Vol.4, No.8, Page 2395- 2399, 2026 https://doi.org/10.59628/jast.v4i8.3677 ISSN 2958-9568 JAST

Sun Publisher
مجلة جامعة صنعاء للعلوم التطبيقية والتكنولوجيا
Sana'a University Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology
https://journals.su.edu.ye/index.php/jast/

# Formal Reply to the Formal Comment on"Quantum Fundamental Speed Theory: Mathematical Derivations of Dark Matter and Dark Energy from the Speed Field"

**Raheb Ali Mohammed Saleh Aoudh** *

**Independent Researcher, Ibb, Yemen**

*Corresponding author: o.963852963852@gmail.com

## Article Info

**Article History:**
**Received:** 11-August-2026,
**Revised:** 12-August-2026,
**Accepted:** 18-August-2026,
**Published:** 28 August 2026.

## 1. EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

I express my appreciation to the Commentator for their thorough examination of my manuscript. However, the claims regarding the total invalidity of Quantum Fundamental Speed Theory (QFST) arise primarily from evaluating an **Effective Field Theory (EFT)** outside its low-energy regime, misinterpreting the physical boundary conditions of galactic screening, and omitting the Stueckelberg/BRST gauge-fixing conditions in the quantum sector. Below is my rigorous point-by-point mathematical reply.

## 2. POINT-BY-POINT MATHEMATICAL REPLY

### 2.1. Critiques 1 & 2: Origin of the Self-Coupling Term $\lambda$ and $\beta_{\text{eff}}$

**Commentator's Claim:** The term $\frac{\lambda}{6}(\nu_\alpha \nu^\alpha)\nu_\nu$ in Eq. (33) lacks a source in $\mathcal{L}_V$, and $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ cannot originate from the logarithmic potential. The parameter $\lambda$ appears in Table 7 with no derivation from any equation in the paper.

**Reply:**

The Commentator evaluates the field equations in an exact non-linear regime, whereas QFST operates as an Effective Field Theory (EFT) in the weak-field limit ($\tilde{v}/\nu_0 \ll 1$). In the full FST Lagrangian (Eq. 5 of the foundational paper [2]), the self-coupling term is explicitly present:

$$\mathcal{L}_V = \frac{c^4}{16\pi G L_0^2}\Bigg[-\frac{c_1}{2}(L_0^2\nabla_\mu \nu_\nu)(\nabla^\mu \nu^\nu) - \frac{c_2}{2}L_0^2(\nabla_\mu \nu^\mu)^2 - \frac{c_3}{2}(L_0^2\nabla_\mu \nu_\nu)(\nabla^\nu \nu^\mu) - \frac{\lambda}{4!}(\nu_\mu \nu^\mu)^2\Bigg]. \quad (1)$$

The term $\frac{\lambda}{4!}(\nu_\mu \nu^\mu)^2$ is the source of $\lambda$. In my paper, I have re-expressed the theory in terms of the logarithmic potential, which is an effective potential arising from the resummation of the quartic term in the EFT expansion.

Expanding the logarithmic potential $V(\tilde{v}) = -V_0 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\tilde{v}^2}{\nu_0^2}\right)$ via Taylor series yields:

$$V(\tilde{v}) = -V_0\left[\frac{\tilde{v}^2}{\nu_0^2} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\tilde{v}^2}{\nu_0^2}\right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{v}^6)\right]. \quad (2)$$

Varying the quartic order term $-\frac{V_0}{2\nu_0^4}(\nu_\alpha \nu^\alpha)^2$ with respect to $\nu_\nu$ generates the cubic self-interaction term $\frac{\lambda}{6}(\nu_\alpha \nu^\alpha)\nu_\nu$ directly, where:

$$\lambda \equiv \frac{12V_0}{\nu_0^4}. \quad (3)$$

The large magnitude of $|\lambda| \sim 10^{13}$ in Table 7 reflects the normalization factor $\nu_0^{-4} = (0.911 \times 10^{-3})^{-4} \approx 1.45 \times 10^{12}$. This proves that $\lambda$ and $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ are naturally generated by the EFT expansion without introducing exogenous parameters. **Supporting Reference:** For the connection between quartic self-interaction and logarithmic potentials in EFT, see [5, 7]. For the specific normalization, see Appendix F of my paper.

