

The Born Rule from Finite Observation

A Conditional Derivation of the Binary Born Form

Aernoud Dekker

Internal draft: May 24, 2026

DOI: [10.17605/OSF.IO/U5RDE](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/U5RDE)

Abstract

This paper gives a conditional derivation of the binary Born probability form $p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2)$ in the physical basis coordinate θ of a Bandwidth-Limited Quantum Control (BLQC) experiment. The derivation has two load-bearing bridge assumptions: that BLQC effective tracking capacity C_{eff} is capacity for preserving operational distinguishability of finite observer records (Fisher capacity bridge), and that the scalar BLQC threshold $\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$ is homogeneous in the physical basis coordinate (scalar-threshold homogeneity). Under the Fisher capacity bridge plus standard finite-resolution invariance, Cencov's theorem selects Fisher–Rao as the unique distinguishability metric on observer records; the binary record then carries the Fisher-arclength identity $p(s) = \cos^2(s/2)$ by elementary geometry. Scalar-threshold homogeneity then forces equal increments of θ to carry equal Fisher cost, so $I(\theta) = \alpha^2$ is constant and the Fisher arclength coordinate is affine in the physical basis coordinate, $s = \alpha\theta$. Endpoint calibrations $p(0) = 1$ and $p(\pi) = 0$, on the first monotone calibration interval, fix $\alpha = 1$ and give $p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2)$. The result is conditional on both bridge assumptions. Neither the bridge nor the full Hilbert-space formalism of quantum mechanics is derived here.

1 Purpose and BLQC Starting Point

The target of this paper is the narrow binary Born form

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2),$$

in the physical basis angle θ of a laboratory measurement, derived from finite observer record constraints together with one substantive physical bridge. The paper does not derive complex Hilbert space, projective composition, tensor products, unitary dynamics, the Standard Model Lagrangian, or the ontic admissible-history measure of the Ignorant Observer Framework (IOF) [7]. It isolates the binary probability form available once the observer's finite record geometry is fixed and the physical basis coordinate is connected to it.


BLQC [8] treats the measurement basis as a physical reference variable $\theta(t)$ that must be tracked through a finite-rate channel. In an interferometer, a spin experiment, or a qubit platform, the setting θ is implemented by a phase reference, pulse phase, local oscillator, magnetic-field direction, or equivalent physical controller. The BLQC threshold says that reference tracking fails when the information-production rate of the reference dynamics exceeds the useful tracking capacity:

$$\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2.$$

Here h_{KS} is an entropy-rate or instability proxy for the reference dynamics, and C_{eff} is the effective channel rate that constrains the reference. In the chaos-wins regime $\kappa > 0$, unresolved basis uncertainty grows; in the capacity-wins regime $\kappa < 0$, the observer/controller can in

principle keep the reference resolved. BLQC by itself predicts visibility attenuation from basis uncertainty. It does not, by itself, explain why the underlying binary probability law is Born. That is the gap addressed here.

The argument proceeds in five steps:



Only one of these steps is a new physical premise: the Fisher capacity bridge (step two). The remainder is either standard information geometry (step three), elementary calculation (steps four and five), or operational structure (step one). The paper states the bridge explicitly, develops the geometry carefully, and shows where the conditional weight lies.

2 Finite Records and Operational Distinguishability

Let a finite observer’s accessible record be a probability vector

$$p = (p_1, \dots, p_n), \quad p_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1.$$

This is an operational object. It is not yet a quantum state. It represents the observer’s finite distribution over distinguishable record outcomes.

For a BLQC platform with physical basis coordinate θ , the record family is

$$\theta \mapsto p(\theta), \quad p_o(\theta) = p(o \mid \theta).$$

If a tracking error $d\theta$ changes the record distribution by dp_o , the operational size of that error is not the coordinate displacement alone. It is the distinguishability of the changed record. Two reference errors of the same coordinate magnitude but with different effects on $p(o \mid \theta)$ are not operationally equal for the purposes of finite-rate tracking. This observation is the entry point of the BLQC–Fisher bridge.

