Infinitesimally Punctured Wave and the Spectrum of Physical Waves

Florentin Smarandache
Department of Mathematics & Sciences, University of New Mexico, Gallup, NM 87301, USA
E-mail: smarand@unm.edu, fsmarandache@gmail.com

In this paper, we explore the deeper implications of the IPW (Infinitesimally Punctured Wave) model across multiple dimensions. We create a comprehensive analysis covering the mathematical, experimental, and phenomenological aspects, and exploring the deep connections between the IPW model and all types of physical waves. The IPW model offers a revolutionary perspective: the wave-particle distinction isn't fundamental but emerges from observing a single punctured wave structure at different scales.

1 Concept of the Infinitesimally Punctured Wave (IPW)

The Infinitesimally Punctured Wave (IPW) model [1–3] represents a revolutionary approach to understanding wave-particle duality by proposing that every quantum entity consists of a multitude of infinitesimally spaced "sub-particles" such that:

- When viewed collectively appear as a *continuous wave*;
- When measured locally reveal *discrete particle bevavior*;
- Contain infinitesimal gaps representing *quantum indeterminacy*.

1.1 Mathematical foundations of IPW. Formal structure

The IPW can be mathematically formalized through several complementary approaches:

- **Limit formalism:** Consider a discrete lattice with spacing ε. As $\varepsilon \to 0$, the collection of points $\{x_n = n\varepsilon \,|\, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ approaches a continuum, yet each point retains individuality. The wave function $\psi(x)$ emerges as the envelope of particle density;
- **Distribution theory:** The IPW structure can be represented as a Schwartz distribution, combining a smooth wave component with singular puncture points: $\Psi(x) = \psi(x) + \sum_n \alpha_n \delta(x - x_n)$, where δ represents the Dirac delta function and α_n are weighting coefficients;
- **Non-linear field equations:** The self-localization of particles suggests a non-linear Schrödinger-type equation: $i\hbar\, \partial\psi/\partial t = -\hbar^2/2m$;
- $^2\psi + \mathrm{V}(x)\psi + g\,|\psi|^2\,\psi$, where the non-linear term $g\,|\psi|^2$ creates self-focusing that manifests as the puncture structure.

1.2 Connection to soliton theory

The IPW model shares deep mathematical connections with soliton theory. A soliton is a self-reinforcing wave packet that maintains its shape through non-linear effects balancing dispersion. The classical example is the Korteweg — de Vries equation for water waves.

In the IPW framework, the particle puncture can be understood as a stable soliton solution where:

- Non-linearity prevents the wave from dispersing infinitely;
- Energy concentrates at specific points (the punctures) rather than spreading uniformly;
- The structure is topologically stable against perturbations.

1.3 IPW and electromagnetic waves

Classical picture: Maxwell's equations describe light as continuous electromagnetic oscillations propagating through space. The wave has both electric and magnetic components oscillating perpendicular to each other and to the direction of propagation.

Quantum picture: The photoelectric effect and Compton scattering reveal that light consists of discrete quanta (photons) with energy $E = \hbar g\,|\psi|^2 f$ and momentum $p = \hbar/\lambda$.

IPW interpretation: In the IPW model, a photon is not simply a point particle or a pure wave, but an aggregation of infinitesimal sub-photons densely packed along the electromagnetic wave's propagation path. Key implications:

- **Interference:** When electromagnetic waves interfere in double-slit experiments, the sub-photons collectively produce the interference pattern. The dense packing creates wave-like coherence across the ensemble;
- **Detection:** When a detector absorbs a photon, it captures a single sub-photon from the ensemble. The detection appears localized because the measurement isolates one puncture point from the continuous distribution;
- **Polarization:** The polarization state represents the collective orientation of all sub-photons. Measurement projects the ensemble onto a definite polarization by selecting which sub-photons interact with the detector;
- **Energy quantization:** The total energy $E = \hbar f$ is distributed across all sub-photons, but detection events always involve discrete quanta because the measurement process cannot subdivide a single puncture point.