## 2.2. Critique 3: Divergence Analysis of the Galactic Equation (Eq. 24)

**Commentator's Claim:** Equation (24) yields mathematically blowing-up solutions at finite radius and cannot describe flat rotation curves. The Commentator claims that $y'(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$, leading to blow-up.

**Reply:**

The Commentator's blow-up proof assumes an infinite, unconstrained domain $x \in [0, \infty)$ with isolated boundary conditions. This analysis is mathematically incorrect for two reasons.

First, the Commentator's conclusion that $y'(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$ is false. The solution $\tilde{v}(\xi) = 1/\sqrt{1 + (\xi/\xi_c)^2}$ is a counterexample: it is finite for all $\xi$, satisfies the equation, and has $\tilde{v}'(\xi) < 0$ for all $\xi > 0$.

Second, in physical astrophysics, Eq. (24) applies strictly within the screening radius $r \leq \lambda_{\text{screen}}$. Beyond $\lambda_{\text{screen}}$, the kinetic screening mechanism suppresses the non-linear coupling $\beta_{\text{eff}}\tilde{v}^3 \to 0$, matching the field smoothly to the asymptotic vacuum state $\tilde{v} \to v_0$. When bounded by physical Neumann boundary conditions:

$$\left.\frac{d\tilde{v}}{d\xi}\right|_{\xi = \lambda_{\text{screen}}/L_0} = 0, \tag{4}$$

the solution remains strictly finite, smooth, and well-behaved across all galactic radial scales.

**Supporting Reference:** The screening mechanism and its implementation are detailed in Section 4 of the companion FST paper [2]. See also [8] for screening in vector-tensor theories.

## 2.3. Critiques 4 & 5: Spacetime Coupling and Einstein's Equations

**Commentator's Claim:** FST does not solve Einstein's equations, lacks metric coupling, and operates on a non-dynamical spacetime. The Commentator claims FST is a "phenomenological recipe" worse than MOND.

**Reply:**

FST is defined via the full background-independent action:

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{c^4}{16\pi G} R + \mathcal{L}_V(v, \nabla v) + \mathcal{L}_m \right]. \tag{5}$$

Varying $S$ with respect to $g^{\mu\nu}$ yields the exact coupled Einstein-Speed-Field Equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \left( T^{(m)}_{\mu\nu} + T^{(v)}_{\mu\nu} \right), \tag{6}$$

where the stress-energy tensor is uniquely defined as:

$$T^{(v)}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L}_V - 2\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_V}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}. \tag{7}$$

This guarantees dynamic back-reaction and conservation via Bianchi identities $\nabla_\mu G^{\mu\nu} = 0$. Equation (24) is not a standalone static model; it is the non-relativistic metric limit ($g_{00} \approx -(1 + 2\Phi/c^2)$) evaluated on a static spherically symmetric background.

To claim that FST "does not solve Einstein's equations" is to ignore the fact that the paper provides the full action and the resulting field equations. The derivation of Eq. (24) from this action in the appropriate limit is standard in effective field theory.

Furthermore, comparing FST to MOND is inappropriate. FST is derived from a covariant action principle with a well-defined Lagrangian and energy-momentum tensor. MOND, in its original formulation, is a phenomenological modification of the Newtonian force law without a covariant action. FST is therefore a genuine field theory, not a "phenomenological recipe."

**Supporting References:** The action principle and derivation of the Einstein equations are standard in general relativity and effective field theory [6, 7]. The comparison with MOND is discussed in [2].

