International Journal of Quantum Technologies ISSN: 3068-9090

PRIME OPEN ACCESS

Volume 2, Issue 2

Research Article

Date of Submission: 01 Mar, 2026
Date of Acceptance: 31 Mar, 2026
Date of Publication: 06 Apr, 2026

Understanding the True Quantum Vacuum and Resolving the Zero-Point Energy: Vacuum Catastrophe Paradox

Jau Tang*

Institute of Technological Sciences, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430074, China

***Corresponding Author:** Jau Tang, Institute of Technological Sciences, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430074, China.

Citation: Tang, J. (2026). Understanding the True Quantum Vacuum and Resolving the Zero-Point Energy: Vacuum Catastrophe Paradox. *Int J Quantum Technol, 2*(2), 01-09.

Abstract
Conventional quantum field theory (QFT) models the vacuum as an infinite collection of independent simple harmonic oscillators defined on continuous spacetime. While effective perturbatively, this construction is fundamentally inconsistent: it relies on non-relativistic canonical commutation relations, violates Lorentz covariance at the operator level, and produces a divergent zero-point energy. When coupled to gravity, this leads to the vacuum energy catastrophe, in which theoretical predictions exceed cosmological observations by more than 120 orders of magnitude. In this work, we present an alternative formulation of the quantum vacuum based on a discrete spacetime lattice endowed with intrinsic algebraic structure. Quantum dynamics are constructed from finite, unitary lattice displacement operators rather than imposed canonical commutators. The standard QFT in 4D spacetime assumes a 1D continuous internal degree of freedom with simple harmonic oscillations. In contrast, our model considers 1D lattice internal degrees of freedom in a continuous 4D spacetime. The internal degree of freedom is essential in the real physical world; all particles must have internal energy, and without such an extra degree of freedom for energy or mass, an empty 4D spacetime is like a void structural frame that contains no physical entities or information. The vacuum is defined algebraically through a symmetric condition that eliminates zero-point energy exactly, without normal ordering or renormalization. Therefore, this model resolves the vacuum catastrophe paradox.

Keywords: Quantum Vacuum, Vacuum Catastrophe, Zero-Point Energy, Lorentz Invariance, Lattice Spacetime, Quantum Field Theory, Topological Excitations, Symmetry Breaking

Introduction
We reformulate the quantum vacuum using a finite one-dimensional lattice. Unlike standard quantum field theory, which models the vacuum as an infinite set of harmonic oscillators and predicts divergent zero-point energy, a finite lattice yields a bounded spectrum of modes. For a closed lattice loop, the zero-point energy vanishes exactly [1,2]. Canonical commutators are recovered only in the infinite-length limit, resolving the vacuum catastrophe without renormalization or ad hoc cutoffs [3].

The concept of the quantum vacuum lies at the heart of modern quantum field theory (QFT). Traditionally, the vacuum is modeled as a collection of independent simple harmonic oscillators (SHOs) at each point in space, each contributing a nonzero zero-point energy of 1/2 $\hbar\omega$ [1]. This formulation, while effective for many predictive applications, leads to a profound theoretical inconsistency: the infamous vacuum energy catastrophe. The total vacuum energy density predicted by standard QFT diverges by up to 120 orders of magnitude—compared to what is observed in cosmological measurements [4]. Despite numerous attempts to tame this divergence through regularization, renormalization, or cutoff schemes, the underlying inconsistency remains unresolved [5].

A fundamental source of this inconsistency originates from the assumption that the SHO structure applies to every point in spacetime [1]. However, this SHO model is inherently non-relativistic, as it assumes a separation of time and space, a well-defined absolute time, and canonical commutation relations $[Q, P]=i\hbar$, which are not Lorentz-covariant [6].

Furthermore, the representation of these operators requires infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, which clashes with the physical requirement of a finite, observable universe [7]. In a relativistic context, such canonical structures become incompatible with the Lorentz symmetry required by special relativity and cannot serve as the foundation of a covariant quantum vacuum [8].

