posed by Barrett and Glaser [7, 8]: what statistical geometric quantities can be recovered from Dirac ensembles? E.g. dimension, volume, curvature, etc.
10. Is there a choice of action for a type $(1, 0)$ Dirac ensemble that recovers JT gravity in the double scaling limit?
11. Can one apply the bootstrapping with positivity to a (truncated) spectral action ?
12. Type $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ Dirac ensembles satisfy (blobbed) topological recursion [1], do other signature Dirac ensembles have a similar recursive structure?
13. Can a positivity-based bootstrap framework reproduce or strengthen the concentration result of Annatharaman and Monk [2]?

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Hamed Hessam and Luuk Verhoven for their hard work that preceded these results. We thank John Barrett for several fruitfull discussions. We would also like to thank Centre International de Rencontres Mathématiques (CIRM) and the organizers of the conference: Applications of NonCommutative Geometry to Gauge Theories, Field Theories, and Quantum Space-Time. We acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

References

- [1] N. I. Akhiezer. *The Classical Moment Problem and Some Related Questions in Analysis*. Hafner, New York, 1965.

- [2] N. Anantharaman and L. Monk. *Friedman–Ramanujan functions in random hyperbolic geometry and application to spectral gaps II*. arXiv:2502.12268, 2025.
- [3] P. Anderson and M. Kruczenski. *Loop equation in lattice gauge theories and bootstrap methods*. EPJ Web Conf. 175, 11011, 2018.
- [4] S. Azarfar and M. Khalkhali. *Random finite noncommutative geometries and topological recursion*. Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré D 11(3):409–451, 2024.
- [5] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker, L. Susskind. *M Theory as a Matrix Model: A Conjecture*. Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 5112–5128.
- [6] J. W. Barrett. *Matrix Geometries and Fuzzy Spaces as Finite Spectral Triples*. J. Math. Phys. 56(8):082301, 2015.
- [7] J. W. Barrett and L. Glaser. *Monte Carlo Simulations of Random Non-commutative Geometries*. J. Phys. A 49(24):245001, 2016.
- [8] J. W. Barrett, P. Druce, and L. Glaser. *Spectral estimators for finite non-commutative geometries*. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 52, 275203, 2019.
- [9] J. W. Barrett. *Fermion integrals for finite spectral triples*. J. Phys. A: Math Theor. 57(45):455201. 2024.
- [10] J. W. Barrett and J. Gaunt. *Finite spectral triples for the fuzzy torus*. J. Geo. Phys. 207:105345. 2025.
- [11] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. B. Zamolodchikov, *Infinite conformal symmetry in two-dimensional quantum field theory*. Nucl. Phys. B 241 (1984), 333–380.
- [12] D. Berenstein and G. Hulsey. *Semidefinite programming algorithm for the quantum mechanical bootstrap*. Phys. Rev. E 107(5):L053301, 2023.
- [13] M. Berger, *A Panoramic View of Riemannian Geometry*, Springer, 2003.
- [14] J. Bonifacio. *Bootstrapping Closed Hyperbolic Surfaces*. arXiv:2111.13215.
- [15] J. Bonifacio and K. Hinterbichler. *Bootstrap Bounds on Closed Einstein Manifolds*. arXiv:2007.10337.
- [16] J. Bonifacio, D. Mazáč, and S. Pal. *Spectral bounds on hyperbolic 3-manifolds: associativity and the trace formula*. Commun. Math. Phys. (published online 2024); arXiv:2308.11174.
- [17] J. Bouttier, P. Di Francesco, E. Guitter. *Planar Maps as Labeled Mobiles*. Electron. J. Combin. 24:R69, 2004.
- [18] T. Budd. *Lessons from the mathematics of two-dimensional Euclidean quantum gravity*. In Handbook of Quantum Gravity, Springer, 2024.
- [19] B. Bukor and J. Tekel. *Cubic asymmetric multitrace matrix model*. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 58(25):255203, 2025.
- [20] B. Bukor, M. Khalkhali, S. Kovácsik1, K. Magdolenov’, N. Pagliaroli, and J. Tekel. *Asymmetric phase transitions in random noncommutative geometries*. In preparation.