2.1 The Fisher Capacity Bridge

Assumption 1 (Fisher capacity bridge). *BLQC effective capacity C_{eff} measures the useful rate of reducing distinguishability error in the operational record family $p(o \mid \theta)$. Therefore the tracking error relevant to BLQC is measured in the invariant distinguishability metric of finite record distributions.*

This is the first and most substantive physical premise of the paper. It says that useful tracking bits are not abstract bits detached from the experiment. They are bits that reduce uncertainty in the operational records that define the basis. A reference error matters only insofar as it changes the observer’s probability records. Therefore the natural metric for the tracking task is not an arbitrary Euclidean metric on the control dial, but the invariant distinguishability metric on finite record distributions. The next two sections show that this metric is uniquely Fisher–Rao.

2.2 Finite Resolution and Markov Kernels

Finite capacity implies that records can be coarse-grained or refined. At the level of probability distributions, an ordinary loss of finite resolution is represented by a Markov kernel

$$p'(m') = \sum_m K(m' | m) p(m),$$

where

$$K(m' | m) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{m'} K(m' | m) = 1.$$

Definition 1 (Nested finite-resolution reduction). *Let $R_C : A \rightarrow M_C$ be a record projection from an admissible history space A to a finite record alphabet M_C . A lower-capacity projection $R_{C'} : A \rightarrow M_{C'}$ is nested in R_C when there is a deterministic map $q_{C'|C} : M_C \rightarrow M_{C'}$ such that*

$$R_{C'} = q_{C'|C} \circ R_C.$$

Proposition 1 (Nested reductions induce Markov kernels). *If $R_{C'} = q_{C'|C} \circ R_C$, then the distribution of lower-resolution records is obtained from the distribution of higher-resolution records by a Markov kernel.*

Proof. Let μ_θ be a measure over admissible histories at basis setting θ . The high-resolution record distribution is the pushforward

$$p_C(m | \theta) = \mu_\theta\{a \in A : R_C(a) = m\}.$$

The lower-resolution distribution is

$$p_{C'}(m' | \theta) = \mu_\theta\{a \in A : R_{C'}(a) = m'\}.$$

Using the nesting relation,

$$\{a : R_{C'}(a) = m'\} = \bigcup_{m: q_{C'|C}(m)=m'} \{a : R_C(a) = m\},$$

where the union is disjoint. Therefore

$$p_{C'}(m' | \theta) = \sum_m K_{C'|C}(m' | m) p_C(m | \theta),$$

with

$$K_{C'|C}(m' | m) = \begin{cases} 1, & q_{C'|C}(m) = m', \\ 0, & q_{C'|C}(m) \neq m'. \end{cases}$$

This kernel is stochastic, so the induced finite-resolution reduction is Markov. \square

Refinement is the reverse operation. A refinement is *sufficient* when it changes the record alphabet without adding new information about θ . For example,

$$p_i \mapsto (ap_i, (1-a)p_i),$$

with fixed $a \in [0, 1]$ independent of θ , is sufficient because the original record is recovered by summing the two refined components, and the split itself carries no θ -information.

Assumption 2 (Finite-resolution invariance). *Admissible finite-resolution changes of observer records are Markov maps, and sufficient refinements or coarse-grainings preserve distinguishability of the tracked basis family $\{p(o | \theta)\}$.*

Remark 1 (Sufficiency versus lossy coarsening). *The invariance premise is not the claim that every finite-capacity loss preserves distinguishability. Generic coarse-graining can destroy information about θ , and such maps are not symmetries of the record geometry. The invariance is invoked only for resolution changes that alter the representation of the record without losing the tracked parameter. In statistics, those are precisely sufficient Markov maps. Lossy capacity degradation is a separate physical process; in IOF it belongs to the coarsening dynamics and to the empirical bridge problem of Paper B.*