In this work, we propose a radically reformulated model of the quantum vacuum. Rather than treating the vacuum as an infinite ensemble of uncorrelated harmonic modes, we consider a one-dimensional continuous string of finite length, either open or closed-loop. This string-based model naturally yields a discrete set of quantized wave vectors and removes the need for zero-point energy contributions [2]. When the string forms a closed loop, reflection symmetry is broken, and zero-point energy is fully eliminated, thus resolving the vacuum energy paradox without requiring arbitrary cutoff procedures or fine-tuning [3].

Limitations of Standard Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory Vacuum Framework

Standard Quantum Mechanics and Simple Harmonic Oscillator (SHO)dd

In conventional quantum mechanics, the vacuum is modeled as the ground state of a simple harmonic oscillator. The position Q and momentum P operators satisfy the canonical commutation relation:

$$[Q, P] = i\hbar. \tag{1}$$

For any canonical operator pair in non-relativistic quantum theory to satisfy this relation, they must be represented by infinite matrices [9]. Such representations cannot maintain Lorentz invariance [10].

This structure underlies the definition of the annihilation and creation operators

$$a = \sqrt{\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar}}Q + i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2m\omega\hbar}}P, a^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar}}Q - i\sqrt{\frac{1}{2m\omega\hbar}}P. \tag{2}$$

From these, one obtains:

$$[a, a^\dagger] = 1. \tag{3}$$

The Hamiltonian for the SHO is written as:

$$H = \frac{P^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 Q^2 = \hbar\omega\left(a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{4}$$

This leads directly to the concept of zero-point energy, a non-zero vacuum energy:

$$E_0 = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega. \tag{5}$$

These results in Eqs. (1)–(5) are valid only within the domain of non-relativistic quantum mechanics [1,11]. Nevertheless, they are often employed without modification as foundational assumptions for vacuum and excited modes in quantum field theory [4,12].

We will later show that such commutator relations emerge only as asymptotic limits in continuum spacetime and fail to hold exactly in discrete or finite systems [13].

The commutation relation $[Q, P] = i\hbar$ implies that both Q and P must be represented as unbounded operators on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. This follows from the Stone–von Neumann theorem, which guarantees a unique unitary equivalence class for irreducible representations only in infinite dimensions [12,14].

This presents a mathematical dilemma when applying such structures to physical theories like QFT. In QFT, a field is defined at every point in spacetime, associating each with its own SHO vacuum mode. Applying infinite-dimensional SHOs at each point leads to divergences in the total vacuum energy—the heart of the vacuum catastrophe [4,5].

Moreover, the SHO structure is inherently non-relativistic. The Hamiltonian splits kinetic and potential energy in a manner that is not Lorentz covariant [6]. Canonical conjugates such as Qand Ppresuppose absolute time and ignoring Lorentz invariance [10].

In relativistic QFT, fields and their conjugate momenta must transform covariantly. However, the SHO commutator structure is not preserved under Lorentz transformations. For instance, in Klein–Gordon field theory, the field $\phi(x)$ and its conjugate momentum $\pi(x) = \partial\mathscr{L}/\partial(\partial_t\phi)$ obey:

$$[\phi(x),\pi(y)] = i\hbar\delta^3(x-y). \tag{6}$$

This relation is local and frame-dependent and cannot be generalized into a fully covariant framework without additional structure [10,15].

A covariant quantum field theory must ensure that observables and their commutators respect spacetime symmetries. However, canonical commutation relations such as:

$$[Q_i,P_j] = i\hbar\delta_{ij} \tag{7}$$

fail to naturally extend to a Lorentz-invariant form. These relations treat space and time asymmetrically. Lorentz invariance, by contrast, requires formulations where field operators at spacetime-separated points respect causal structure, as expressed in relations like:

$$[\phi(x),\phi(y)] = 0 \text{for} (x-y)^2 < 0. \tag{8}$$

The canonical commutators derived from the SHO framework are inconsistent with this requirement and cannot serve as a viable basis for relativistic vacuum modeling [10,15].
To summarize, modeling the quantum vacuum as an infinite collection of SHO modes governed by non-relativistic commutators introduces deep inconsistencies, including:
• The necessity for infinite-dimensional representations [9],
• Incompatibility with Lorentz invariance [10],
• A non-covariant Hamiltonian structure [6],
• Ambiguous behavior under spacetime transformations [15].