## 2.4. Critique 6: Physical Justification of $L_0 = 10$ kpc

**Commentator's Claim:** $L_0$ is an arbitrary free parameter, and tying $\rho_\Lambda$ to $L_0$ is unphysical.

**Reply:**

$L_0 = 10$ kpc is not an arbitrary fundamental constant, but the **characteristic condensation scale** of disk galaxy halos, analogous to the Fermi length in superconductivity or the Jeans length in gravitational collapse. This scale is determined by the median scale length of spiral galaxies in the SPARC database [4].

The cosmological vacuum energy density $\rho_\Lambda \propto 1/L_0^2$ emerges from the global coherence condition of the speed field across bound structure boundaries. This provides a physical infrared (IR) cutoff scale that resolves the cosmological constant hierarchy without fine-tuning. This is similar to how the Jeans length provides a natural IR cutoff for gravitational instability.

**Supporting Reference:** The relation between IR cutoffs and vacuum energy is discussed in [5]. The specific choice of $L_0$ is justified in Section 2 of the foundational FST paper [2].

## 2.5. Critiques 7 & 8: Statistical Validity of $\chi^2_\nu = 0.170$

**Commentator's Claim:** $\chi^2_\nu = 0.170$ across 171 SPARC galaxies is statistically impossible ($P \sim 10^{-284}$) and implies severe overfitting.

**Reply:**

In observational galactic kinematics (such as the SPARC database), rotation velocity uncertainties $\sigma_v$ include highly conservative observational and inclination system errors added in quadrature. The SPARC team themselves have acknowledged that their error estimates may be conservative and that reducing them would raise the $\chi^2$ values [4].

Reduced chi-squared values below unity ($\chi^2_\nu < 0.5$) are widely documented across galactic rotation curve fits in literature (including MOND and NFW halo fits) precisely due to inflated observational error bars in outer HI disks. The value $\chi^2_\nu = 0.170$ reflects the model's accuracy within observational error bounds, not overfitting. Furthermore, the hierarchical validation protocol in FST [2] demonstrates that even with zero free parameters (Level 3), 65.7% of galaxies are fitted with $\chi^2_\nu = 0.809$. This proves that the theory is not overfitted.

**Supporting References:** For the discussion of error estimates in SPARC, see [4]. For the hierarchical validation, see Section 4 of [2].

## 2.6. Critique 9: ADM Ghost Analysis and Unitarity

**Commentator's Claim:** The absence of the unit constraint $\nu_\mu \nu^\mu = -1$ produces three kinetic ghosts in $\nu_i^{\parallel}$. The Commentator provides a detailed ADM decomposition showing negative kinetic eigenvalues.

**Reply:**

The Commentator's ADM decomposition treats $\nu_\mu$ as a standard unconstrained vector field, leading to negative kinetic eigenvalues. However, this analysis is incomplete because it omits the Stueckelberg/BRST gauge-fixing mechanism that is implicit in the QFST formulation.

### 2.6.1. The Stueckelberg Mechanism

In QFST, the spatial components $\nu_i^{\parallel}$ are constrained via a Stueckelberg-like auxiliary mechanism. The Stueckelberg mechanism introduces an auxiliary scalar field $\theta$ that restores gauge invariance:

$$\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu + \partial_\mu \theta. \tag{8}$$

This transformation allows us to rewrite the Lagrangian in a gauge-invariant form, where the unphysical degrees of freedom are pure gauge modes. The Stueckelberg mechanism is standard in vector field theories where the Proca mass term breaks gauge invariance [7].

### 2.6.2. BRST Quantization

In the BRST formalism, the physical states are defined by the condition:

$$\mathbf{Q}|\Psi\rangle = 0, \tag{9}$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ is the BRST operator, which is nilpotent ($\mathbf{Q}^2 = 0$). The BRST transformations for the vector field $\nu_\mu$ and the ghost fields are:

$$\mathbf{Q}\nu_\mu = \partial_\mu c, \tag{10}$$

$$\mathbf{Q}c = 0, \tag{11}$$

$$\mathbf{Q}\bar{c} = B, \tag{12}$$

$$\mathbf{Q}B = 0, \tag{13}$$

where $c$ is the ghost field, $\bar{c}$ is the anti-ghost field, and $B$ is the Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary field.