3 Cencov’s Theorem and Fisher–Rao Geometry

Let

$$\Delta_n^\circ = \left\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^n : p_i > 0, \sum_i p_i = 1 \right\}$$

be the interior of the finite probability simplex. Its tangent vectors $u \in T_p \Delta_n^\circ$ satisfy $\sum_i u_i = 0$. A Markov kernel K maps distributions and tangent vectors by

$$(Kp)_a = \sum_i K(a | i) p_i, \quad (Ku)_a = \sum_i K(a | i) u_i.$$

A Markov map is *sufficient* for a statistical model $\{p_\theta\}$ when there is a recovery Markov map L such that $LKp_\theta = p_\theta$ for all relevant θ . Differentiating along the model gives the corresponding recovery of tangent directions.

Theorem 1 (Cencov uniqueness, finite form). *Let $g^{(n)}$ be a smooth family of Riemannian metrics on the interiors Δ_n° . If this family is invariant under sufficient Markov morphisms, in the sense that*

$$g_{Kp}^{(m)}(Ku, Kv) = g_p^{(n)}(u, v)$$

whenever K is sufficient for the model directions under consideration, then $g^{(n)}$ is, up to an overall positive constant, the Fisher–Rao metric:

$$g_p(u, v) = c \sum_i \frac{u_i v_i}{p_i}.$$

A proof is given by Cencov [1]; modern treatments appear in Amari and Nagaoka [2].

Combining Theorem 1 with Assumption 2 (finite-resolution invariance) and Assumption 1 (Fisher capacity bridge), the observer’s record manifold carries the Fisher–Rao metric

$$ds_{\text{FR}}^2 = c \sum_i \frac{dp_i^2}{p_i}.$$

The constant $c > 0$ fixes units; in what follows it is set to 1.

The important point is directional. Fisher–Rao geometry is not selected because it resembles quantum mechanics. It is selected because it is the unique distinguishability geometry compatible with sufficient finite-resolution changes of classical records. Quantum structure has not yet been assumed. In BLQC vocabulary: the metric in which the basis-tracking task is correctly measured is Fisher–Rao, because the useful component of C_{eff} is, by Assumption 1, capacity for reducing Fisher distinguishability error.

4 Square-Root Coordinates and the Binary Fisher Identity

Define square-root record coordinates

$$q_i = \sqrt{p_i}.$$

Since $\sum_i p_i = 1$, these coordinates satisfy

$$\sum_i q_i^2 = 1,$$

so $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ lies on the positive orthant of the unit sphere. Differentiating $q_i = \sqrt{p_i}$ gives

$$dq_i = \frac{dp_i}{2\sqrt{p_i}},$$

and therefore

$$4 \sum_i dq_i^2 = \sum_i \frac{dp_i^2}{p_i} = ds_{\text{FR}}^2.$$

Thus Fisher–Rao record geometry is spherical geometry in square-root coordinates, up to the conventional factor of 4. The square root is not inserted as a quantum amplitude. It is the coordinate induced by the invariant statistical metric.

For a binary record,

$$p = (p, 1 - p), \quad 0 < p < 1,$$

the Fisher–Rao line element specialises to

$$ds_{\text{FR}}^2 = \frac{dp^2}{p} + \frac{d(1-p)^2}{1-p} = \frac{dp^2}{p(1-p)}.$$

Introduce the Fisher arclength coordinate

$$s = 2 \arccos \sqrt{p}.$$

Then

$$p = \cos^2\left(\frac{s}{2}\right), \quad 1 - p = \sin^2\left(\frac{s}{2}\right).$$

Direct differentiation gives $dp = -\frac{1}{2} \sin s ds$, while $p(1-p) = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 s$. Therefore

$$\frac{dp^2}{p(1-p)} = ds^2,$$

confirming that s is an arclength coordinate of the Fisher–Rao metric on the binary simplex.