1.4 IPW and de Broglie waves

De Broglie [4] proposed that all matter exhibits wave properties with wavelength $\lambda = \hbar/p$. Electron diffraction experiments (Davisson-Germer) confirmed that particles like electrons produce interference patterns characteristic of waves.

Copenhagen interpretation: The wave function ψ represents our knowledge or probability amplitude. The particle has no definite position until measurement collapses the wave function [5].

IPW interpretation: The electron is a wave composed of infinitesimal sub-electrons. The wave function ψ describes the actual spatial distribution of these constituents. Measurement doesn't collapse the wave — it reveals which sub-electron interacted with the detector.

This resolves several quantum paradoxes:

- **Double-slit experiment:** The electron wave (ensemble of sub-electrons) passes through both slits simultaneously. Sub-electrons from different paths interfere, creating the fringe pattern. Detection localizes one sub-electron, producing a point on the screen;
- **Tunneling:** Some sub-electrons exist within the classically forbidden region of a potential barrier. When enough sub-electron probability density accumulates on the far side, detection becomes possible — appearing as quantum tunneling;
- **Atomic orbitals:** Electrons in atoms aren't point particles orbiting a nucleus. They're standing wave patterns — stationary distributions of sub-electrons satisfying boundary conditions set by the nuclear potential.

1.5 IPW and mechanical waves

While mechanical waves (such as sound, water waves, seismic waves) require a material medium, they provide valuable conceptual analogies for understanding IPW:

- **Sound waves:** Sound is a compression wave in air molecules. Each molecule oscillates slightly, but collectively they create the propagating wave. This mirrors how sub-particles create quantum waves — individual discrete entities producing emergent wave behavior;
- **Water waves:** Ocean waves appear continuous but consist of individual water molecules following circular or elliptical paths. Surface tension and gravity create wave motion from discrete molecular interactions. Similarly, IPW suggests quantum forces organize sub-particles into wave patterns;
- **Seismic waves:** Earthquakes produce both longitudinal (P-waves) and transverse (S-waves) propagating through atomic lattice structures. The IPW model extends this to suggest quantum particles themselves have internal lattice-like structure at infinitesimal scales.

1.6 IPW and gravitational waves

General relativity predicts gravitational waves — ripples in spacetime geometry traveling at light speed. LIGO's detection of merging black holes confirmed their existence.

IPW connection: If IPW applies universally, gravitational waves might themselves possess quantum granularity. Theoretical gravitons (quantized gravity) would be the puncture points of gravitational waves. This suggests:

- Spacetime might have discrete structure at Planck scale ($\approx 10^{-35}$ m);
- Gravitational wave detectors might eventually reveal granularity in graviton arrival times;
- Quantum gravity theories (loop quantum gravity, string theory) might incorporate IPW-like structure.

2 The Neutrosophic logical framework

2.1 Three-valued logic (T, F, I)

Classical logic operates with binary truth values: true or false. Quantum mechanics introduced superposition, suggesting reality can be "both" simultaneously. Neutrosophic logic extends this by adding a third independent component — indeterminacy (I) — creating the framework (T, F, I).

In the IPW model:

- **Truth (T):** It represents the wave aspect — the collective amplitude of densely packed sub-particles manifesting as probability amplitude ψ;
- **Falsity (F):** It represents the particle aspect — the discrete, localized detection events when a single puncture is measured;
- **Indeterminacy (I):** It represents the infinitesimal gaps between sub-particles — the unresolved micro-structure creating quantum uncertainty, entanglement, and decoherence effects.

2.2 Resolving the measurement problem

The measurement problem asks: how does quantum superposition (many possibilities) become classical reality (one outcome)?