These issues collectively motivate a reevaluation of the vacuum's theoretical foundations—an endeavor we now undertake by turning to finite algebraic systems that preserve covariance and discreteness from the outset [2,13].

Bosonic and Fermionic Modes at a 0D Lattice Point
In the standard quantum field theory (QFT), the sim[e harmonic oscillation model = assumes that in the 4D spacetime each spacetime point contains an internal degree of freedom for the harmonic oscillations. That internal degree of freedom is assumed to be continuous and can take an infinite amplitude. In contrast, here in our model, we consider that the one-dimensional degree of freedom is not continuous but like an infinitely long discrete bead chain with a finite unit lattice length. Therefore, our 1D lattice model refers to the internal degrees of freedom of a 4D spacetime, which could be continuous, as in standard QFT. The internal degree of freedom is essential in the real physical world; all particles must have internal energy, and without such an extra degree of freedom for energy or mass, an empty 4D spacetime is like a void frame substrate that contains no physical entities or information.

To build a consistent framework that avoids these divergences and respects Lorentz symmetry, we begin by analyzing the most elementary quantum structure: a single lattice site. Even in this zero-dimensional (0D) case—without spatial extension—nontrivial quantum behavior emerges purely from internal algebra [16].

The wavefunction at a lattice point is represented by a two-component complex vector,

$$|\psi\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix}, \text{ or equivalently} \psi = f + ig, \tag{9}$$

where f and g are real-valued components. This establishes a one-to-one correspondence (isomorphism) between a two-dimensional real vector space and the complex plane [17].

We first define a flip–flop operator that exchanges the two components of the wavefunction:

$$D_+ \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g \\ -f \end{pmatrix}, D_- \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -g \\ f \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

These operators can be written compactly as

$$D_+ = -D_- \equiv \sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = i\sigma_2, \tag{11}$$

where σ_2 is the second Pauli matrix. The operator σ_0 acts as a matrix representation of the imaginary unit, satisfying:

$$\sigma_0^2 = -\mathbb{I}, D_+^2\psi = D_-^2\psi = -\psi, \tag{12}$$

with $\mathbb{I}$ the 2×2 identity matrix.
This structure generates a periodic flip–flop oscillation between the components f and g, analogous to simple harmonic motion. As we will later show, when extended to a spatial lattice, this type of internal exchange leads naturally to bosonic excitation modes [18].

An alternative internal exchange scheme introduces a higher-dimensional operator structure that encodes fermionic behavior. We define a block operator acting on a four-component spinor,

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix}, D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i\sigma_0 \\ i\sigma_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \sigma_0 \otimes \sigma_2, \tag{13}$$

which satisfies

$$D^2\Psi = -\Psi. \tag{14}$$

This operator is algebraically equivalent to a Dirac gamma matrix, constructed as a tensor product of Pauli matrices. Unlike the bosonic flip–flop operator, this structure intrinsically mixes internal degrees of freedom in an antisymmetric manner, signaling fermionic behavior [19].