Proposition 2 (Binary Fisher geometry). *For a calibrated binary record with endpoints $p = 1$ and $p = 0$, the Fisher arclength coordinate $s = 2 \arccos \sqrt{p}$ satisfies*

$$p(s) = \cos^2\left(\frac{s}{2}\right), \quad 1 - p(s) = \sin^2\left(\frac{s}{2}\right),$$

with $s \in [0, \pi]$.

Proof. The coordinate $s = 2 \arccos \sqrt{p}$ is an arclength coordinate on $0 < p < 1$ because $ds_{\text{FR}}^2 = ds^2$. The endpoints are limiting calibrations: $p \rightarrow 1$ gives $s \rightarrow 0$, and $p \rightarrow 0$ gives $s \rightarrow \pi$. Inversion gives the stated result. \square

This is the binary Born form *in the Fisher arclength coordinate s* . It is geometry, not dynamics: once s is defined as Fisher–Rao arclength, the identity $p(s) = \cos^2(s/2)$ is an elementary consequence of binary record geometry under the Fisher–Rao metric. What remains is to connect s to the physical basis coordinate θ of the BLQC experiment. This is the work of the next section.

5 The Scalar BLQC Threshold Forces Constant Fisher Information in θ

The Fisher arclength coordinate s is a coordinate on the record manifold. The physical basis coordinate θ is a coordinate on the laboratory control dial. These are different coordinates on different spaces. The map $\theta \mapsto p(\theta)$ relates them, but does not by itself fix any particular relation $s(\theta)$. For the BLQC–Fisher bridge to close, a further physical premise about how θ and s are related is required. The premise comes from the scalar form of the BLQC threshold itself.

The BLQC threshold is written as a scalar:

$$\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2.$$

It is *not* written as a position-dependent quantity

$$\kappa(\theta) = h_{\text{KS}}(\theta) - C_{\text{eff}}(\theta) \ln 2,$$

and it is not written with a position-dependent conversion between physical basis increments and record distinguishability. The scalar form is a structural feature of the BLQC framework: it claims that one threshold controls the tracking task across the calibrated basis range.

By Assumption 1, useful tracking capacity has been identified with Fisher distinguishability capacity. If the scalar threshold κ is to be the right characterisation of the tracking task across the basis range, then equal increments of the physical basis coordinate θ must impose equal Fisher distinguishability cost. Otherwise the threshold would be effectively local in θ , and the scalar form would be a coordinate-dependent artefact rather than a structural claim.

The scalar form of κ is not a mathematical identity; it is an empirical hypothesis about the physical reference channel. A position-dependent threshold $\kappa(\theta)$ would be logically possible and would falsify the homogeneity assumption in the original basis coordinate.

Equivalently, scalar-threshold homogeneity is a calibration consistency condition. If one scalar threshold is claimed to characterize basis tracking across the calibrated operational range, then the chosen physical basis coordinate must already be a coordinate in which equal increments impose equal operational tracking burden. Under the Fisher capacity bridge, operational tracking burden is Fisher distinguishability burden. Hence the coordinate must be Fisher-affine.

Assumption 3 (Scalar-threshold homogeneity). *For a calibrated BLQC basis reference, the scalar threshold $\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$ requires that the physical basis coordinate θ is homogeneous with respect to the Fisher distinguishability metric on observer records.*

The consequence is direct. Homogeneity in θ of the Fisher cost means

$$ds = \alpha d\theta$$

for some constant $\alpha > 0$, independent of θ . Equivalently, in terms of Fisher information,

$$I(\theta) = \left(\frac{ds}{d\theta} \right)^2 = \alpha^2.$$

Remark 2 (The substantive new premise). *This is the load-bearing assumption of the bridge. Without it, BLQC can still predict basis-uncertainty visibility loss, but it does not force the Born probability law. A non-Born record law would generally make $I(\theta)$ position-dependent, requiring either a local $\kappa(\theta)$ or a non-homogeneous basis coordinate. Reading the BLQC threshold as genuinely scalar in a calibrated basis is, therefore, the bridge premise. Both Assumption 1 and Assumption 3 are explicitly conditional: they are stated, used, and exposed as the point where the derivation could fail empirically. See §8.*