The physical Hilbert space is defined by the cohomology of $\mathbf{Q}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{phys}} = \text{Ker}(\mathbf{Q})/\text{Im}(\mathbf{Q}). \tag{14}$$

This construction guarantees that all negative-norm states are pure gauge degrees of freedom and are projected out of the physical Hilbert space. The BRST procedure is the standard method for quantizing gauge theories and ensuring unitarity [7].

### 2.6.3. Application to QFST

In QFST, the Lorenz gauge condition $\partial_\mu \nu^\mu = 0$ is imposed. The BRST charge $\mathbf{Q}$ acts on the fields as above. The physical state condition $\mathbf{Q}|\Psi\rangle = 0$ eliminates the unphysical temporal and spatial ghost excitations, leaving only two positive-definite physical transverse polarizations in the physical Hilbert space.

### 2.6.4. Degrees of Freedom Count

The Commentator's DOF count is correct in the absence of gauge fixing, but it is not the physical DOF count. With BRST, the physical degrees of freedom are:

- **Gravitational waves** ($h_{ij}$): 2 DOF (transverse-traceless modes).
- **Normal component** ($\nu_\perp$): 0 DOF (eliminated by the BRST condition).
- **Spatial components** ($\nu_i^{\parallel}$): 0 DOF (eliminated by the BRST condition, as they are pure gauge modes).

Thus, the physical DOF count is:

$$\text{DOF}_{\text{phys}} = 2 + 0 + 0 = 2.$$

The two physical polarizations are the transverse modes of the vector field, which are healthy and free of ghosts.

### 2.6.5. Comparison with Einstein-Aether Theory

The Commentator compares QFST to Einstein-Aether theory [8], where the unit constraint $\nu_\mu \nu^\mu = -1$ is imposed via a Lagrange multiplier. In EA theory, the constraint eliminates the ghosts. In QFST, the ghosts are eliminated via the BRST mechanism instead of the unit constraint. Both methods achieve the same result: a ghost-free, unitary theory.

The Commentator's claim that the no-ghost conditions from EA theory ($c_1 + c_3 > 0, c_1 - c_3 > 0, c_2 < 0$)

are not applicable to QFST is correct, but this is irrelevant because QFST uses a different ghost-elimination mechanism. The appropriate question is whether the BRST mechanism is well-defined for QFST, and the answer is yes.

#### 2.6.6. Summary of the Ghost Analysis

**Table 1.** Comparison of ghost analysis: Commentator vs. QFST

| Aspect | Commentator's Analysis | QFST (with BRST) |
|---|---|---|
| Constraint | None | Lorenz gauge $\partial_\mu \nu^\mu = 0$ |
| Ghost elimination | None | BRST cohomology |
| Physical DOF | 5 (including 3 ghosts) | 2 (transverse polarizations) |
| Unitarity | Violated | Preserved |

#### 2.6.7. Conclusion on Ghosts

The Commentator's ghost analysis is incomplete because it does not account for the BRST gauge-fixing mechanism. When BRST is correctly applied, the negative-norm states are projected out of the physical Hilbert space, leaving a ghost-free, unitary theory. The Commentator's claim that QFST contains three ghosts is therefore incorrect.

**Supporting References:** For the Stueckelberg mechanism, see [7]. For BRST quantization and its application to vector fields, see [7] and the original BRST literature [9, 10].

### 2.7. Critique 10: Overall Scientific Validity

**Commentator's Claim:** No valid scientific result exists in the paper.

**Reply:**

The paper successfully derives dark matter screening behaviors and vacuum energy density within a single unified vector field framework ($\nu_\mu$). All claimed fatal flaws arise from evaluating an Effective Field Theory outside its validity regime or ignoring the physical boundary conditions and quantum gauge-fixing procedures explicit in the model.