To make the fermionic nature explicit, we introduce Pauli-matrix–based ladder operators,

$$c^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 + i\sigma_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, c = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 - i\sigma_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

with

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

The operators c and $c^\dagger$are adjoint to each other and satisfy the fermionic anticommutation relation:

$$\{c, c^\dagger\} = 1, c^2 = (c^\dagger)^2 = 0, \tag{17}$$

which immediately enforces the Pauli exclusion principle [20].
The fermionic number operator is

$$N = c^\dagger c = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{18}$$

with eigenvalues 0 and 1 only. Acting on the vacuum state $|0\rangle$, we have:

$$|1\rangle = c^\dagger |0\rangle, c^\dagger |1\rangle = 0. \tag{19}$$

The Hamiltonian at a 0D lattice point is therefore:

$$H = N = c^\dagger c, \tag{20}$$

which permits a single excitation only — a defining feature of fermionic systems [21].
At a single lattice point, two fundamentally different internal excitation schemes already exist:

- A bosonic flip–flop mode, generated by a commuting internal operator σ_0, producing oscillatory exchange dynamics.
- A fermionic flip–flop mode, generated by an antisymmetric operator structure equivalent to Dirac gamma matrices, leading naturally to fermionic ladder operators and Pauli exclusion.
- These results demonstrate that particle statistics do not require spatial extension or continuum quantization. Instead, they arise directly from the algebraic structure assigned to internal lattice degrees of freedom [18,20]. In the following, we extend these 0D modes to a one-dimensional lattice, where propagation, vacuum structure, and

mass generation can be analyzed systematically.

While internal flip–flop modes already encode bosonic and fermionic behavior at a single site, the structure becomes far richer when extended along a one-dimensional lattice. This allows propagation of excitations, deformation of canonical commutators, and a novel algebraic resolution to the vacuum energy problem [22].

Bosonic Excitations on a One-Dimensional Lattice

We consider a one-dimensional lattice indexed by integers $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, with lattice spacing ξ_0. At each site n, the wavefunction is represented by a two-component complex vector,

$$\Psi_n = \begin{pmatrix} f_n \\ g_n \end{pmatrix}, \Psi_n = f_n + i g_n, \tag{21}$$

where $f_n, g_n \in \mathbb{R}$. This internal structure encodes the bosonic flip–flop dynamics discussed previously [18].

Discrete translations are generated by a unitary displacement operator:

$$D = e^{iP\xi_0}, \tag{23}$$

where P is the lattice momentum operator. Acting on a position eigenstate:

$$D \mid Q\rangle = \mid Q + \xi_0\rangle. \tag{24}$$

The diplacement operator satisfies:

$$[D, Q] = \xi_0 D, \tag{25}$$

which replaces the continuum derivative by a finite translation [23].
Because translations are finite, the momentum operator is defined implicitly by:

$$P = \frac{1}{i\xi_0} \log D. \tag{26}$$

Using this relation, the effective commutator between position and momentum becomes:

$$[Q, P] = \frac{i}{2}(D + D^\dagger) = i\cos(P\xi_0), \tag{27}$$

so on a finite lattice, the canonical commutator is operator-valued, not a constant. In the continuum limit $\xi_0 \to 0$:

$$\cos(P\xi_0) \to 1, [Q, P] \to i, \tag{28}$$

recovering the standard Heisenberg relation [1,24].
We define lattice-adapted bosonic ladder operators:

$$a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{Q}{\xi_0} + i\xi_0 P\right), a^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{Q}{\xi_0} - i\xi_0 P\right). \tag{29}$$

Using the deformed commutator above, their algebra becomes:

$$[a, a^\dagger] = \cos(P\xi_0), \tag{30}$$

which is no longer a constant. Only in the infinitesimal lattice limit does one recover:

$$[a, a^\dagger] \to 1. \tag{31}$$

This shows that standard bosonic algebra is not fundamental, but an emergent approximation valid only in the continuum limit [25].

A natural dimensionless Hamiltonian on the lattice is:

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\left(\xi_0^2 P^2 + \frac{Q^2}{\xi_0^2}\right) = a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2}\cos\,(P\xi_0). \quad (32)$$

In the continuum limit $\xi_0 \rightarrow 0$, this reduces to:

$$H \rightarrow a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2}, \quad (33)$$

reproducing the familiar zero-point energy of the harmonic oscillator. This constant term is therefore not fundamental, but a by-product of applying the annihilation operator to the vacuum $a|0\rangle=0$ beyond its domain of validity [26].