- [21] A. H. Chamseddine and A. Connes. *The Spectral Action Principle*. Commun. Math. Phys. 186:731–750, 1997.
- [22] A. H. Chamseddine, A. Connes, M. Marcolli. *Gravity and the standard model with neutrino mixing*. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 11:991–1089, 2007.
- [23] M. Cho, B. Gabai, J. Sandor, X. Yin. *Thermal bootstrap of matrix quantum mechanics*. JHEP 2025(4):1–27, 2025.
- [24] G. F. Chew, *The Analytic S-Matrix*, W. A. Benjamin, 1962.
- [25] A. Connes. *Noncommutative Geometry*. Academic Press, 1994.
- [26] A. Connes. *Geometry from the spectral point of view*. Lett. Math. Phys. 34:203–238, 1995.
- [27] A. Connes. *Noncommutative geometry and reality*. J. Math. Phys. 36:6194–6231, 1995.
- [28] A. Connes. *Gravity coupled with matter and foundation of non-commutative geometry*. Comm. Math. Phys. 182:155–176, 1996.
- [29] A. Connes. *On the spectral characterization of manifolds*. J. Noncommut. Geom. 7(1):1–82, 2013.
- [30] A. Connes. *Geometry and the Quantum*. In *Foundations of Mathematics and Physics After Hilbert*. Edited by Joseph Kounineher, Springer, 2018.
- [31] A. Connes and J. Lott. *Particle Models and Noncommutative Geometry*. In Cargèse Summer School, Plenum, 1992.
- [32] A. Connes and M. Marcolli. *Noncommutative Geometry, Quantum Fields and Motives*. AMS, 2007.
- [33] S. Gakkhar and M. Marcolli. *Spectral action and heat kernel trace for Ricci flat manifolds from stochastic flow over second quantized L^2 -differential forms*. arXiv:2401.00643.
- [34] J. Gamble, M. Khalkhali, and N. Pagliaroli. *The Schwinger-Dyson equations for random fuzzy geometries coupled to matter*. In preparation.
- [35] P. B. Gilkey. *Invariance theory, the Heat Equation, and the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem*. CRC press 2018.
- [36] L. Glaser. *Scaling behaviour in random non-commutative geometries*. J. Phys. A 50:275201, 2017.
- [37] L. Glaser. *Computational explorations of a deformed fuzzy sphere*. J. Math. Phys. 64, 2023.
- [38] L. Glaser and A. Stern. *Understanding truncated non-commutative geometries through computer simulations*. J. Math. Phys. 61:033507, 2020.
- [39] L. Glaser and A. Stern. *Reconstructing manifolds from truncations of spectral triples*. J. Geom. Phys. 159:103921, 2021.
- [40] E. Gwynne. *Random surfaces and Liouville quantum gravity*. Notices AMS 67(4):484–491, 2020.

- [41] Y. Guo, Z. Li, G. Yang, G. Zhu. *Bootstrapping $SU(3)$ lattice Yang–Mills theory*. arXiv:2502.14421.
- [42] H. Hessam, M. Khalkhali, N. Pagliaroli. *Bootstrapping Dirac ensembles*. J. Phys. A 55:335204, 2022.
- [43] H. Hessam, M. Khalkhali, N. Pagliaroli, L. Vanhoeven. *From noncommutative geometry to random matrix theory*. J. Phys. A. 55(41):413002, 2022.
- [44] H. Hessam, M. Khalkhali, N. Pagliaroli. *Double scaling limits of Dirac ensembles and Liouville quantum gravity*. J. Phys. A 56(22):225201, 2023.
- [45] K. Johansson. *On fluctuations of eigenvalues of random Hermitian matrices*. Duke Math. J. 95:151–204, 1998.
- [46] V. Kazakov and Z. Zheng. *Analytic and numerical bootstrap for one-matrix and two-matrix models*. JHEP (2022).
- [47] V. Kazakov and Z. Zheng. *Bootstrap for finite- N lattice Yang–Mills*. JHEP 2025(3):1–40.
- [48] V. Kazakov and Z. Zheng. *Bootstrap for lattice Yang–Mills theory*. Phys. Rev. D 107:051501, 2023.
- [49] M. Khalkhali and N. Pagliaroli. *Phase transition in random noncommutative geometries*. J. Phys. A 54:035202, 2021.
- [50] M. Khalkhali and N. Pagliaroli. *Spectral statistics of Dirac ensembles*. J. Math. Phys. 63:053504, 2022.
- [51] M. Khalkhali and N. Pagliaroli. *Coloured combinatorial maps and quartic bi-tracial 2-matrix ensembles from noncommutative geometry*. JHEP 2024(5):1–28.
- [52] M. Khalkhali, N. Pagliaroli, L. S. Verhoeven. *Large- N limit of fuzzy geometries coupled to fermions*. J. Math. Phys. 66(5), 2025.
- [53] M. Khalkhali, N. Pagliaroli, A. Parfeni, B. Smith. *Bootstrapping the critical behavior of multi-matrix models*. JHEP 2025(2):1–35.
- [54] S. Kováčik and D. O’Connor. *Scalar field theory on fuzzy sphere*. JHEP 2018(10):1–3.
- [55] S. Kováčik and K. Magdolenová. *Eigenvalue distribution from bootstrap estimates*. arXiv:2509.16005, 2025.
- [56] T. Krajewski. *Classification of finite spectral triples*. J. Geom. Phys. 28:1–30, 1998.
- [57] J.-F. Le Gall. *Uniqueness and universality of the Brownian map*. Ann. Prob. 41:2880–2960, 2013.
- [58] J.-F. Le Gall. *Brownian geometry*. Japanese Journal of Mathematics 14:135–174, 2019.
- [59] H. W. Lin and Z. Zheng. *High-precision bootstrap of multi-matrix quantum mechanics*. arXiv:2507.21007, 2025.
- [60] H. W. Lin. *Bootstraps to strings: solving random matrix models with positivity*. JHEP 2020:90.