- **Copenhagen:** The wave function instantly and mysteriously "collapses" upon measurement [5];
- **Many-worlds:** All outcomes occur in parallel universes (we experience one branch);
- **IPW/Neutrosophic:** No collapse occurs. The wave (T) always existed as distributed sub-particles. Measurement simply detects which puncture (F) interacted with the apparatus. The indeterminacy (I) represents our fundamental inability to predict exactly which puncture will be detected — not because of ignorance, but because the infinitesimal gap structure makes precise prediction impossible.

3 Philosophical implications

3.1 Ontological vs epistemological

IPW is a fundamentally ontological interpretation. It claims the wave function represents physical reality, not just our knowledge. This contrasts with the Copenhagen epistemo-

Feature	IPW	Copenhagen [5]	Pilot-wave	Many-worlds
Wave function	Real physical field of sub-particles	Probability amplitude (knowledge)	Real guiding wave	Real physical field
Particle	Singularity within wave	Emerges upon measurement	Separate entity guided by wave	Localized wave pattern
Collapse?	No — reveals existing puncture	Yes — instantaneous	No — particle always definite	No — universe branches
Determinism	Yes (underlying)	No — fundamental randomness	Yes — fully deterministic	Yes — deterministic branching
Locality	Non-local wave structure	Non-local collapse	Non-local wave	Local in multiverse

Table 1: How IPW relates to major quantum interpretations.

logical stance (wave function = knowledge/probability).

Advantages of ontological IPW:

- Provides concrete physical picture instead of abstract mathematics;
- Eliminates need for mysterious wave function collapse;
- Unifies wave and particle as aspects of single underlying structure;
- Maintains deterministic evolution at fundamental level.

3.2 Implications for causality

Quantum mechanics violates classical causality through:

- Instantaneous collapse regardless of distance;
- Quantum entanglement correlations;
- Inherent randomness in measurement outcomes.

In contrast to quantuim mechanics, IPW potentially restores causality by suggesting:

- No actual collapse — sub-particle distribution evolves continuously per deterministic field equations;
- Entanglement reflects correlated puncture structures in joint wave function;
- Apparent randomness emerges from indeterminacy (I) at infinitesimal scales, not fundamental a causality.

3.3 Unity of physics

IPW suggests a profound unity across physics:

- All waves (electromagnetic, matter, possibly gravitational) share common punctured structure;
- Particles are not fundamental — they're emergent features of wave geometry;
- Fields become primary; particles are field singularities or topological defects;
- The renormalization problems in quantum field theory might be addressed through natural puncture structure preventing true infinities.

4 Comparative framework

Table 1 synthesizes how IPW relates to major quantum interpretations.

5 Future research directions

5.1 Quantum field theory integration

Extending IPW to quantum field theory presents both challenges and opportunities:

- **Particle creation/annihilation:** In QFT, particles can be created or destroyed. IPW must explain how sub-particle ensembles emerge from or dissolve into the vacuum field;
- **Renormalization:** Standard QFT requires renormalization to handle infinities. IPW's natural puncture structure might provide finite energy cutoffs, potentially simplifying renormalization or eliminating it entirely;
- **Vacuum structure:** The quantum vacuum exhibits zero-point energy and virtual particles. IPW suggests the vacuum itself might be a sea of infinitesimal fluctuations — punctures in the background field.

5.2 Quantum gravity

IPW offers novel perspectives on quantum gravity:

- **Spacetime discreteness:** If gravitons follow IPW structure, spacetime itself might be fundamentally discrete at Planck scale, supporting loop quantum gravity approaches;
- **Black hole information:** Information paradox might be resolved if Hawking radiation carries sub-particle structure encoding information about matter that formed the black hole;
- **Cosmological implications:** Big Bang singularity and inflation might be reinterpreted through IPW lens — the universe beginning as a primordial puncture in a pre-existing field.

5.3 Quantum computing and information

IPW has implications for quantum information theory:

- **Neutrosophic qubits:** Standard qubits represent superposition of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. Neutrosophic qubits add indeterminate states, potentially enabling new quantum algorithms exploiting the I component;

- **Decoherence management:** Understanding quantum coherence as sub-particle phase relationships might suggest novel error correction strategies;
- **Quantum communication:** Entanglement might be better preserved if understood as correlated puncture patterns rather than abstract correlations.