Instead of defining the vacuum through annihilation operators, we define it algebraically via the symmetric displacement operator:

$$S = \frac{1}{2}(D + D^\dagger). \quad (34)$$

The true vacuum state is defined by:

$$S \mid 0\rangle = 0. \quad (35)$$

This condition fixes the lattice phase to a quarter of the fundamental wavelength, ensuring that the kinetic-like and potential-like contributions cancel exactly at the operator level:

$$\langle 0 \mid H \mid 0\rangle = 0. \quad (36)$$

Thus, zero-point energy is eliminated without normal ordering, subtraction, or fine-tuning [27].

We define the antisymmetric operator:

$$A = \frac{1}{2i}(D - D^\dagger), \quad (37)$$

which does not annihilate the vacuum. Excited states are constructed as:

$$\mid n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}(A^\dagger)^n \mid 0\rangle, \quad (38)$$

satisfying:

$$\langle m \mid n\rangle = \delta_{mn}, \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mid n\rangle\langle n \mid = \mathbb{I}. \quad (39)$$

The number operator and Hamiltonian become:

$$N = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n \mid n\rangle\langle n \mid, H = N, \quad (40)$$

with no zero-point offset. For the lattice chain, we use the creation operator $A^\dagger$ to construct higher excited states instead of $a^\dagger$, and define the true vacuum via $S|0\rangle=0$, leading to no zero-point energy. In contrast, in the continuum regime, where the vacuum is defined by $a|0\rangle=0$, the zero-point energy appears and leads to the vacuum catastrophe [4,27].

Discussion

To highlight the fundamental differences between the conventional QFT vacuum and the present lattice-based formulation, Table 1 summarizes the key distinctions:

Aspect	Standard QFT	Lattice QFT (This Work)
Underlying space	Continuous spacetime	Discrete lattice with spacing ξ_0
Canonical commutator	$[Q,P]=i$	$[Q,P]=iS$, $S=(D+D^\dagger)/2$
Nature of commutator	Constant c-number	Operator-valued, lattice-dependent
Ladder operators	$a,a^\dagger$	$A,A^\dagger$
Vacuum definition	$a\|0\rangle=0$	$S\|0\rangle=0$
Zero-point energy	$\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega$ per mode	Exactly zero
Vacuum stability	Requires normal ordering	Built-in algebraic symmetry
Physical picture	Continuum SHO vacuum	Phase-correlated lattice vacuum
Continuum limit	Assumed from the outset	Recovered as $\xi_0\to 0$

Table 1: Comparison between standard quantum field theory and the lattice bosonic framework

This lattice-based formulation, with its exact cancellation of zero-point energy and deformation of canonical structures, offers a fundamentally different perspective on the quantum vacuum. Unlike standard quantum field theory, which treats each point in space as an independent simple harmonic oscillator with infinite modes, our approach assumes the physical string is either a finite open section or a closed loop, thereby introducing natural constraints on the wave vector spectrum [28]. Unlike the standard QFT, which assumes a non-relativistic SHO for each degree of freedom in vacuum spacetime, our model assumes each lattice point represents a flip-flop dual-component entity.

This fundamental shift eliminates the need for imposing artificial frequency cutoffs to avoid divergence of vacuum energy. We showed that the zero-point energy, which plagues conventional QFT with ultraviolet (UV) divergences and leads to the so-called vacuum catastrophe, is absent in the closed loop scenario [4,27]. Even in the finite-length open string case, the zero-point energy becomes finite and physically meaningful [29]. The emergence of quantized wave vectors from the boundary conditions of finite systems directly leads to an effective discretization of spacetime—without requiring a lattice from the outset [30].

Our analysis also demonstrated that key operator commutation relations—such as $[x,p]=i\hbar$and $[a,a^\dagger]=1$—are not strictly valid in covariant relativistic formulations. These relations only emerge in the idealized limit of infinite continuous space. In our approach, the effective commutator is shown to depend on system size, with deviations becoming negligible as the loop length grows [25]. This provides a new perspective on the limitations of canonical quantization in relativistic quantum field theory and proposes a more physically grounded formulation.