- [61] Z. Li, S. Zhou. *Bootstrapping Abelian lattice gauge theories*. JHEP 2024(8):1–32.
- [62] W. Li. *Analytic trajectory bootstrap for matrix models*. JHEP 2025(2):1–35.
- [63] W. Li and X. Su. *Bootstrapping Yang–Mills matrix integrals*. arXiv:2510.06704, 2025.
- [64] E. Lira-Torres and S. Majid. *Geometric Dirac operator on the fuzzy sphere*. Lett. Math. Phys. 112:1–22, 2022.
- [65] F. Lizzi and B. Spisso. *Noncommutative field theory: numerical analysis with the fuzzy disk*. Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 27:1250137, 2012.
- [66] J. Madore. *The Fuzzy Sphere*. Class. Quantum Grav. 9:69–88, 1991.
- [67] M. Marcolli, E. Pierpaoli and K. Teh. *The coupling of topology and inflation in Noncommutative Cosmology*, Communications in Mathematical Physics 309 (2012) 341–369.
- [68] M. Marcolli. *Spectral action gravity and cosmological models*. Comptes Rendus Physique 18 (3–4): 226–236, 2027.
- [69] M. Marcolli. *Noncommutative Cosmology*. World Scientific, 2019.
- [70] G. Miermont. *Brownian map as scaling limit of quadrangulations*. Acta Math. 210:319–401, 2013.
- [71] N. Pagliaroli. *Enumerating planar stuffed maps as hypertrees of mobiles*. arXiv:2506.06086, 2025.
- [72] C. I. Pérez-Sánchez. *Computing the spectral action for fuzzy geometries*. J. Noncommut. Geom. 16:1137–1178, 2022.
- [73] C. Pérez-Sánchez. *Functional renormalization flow in multimatrix models*. Ann. Henri Poincaré 22:3095–3148, 2021.
- [74] C. Pérez-Sánchez. *Multimatrix Yang–Mills–Higgs models*. Ann. Henri Poincaré 23:1979–2023, 2022.
- [75] C. Pérez-Sánchez. *The Spectral Action on quivers*. arXiv:2401.03705, 2024.
- [76] C. Pérez-Sánchez. *The loop equations for noncommutative geometries on quivers*. J. Math. Phys. 10;58(24):245202, 2025.
- [77] R. Rattazzi, V. S. Rychkov, E. Tonni, A. Vichi. *Bounding scalar operator dimensions in 4D CFT*, J. High Energy Phys. 12 (2008).
- [78] R. Rhodes and V. Vargas. *Gaussian multiplicative chaos and applications: A review*. Probability Surveys. 11:315–92, 2014.
- [79] P. Schreivogl and H. Steinacker. *Generalized fuzzy torus and modular properties*. SIGMA 9:060, 2013.
- [80] T. D. H. van Nuland and W. D. van Suijlekom. *One-loop corrections to the spectral action*. JHEP. 2022(5):1–5. 2022.

- [81] T. D. H. van Nuland and W. D. van Suijlekom. *Cyclic cocycles and one-loop corrections in the spectral action*. Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics. 105. 2023.
- [82] W. D. van Suijlekom. *Noncommutative Geometry and Particle Physics*. Springer, 2014.
- [83] W. D. van Suijlekom. *Towards a Quantum Theory*. In *Noncommutative Geometry and Particle Physics*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. (pp. 287-301). 2024.
- [84] R. Wulkenhaar. *Quantum field theory on noncommutative spaces*. in *Advances in Noncommutative Geometry*, edited by Ali H. Chamseddine, Connes, N. Higson, M. Khalkhali, H. Moscovici, and G. Yu, pp. 607–690, Springer, 2020.