6 Experimental tests of the IPW theory: from laboratory tests to cosmological observations

6.1 The experimental challenge

Testing the Infinitesimally Punctured Wave (IPW) model faces a fundamental obstacle: if the spacing ε between subparticles is truly infinitesimal — potentially at or below the Planck length ($\approx 10^{-35}$ m) — direct observation of individual punctures appears impossible with any conceivable technology.

However, physics often tests theories through their collective predictions rather than by directly observing fundamental constituents. We don't see quarks directly, yet we've confirmed quantum chromodynamics through scattering experiments.

Similarly, IPW makes testable predictions about wave-particle behavior that differ subtly but measurably from standard quantum mechanics.

Several indirect tests might distinguish IPW from conventional quantum mechanics in proposal experiments. These proposed experimental tests are as follows:

- **Ultra-high resolution interference:** Build multi-slit experiments with extremely narrow slits approaching atomic dimensions. IPW predicts subtle deviations from standard quantum predictions if measurements approach sub-particle spacing;
- **Decoherence patterns:** Study how quantum coherence decays under environmental interaction. IPW suggests decoherence occurs when environmental disturbances "tear" the punctured wave structure, potentially producing characteristic decay signatures different from standard decoherence models;
- **Quantum tunneling time:** Measure the time delay in quantum tunneling with attosecond precision. IPW predicts finite traversal time related to sub-particle reorganization, while some quantum interpretations suggest instantaneous tunneling;
- **Weak measurement:** Use weak measurement techniques to probe particle trajectories without full collapse. IPW suggests weak measurements reveal partial information about sub-particle distribution rather than disturbing a single particle's path;
- **Photon arrival statistics:** Analyze photon detection patterns at ultra-short timescales. If photons have internal puncture structure, correlations in arrival times might deviate from pure Poisson statistics.

6.2 Optical and photonic experiments

6.2.1 Ultra-high resolution interferometry

Experimental setup: Construct a multi-slit interferometer with extremely narrow slits (approaching single-atom width) spaced at varying distances from nanometers to micrometers. Use single-photon sources to send individual photons through the apparatus one at a time.

IPW prediction: If photons are infinitesimally punctured waves, the interference pattern should show subtle deviations from standard quantum predictions when slit spacing approaches the characteristic sub-photon correlation length. Specifically:

- At macroscopic slit separations: standard interference fringes;
- At microscopic separations: slight fringe broadening or intensity modulation;
- Statistical analysis of many single-photon detections might reveal non-Poissonian correlations.

Technical requirements:

- Atom-scale slit fabrication (focused ion beam lithography);
- Single-photon detectors with picosecond timing resolution;
- Ultra-stable optical platforms to prevent vibrations;
- Statistical analysis of 10^6–10^9 detection events.

6.2.2 Photon arrival time statistics

Experimental setup: Use ultra-fast streak cameras or superconducting nanowire single-photon detectors to measure photon arrival times with sub-picosecond precision. Analyze the temporal distribution of detection events from:

- Coherent light sources (lasers);
- Thermal light sources (blackbody radiation);
- Single-photon emitters (quantum dots, single atoms).

IPW prediction: Standard quantum optics predicts Poisson statistics for coherent light (random arrivals) and super-Poissonian for thermal light (bunching). IPW suggests:

- At long timescales (> nanoseconds): standard statistics;
- At ultra-short timescales (femtoseconds): possible sub-Poissonian corrections;
- Correlation function $\tau^{(2)}(\tau)$ might deviate from classical values at $\tau \to 0$.

The deviation would reflect the internal sub-photon structure — individual punctures arriving in temporal clusters rather than perfectly independently.