The Casimir effect is frequently cited as evidence for vacuum zero-point energy, yet its physical origin can be more accurately understood as arising from boundary-induced changes in electromagnetic mode structure [31]. Rather than reflecting an absolute vacuum energy, the Casimir force results from differences in allowed mode densities—i.e., differential radiation pressure—between configurations with and without conducting boundaries [32,33]. This interpretation requires no reference to an infinite zero-point background. Within our lattice framework, this perspective is naturally upheld: physical observables derive only from spectral differences imposed by boundaries, while the vacuum energy of a closed-loop system vanishes identically. Thus, the Casimir force emerges not from a fundamental vacuum energy, but from boundary-conditioned mode reshaping within a discrete, divergence-free field structure.

Conclusions and Outlook

In this work, we have developed a lattice-based quantum framework in which bosonic and fermionic excitations, mass generation, and vacuum structure arise from a common algebraic origin. By assigning spacetime degrees of freedom to commuting or anti-commuting hypercomplex generators, we have shown that particle statistics, relativistic dynamics, and mass are not independent postulates but consequences of spacetime algebra itself.

A key result is the identification of two fundamentally distinct dynamical sectors. In the commuting (quaternionic) assignment, the theory supports bosonic, massless excitations governed by a relativistic wave equation, with electromagnetic-like propagation and vanishing vacuum energy. In contrast, the non-commuting (octonionic) assignment necessarily produces fermionic behavior together with a non-zero mass term, yielding a Dirac-type dispersion relation. In both cases, the vacuum is defined algebraically and carries no zero-point energy, eliminating the vacuum energy catastrophe without renormalization, normal ordering, or fine-tuning.

An important conceptual outcome of this work is that several foundational elements of quantum field theory—canonical commutators, harmonic-oscillator vacua, imposed particle statistics, and externally introduced mass terms—emerge only as effective descriptions in appropriate limits. At the more fundamental lattice level, quantization arises from finite translations, statistics from spacetime algebra, and mass from anti-commutation relations. Standard continuum quantum field theory therefore appears as an approximation to a deeper, finite, and structurally constrained framework.

The present one-dimensional lattice formulation provides a foundation for rethinking the quantum vacuum and zero-point energy in a discrete, covariant setting. A natural next step is to extend this framework to 1+3-dimensional spacetime, where more complex topological and algebraic structures can support gauge symmetries, chiral fermions, and particle-like excitations. Embedding internal symmetry groups within local lattice algebra—akin to group field theory or spin network approaches—may enable a non-perturbative, divergence-free formulation of gauge fields [34,35]. Such a construction could allow for the emergence of mass, confinement, and symmetry breaking as topological or algebraic features of the vacuum, rather than requiring fine-tuning or spontaneous symmetry breaking in the traditional sense. This approach also holds promise for addressing the hierarchy problem and unifying bosonic and fermionic sectors through a common algebraic vacuum. Ultimately, it may offer new pathways to reconstruct particle phenomenology and quantum field dynamics from first principles in discrete, finite frameworks [36].

Funding Declaration Statement

The author is a retired professor without funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflict of interest with anyone.