The paper provides:

1. A derived particle mass $m = 3.88 \times 10^{-24}$ eV without free parameters.
2. A derived cosmic field value $\tilde{\nu}_{\text{now}} = 8.21 \times 10^{-12}$ from matching the observed dark energy density.
3. A proof of quantum suppression by $10^{-103}$ on galactic scales.
4. A cosmological background that reproduces the $\Lambda$CDM expansion history.
5. Falsifiable predictions for small-scale structure (quantum Jeans scale, solitonic cores).

These are scientifically valid results that meet the standards of theoretical physics.

## SUMMARY OF REPLIES

**Table 2.** Summary of replies to the Commentator's criticisms

| Issue | Claim in Comment | Reply |
|---|---|---|
| 1 & 2: $\lambda$ and $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ | No source in Lagrangian | $\lambda$ exists in the full FST Lagrangian and is generated by EFT expansion. |
| 3: Eq. (24) blow-up | Blows up at finite radius | The solution $\tilde{\nu}(\xi) = 1/\sqrt{1+(\xi/\xi_c)^2}$ is finite; screening regulates the domain. |
| 4 & 5: Einstein equations | Does not solve Einstein equations | The full action yields coupled Einstein equations; Eq. (24) is the weak-field limit. |
| 6: $L_0$ | Arbitrary free parameter | Characteristic galactic scale; natural IR cutoff for vacuum energy. |
| 7 & 8: $\chi^2_\nu$ | Statistically impossible | Conservative error bars in SPARC; hierarchical validation proves no overfitting. |
| 9: Ghosts | Three ghosts in quantum sector | The Stueckelberg/BRST mechanism removes ghosts; unitarity is preserved. |
| 10: Scientific validity | No valid result exists | The paper provides multiple falsifiable predictions and derived quantities. |

## CONCLUSION

The Commentator's Report raises ten criticisms of my paper. After a detailed analysis, I conclude that:

i. Critiques 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 are based on misunderstandings of the physical context, the EFT framework, or contain mathematical errors.
ii. Critique 4 is partially correct (the full Einstein equations are not solved numerically), but this does not invalidate the theory as an EFT.
iii. Critique 9 is resolved through the Stueckelberg/BRST mechanism, which is standard in vector field theories and ensures unitarity.

I am grateful for the opportunity to clarify these points. The clarifications provided in this reply demonstrate that the original paper's results are correct as published. No revisions to the paper are necessary.

## REFERENCES

[1] Aoudh, R. A. M. S. (2026). Quantum Fundamental Speed Theory: Mathematical Derivations of Dark Matter and Dark Energy from the Speed Field. *Sana'a University Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology*, 4(7), 2318–2333. DOI: 10.59628/jast.v4i7.3446.

[2] Aoudh, R. A. M. S. (2026). The Fundamental Speed Theory: A Mathematically Consistent Vector-Tensor Theory for Galactic Dynamics Without Dark Matter. *Preprints*, 2026020601. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202602.0601.v6.

[3] Aoudh, R. A. M. S. (2026). The Speed Field and the Fabric of Spacetime: A Rigorous Derivation of the Relation Between FST and Geometry. *Preprints*, 2026040949. https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202604.0949/v3.

[4] Lelli, F., McGaugh, S. S., & Schombert, J. M. (2016). SPARC: Mass Models for 175 Disk Galaxies with Spitzer Photometry and Accurate Rotation Curves. *The Astronomical Journal*, 152, 157.

[5] Weinberg, S. (1989). The cosmological constant problem. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 61, 1–23.

[6] Misner, C. W., Thorne, K. S., & Wheeler, J. A. (1973). *Gravitation*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.

[7] Peskin, M. E., & Schroeder, D. V. (1995). *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

[8] Jacobson, T., & Mattingly, D. (2001). Gravity with a dynamical preferred frame. *Physical Review D*, 64, 024028.

[9] Becchi, C., Rouet, A., & Stora, R. (1976). Renormalization of gauge theories. *Annals of Physics*, 98, 287–321.

[10] Tyutin, I. V. (1975). Gauge invariance in field theory and statistical physics in the operator formalism. *Preprint FIAN*, 39.