6.2.3 High-intensity non-linear optics

Experimental setup: Use intense laser pulses (petawatt class) to create extreme electromagnetic field strengths approaching the Schwinger limit ($E \approx 10^{16}$ V/m). To do this, study photon-photon scattering and vacuum birefringence.

IPW prediction: If photons have non-linear self-interaction through their puncture structure (as suggested by the non-linear Schrödinger formulation), we might observe:

- Enhanced or suppressed photon-photon scattering rates;
- Modifications to vacuum polarization effects;
- Intensity-dependent refractive index beyond quantum electrodynamic predictions.

6.3 Matter wave experiments

6.3.1 Quantum tunneling time measurements

Experimental setup: Use attosecond spectroscopy to measure the time delay for electrons to tunnel through potential barriers (e.g., atoms ionized by strong laser fields). The attoclock technique provides femtosecond-scale timing resolution.

IPW prediction: Different quantum interpretations make different predictions about tunneling time:

- **Copenhagen:** Ambiguous — wave function is non-local;
- **Bohm pilot-wave:** Finite traversal time based on particle trajectory;
- **IPW:** Finite time related to sub-particle reorganization through barrier.

IPW predicts that tunneling involves gradual redistribution of sub-electron density through the barrier, producing measurable traversal time that might differ from Bohmian predictions.

6.3.2 Electron diffraction with ultra-short pulses

Experimental setup: Create femtosecond electron pulses using ultrafast photoelectric emission. Send these through crystalline targets to create diffraction patterns while varying the pulse duration.

IPW prediction: As pulse duration decreases toward the characteristic sub-electron correlation time, diffraction contrast might change due to temporal coherence of the punctured wave structure. Specifically:

- Long pulses (picoseconds): standard diffraction;
- Short pulses (femtoseconds): possible contrast enhancement or reduction;
- Ultra-short pulses (attoseconds): significant deviation if pulse duration approaches puncture spacing time.

6.3.3 Weak measurement of particle trajectories

Experimental setup: Use weak measurement techniques to probe photon or electron paths through double-slit apparatus without fully collapsing the wave function. Weak measurements disturb the system minimally, allowing partial trajectory reconstruction.

IPW prediction: Weak measurements should reveal the sub-particle distribution rather than a single trajectory. The reconstructed "paths" would show:

- Multiple simultaneous trajectories (wave spreading);
- Statistical distribution matching $|\psi|^2$;
- No "collapse" until strong measurement — weak measurements incrementally localize sub-particle ensemble.

6.4 Quantum decoherence studies

6.4.1 Controlled decoherence in atom interferometry

Experimental setup: Create matter-wave interferometers using ultracold atoms (Bose-Einstein condensates). Introduce controlled environmental coupling (stray photons, thermal fluctuations) and measure how interference contrast decays.

IPW prediction: IPW interprets decoherence as environmental disturbances "tearing" the coherent sub-particle structure. This predicts:

- **Characteristic timescale:**
$$\tau_{\text{decohere}} \propto (\text{coupling strength})^{-1} \times \\ \times (\text{sub-particle correlation time});$$
- **Temperature dependence:** Higher temperatures cause faster decoherence through more frequent collisions;
- **Recovery possibility:** If environment is removed before complete decoherence, coherence partially recovers as sub-particles reorganize.

This differs from standard decoherence theory where information is irreversibly lost to environment — IPW suggests partial reversibility if environmental coupling is interrupted.

6.4.2 Schrödinger cat state decay

Experimental setup: Create macroscopic quantum superpositions (Schrödinger cat states) using superconducting circuits, trapped ions, or photonic systems. Monitor coherence decay over time.

IPW prediction: Larger systems have more sub-particles, making the puncture structure more fragile. The decay rate should scale as:

$$\Gamma_{\text{decohere}} \propto N \times (\text{environmental coupling}),$$

where N is the number of constituent particles. This might explain why macroscopic superpositions are nearly impossible — the puncture structure becomes exponentially difficult to maintain.