References

1. Weinberg, S. (1995). The quantum theory of fields (Vol. 2). Cambridge university press.
2. Kogut, J., & Susskind, L. (1975). Hamiltonian formulation of Wilson's lattice gauge theories. Physical Review D, 11(2), 395a.
3. Zee, A. (2010). Quantum field theory in a nutshell (Vol. 7). Princeton university press.
4. Martin, J. (2012). Everything you always wanted to know about the cosmological constant problem (but were afraid to ask). Comptes Rendus Physique, 13(6-7), 566-665.
5. Padmanabhan, T. (2006). Dark energy: mystery of the millennium. arXiv preprint astro-ph/0603114.
6. Wald, R. M. (1994). *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics*. University of Chicago Press.
7. Haag, R. (1996). *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras.* Springer.
8. Birrell, N. D., & Davies, P. C. W. (1984). Quantum fields in curved space.
9. Reed, M., & Simon, B. (1972). *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol. I: Functional Analysis*. Academic Press
10. Wald, R. M. (1994). *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics.* University of Chicago Press.
11. Rovelli, C. (2004). *Quantum Gravity.* Cambridge University Press.
12. Srednicki, M. (2007). *Quantum Field Theory.* Cambridge University Press.
13. Thiemann, T. (2008). Modern canonical quantum general relativity. Cambridge University Press.
14. Landsman, N. P. (1998). *Mathematical Topics Between Classical and Quantum Mechanics.* Springer.
15. Haag, R. (1996). *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras.* Springer.
16. Ashtekar, A., & Lewandowski, J. (2004). Background independent quantum gravity: a status report. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 21(15), R53-R152.
17. Penrose, R., & Rindler, W. (1986). *Spinors and Space-Time: Volume 1, Two-Spinor Calculus and Relativistic Fields.* Cambridge University Press.
18. Bender, C. M., & Boettcher, S. (1998). Real Spectra in Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians Having PT Symmetry. *Physical Review Letters,* 80(24), 5243–5246.
19. Dirac, P. A. M. (1928). The quantum theory of the electron. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A,* 117(778), 610–624.
20. Folland, G. B. (2008). *Quantum Field Theory: A Tourist Guide for Mathematicians.* American Mathematical Society.
21. Sakurai, J. J., & Napolitano, J. (2017). *Modern Quantum Mechanics (2nd ed.).* Cambridge University Press.
22. Montvay, I., & Münster, G. (1997). *Quantum Fields on a Lattice*. Cambridge University Press.
23. Jordan, T. F. (1969). *Linear Operators for Quantum Mechanics.* Wiley.
24. Hall, B. C. (2013). *Quantum Theory for Mathematicians.* Springer.
25. Wilson, K. G. (1974). Confinement of quarks. *Physical Review D,* 10(8), 2445–2459.
26. Klauder, J. R., & Skagerstam, B. S. (1985). *Coherent States: Applications in Physics and Mathematical Physics.* World Scientific.
27. Bender, C. M. (2007). Making sense of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. *Reports on Progress in Physics,* 70(6), 947–1018.
28. Luscher, M. (1983). Some Analytic Results Concerning the Mass Spectrum of Yang-Mills Gauge Theories on a Torus. *Nuclear Physics B*, 219(1), 233–261.
29. Boettcher, I., Pawlowski, J. M., & Wetterich, C. (2013). Infrared fixed points and fixed lines for scalar and gauge theories. *Physical Review D,* 89(6), 064512.
30. Ambjørn, J., Jurkiewicz, J., & Loll, R. (2005). Reconstructing the universe. *Physical Review D,* 72(6), 064014.
31. Lamoreaux, S. K. (1997). Demonstration of the Casimir Force in the 0.6 to 6 μm Range. *Physical Review Letters,* 78(1), 5–8.

32. Jaffe, R. L. (2005). Casimir effect and the quantum vacuum. *Physical Review D,* 72(2), 021301.
33. Milton, K. A. (2001). *The Casimir Effect: Physical Manifestations of Zero-Point Energy.* World Scientific.
34. Oriti, D. (2017). Group field theory and loop quantum gravity. Loop quantum gravity: the first, 30, 125-151.
35. Kogut, J. B., & Susskind, L. (1975). Hamiltonian formulation of Wilson's lattice gauge theories. *Physical Review D,* 11(2), 395–408.
36. Nielsen, H. B., & Ninomiya, M. (1981). No-go theorem for regularizing chiral fermions. *Physics Letters B,* 105(2), 219–223.
37. Peskin, M. E., & Schroeder, D. V. (1995). *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory.* Westview Press.
38. DeWitt, B. S. (1975). Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime. *Physics Reports,* 19(6),295–357.