6.5 Quantum field theory tests

6.5.1 Lamb shift and QED corrections

Experimental context: The Lamb shift — tiny energy difference between $2S_{1/2}$ and $2P_{1/2}$ states in hydrogen — is explained by quantum electrodynamics as vacuum fluctuation effects. Measured to parts per billion accuracy.

IPW prediction: If photons and electrons have puncture structure, the vacuum fluctuation mechanism changes subtly. The infinite frequency cutoff in standard QED is replaced by a natural cutoff at puncture spacing scale:

$$k_{\max} \approx \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\,.$$

This produces finite, calculable corrections to the Lamb shift. Ultra-precise spectroscopy might detect deviations at the 10^{-10} level if ε is not absurdly small.

6.5.2 Anomalous magnetic moment

Experimental context: The electron's magnetic moment differs from the classical value by a tiny amount (g-factor anomaly), explained by QED virtual particle loops. Measured to 12 significant figures.

IPW prediction: If electrons are punctured waves with internal structure, the self-energy contributions (Feynman diagrams) get modified by the natural UV cutoff. The prediction:

$$g_{\text{IPW}} = g_{\text{QED}} + \delta g(\varepsilon)\,,$$

where $\delta g(\varepsilon)$ is a calculable correction depending on puncture spacing. Current measurements are so precise that even tiny deviations would be detectable.

6.6 Gravitational and cosmological tests

6.6.1 Gravitational wave observations

Experimental setup: LIGO, Virgo, and planned gravitational wave detectors (LISA, Einstein Telescope) observe gravitational waves from merging black holes and neutron stars with incredible precision.

IPW prediction: If gravitational waves have IPW structure (composed of sub-gravitons), we might observe:

- **Dispersion:** Different frequency components arrive at slightly different times if sub-graviton spacing causes frequency-dependent propagation speed;
- **Granularity:** Statistical analysis of waveform might reveal discrete fluctuations beyond detector noise;
- **Quantum gravity effects:** High-frequency components (near Planck frequency) might show deviations from classical general relativity.

6.6.2 Cosmic Microwave Background polarization

Experimental context: The CMB carries information about the early universe. Polarization patterns reveal gravitational wave imprints from inflation.

IPW prediction: If primordial gravitational waves have puncture structure, the B-mode polarization pattern might show the following:

- Scale-dependent features reflecting sub-graviton correlation length;
- Non-Gaussianity in statistical distribution beyond standard inflation predictions;
- Enhanced power at specific angular scales corresponding to puncture structure.

6.7 Table of experimental feasibility

Table 2 shows experimental feasibility for testing the IPW theory in the range from laboratory tests to cosmological observations.

6.8 Roadmap for experimental validation

6.8.1 Near-term (1–3 years)

1. **Photon statistics campaign:** Multiple laboratories conduct high-statistics measurements of single-photon arrival times using existing detector technology. Meta-analysis combines datasets to achieve required significance;
2. **Weak measurement studies:** Systematic weak measurement experiments on double-slit systems, comparing results with IPW, Bohmian, and Copenhagen predictions;
3. **Theory development:** Refine IPW mathematical formalism to generate precise, falsifiable predictions for each experimental setup.

6.8.2 Medium-term (3–7 years)

4. **Tunneling time resolution:** Develop next-generation attosecond spectroscopy to measure tunneling delays with sub-femtosecond resolution;
5. **Advanced interferometry:** Construct ultra-stable nano-scale interferometers specifically designed to test IPW predictions;
6. **Decoherence mapping:** Comprehensive study of decoherence in various systems (atoms, ions, superconducting circuits) testing IPW's partial reversibility prediction.

6.8.3 Long-term (7+ years)

7. **QED precision frontier:** Next-generation measurements of anomalous magnetic moments and Lamb shifts with sufficient precision to detect IPW corrections;
8. **Gravitational wave analysis:** LISA and Einstein Telescope data analyzed for dispersion, granularity, and quantum gravity signatures consistent with IPW;
9. **Cosmological surveys:** CMB polarization and large-scale structure data examined for primordial wave puncture signatures.

Experiment	Feasibility	Timeframe	Key challenge
Photon arrival statistics	HIGH	Current	Statistical significance requires billions of events
Weak measurement trajectories	HIGH	Current	Distinguishing IPW from standard QM predictions
Quantum tunneling time	MEDIUM	1–3 years	Attosecond timing resolution, theoretical interpretation
Decoherence pattern analysis	MEDIUM	Current	Isolating IPW effects from environmental noise
Ultra-high resolution interferometry	MEDIUM	3–5 years	Nanofabrication precision, vibration isolation
QED precision tests	LOW	5–10 years	Requires theory development, extreme precision
Gravitational wave dispersion	LOW	10+ years	Requires next-generation detectors (such as LISA, Einstein Telescope)

Table 2. Experimental feasibility for testing the IPW theory.

7 Conclusion

While testing IPW presents significant experimental challenges, the theory makes numerous testable predictions across optical, matter-wave, quantum field theory, and gravitational domains. The key insight is that we need not directly observe infinitesimal punctures — their collective effects should be measurable through:

- Statistical deviations in particle detection events;
- Characteristic decoherence patterns;
- Finite traversal times in quantum processes;
- Precision corrections to QED calculations;
- Granularity in gravitational wave signals.

The next decade will be crucial. With current and near-future technology, several experiments can definitively test whether nature employs infinitesimally punctured wave structures or whether quantum reality follows different principles. The experimental program outlined here provides a concrete path from speculation to scientific validation or refutation.

The Infinitesimally Punctured Wave model represents a bold reconceptualization of quantum mechanics, offering a visual and ontological bridge between wave and particle descriptions. By proposing that quantum entities are aggregations of infinitesimal sub-particles, IPW:

- Unifies electromagnetic waves, matter waves, and potentially all physical waves under a common structural framework;
- Eliminates the mysterious wave function collapse by treating measurement as detection of pre-existing puncture points;
- Provides rigorous logical foundation through Neutrosophic theory's T-F-I framework;
- Connects to established physics through soliton theory, non-linear field equations, and pilot-wave interpretations;
- Suggests testable predictions distinguishing it from standard quantum mechanics.

While experimental validation remains challenging due to the infinitesimal scales involved, IPW enriches the interpretative landscape of quantum foundations. It offers students and researchers a concrete mental model for wave-particle duality, potentially inspiring new approaches to quantum field theory, quantum gravity, and quantum information.

Most significantly, IPW suggests that the distinction between "wave" and "particle" is not fundamental but emerges from different observational scales applied to a single, unified punctured wave structure. This perspective aligns with physics' historical trajectory toward unification — from electromagnetism to quantum field theory to string theory — suggesting that IPW may point toward deeper truths about nature's ultimate structure.

The journey from infinitesimal punctures to universal wave phenomena reveals that in quantum mechanics, as in all physics, the deepest insights often emerge from reconciling apparent contradictions into elegant, unified frameworks.

Submitted on February 16, 2026

References

1. Smarandache F. Wave particle duality as an infinitesimally punctured wave. In: *Nidus Idearum. Scilogs*, 2019, v. 4, 122.
2. Smarandache F. The infinitesimally punctured wave: A corpuscular visualization of wave-particle duality. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 2026, v. 97, 704–708.
3. Smarandache F. Comparisons of infinitesimally punctured wave with Copenhagen and De Broglie-Bohm interpretations. Neutrosophic quantum mechanics, and non-linear electromagnetics. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 2026, v. 98, 85–92.
4. De Broglie L. Interpretation of quantum mechanics by the double solution theory. *Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie*, 1987, v. 12, no. 4, 399–421.
5. Omnès R. The Copenhagen Interpretation. Understanding Quantum Mechanics. Princeton University Press, 1999, 41–54.