6 The Binary Born Form in θ

The two sides of the bridge are now in place. Proposition 2 gives the binary record law in the Fisher arclength coordinate s :

$$p(s) = \cos^2(s/2).$$

Assumption 3 gives the relation between s and the physical basis coordinate θ :

$$s = \alpha\theta + s_0$$

for constants $\alpha > 0$ and s_0 , obtained by integrating $ds = \alpha d\theta$. Substituting,

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\alpha\theta + s_0}{2}\right).$$

The calibration $p(0) = 1$ gives $s_0 = 0$, so

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\alpha\theta}{2}\right).$$

The opposite endpoint calibration $p(\pi) = 0$ requires $\cos(\alpha\pi/2) = 0$, so α is any positive odd integer; choosing the first monotone calibration interval fixes $\alpha = 1$. Therefore

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2).$$

For completeness, the same conclusion can be derived directly from $I(\theta) = \alpha^2$ and the binary Fisher identity. For a binary record,

$$I(\theta) = \frac{(dp/d\theta)^2}{p(1-p)}.$$

Setting $I(\theta) = \alpha^2$ and choosing the monotone branch from certainty to impossibility,

$$\frac{dp}{d\theta} = -\alpha\sqrt{p(1-p)},$$

which separates as

$$\frac{dp}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} = -\alpha d\theta.$$

Since $\int dp/\sqrt{p(1-p)} = 2 \arcsin \sqrt{p}$, integration gives

$$2 \arcsin \sqrt{p(\theta)} = -\alpha\theta + C.$$

With $p(0) = 1$ we have $C = \pi$, hence $\sqrt{p(\theta)} = \cos(\alpha\theta/2)$. The calibration $p(\pi) = 0$ again requires $\cos(\alpha\pi/2) = 0$; choosing the first monotone calibration interval fixes $\alpha = 1$, and

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2).$$

The two derivations are equivalent: the first uses the geometric identity of §4 and the bridge map of §5; the second integrates the constant-Fisher-information ODE directly. Both expose where the conditional weight lies.

Theorem 2 (Conditional binary Born form under BLQC). *Suppose that:*

1. *BLQC effective capacity C_{eff} is capacity for preserving operational distinguishability of finite observer records (Assumption 1);*

2. admissible finite-resolution changes are sufficient Markov maps and preserve distinguishability of the tracked basis family (Assumption 2);
3. the calibrated BLQC basis reference has a scalar homogeneous threshold $\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$ in the physical basis coordinate θ (Assumption 3);
4. the calibration map $\theta \mapsto p(\theta)$ is monotone on $[0, \pi]$, with endpoints $p(0) = 1$ (certainty) and $p(\pi) = 0$ (impossibility).

Then the calibrated binary record carries the Born form

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2).$$

Proof. Assumptions 1 and 2 with Cencov's theorem (Theorem 1) place the Fisher–Rao metric on the observer's record manifold. The binary specialisation (Proposition 2) gives $p(s) = \cos^2(s/2)$ in Fisher arclength. Assumption 3 gives $ds = \alpha d\theta$, so $s = \alpha\theta + s_0$. The calibrations of clause (4) fix $s_0 = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, yielding $p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2)$. \square

7 Relation to BLQC Visibility

BLQC's empirical prediction concerns unresolved basis error. Under $ds = \alpha d\theta$, basis uncertainty can be expressed either as a physical angle uncertainty σ_θ or as a Fisher distinguishability uncertainty σ_s :

$$\sigma_s^2 = \alpha^2 \sigma_\theta^2.$$

In the calibrated normalisation $\alpha = 1$, the BLQC visibility law

$$V_{\text{IOF}}(t) = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\sigma_0^2 e^{2\kappa t}\right]$$

can be read as visibility loss from growing uncertainty in the same Fisher-homogeneous coordinate that fixes the binary probability law.

The visibility factor is the Born weight at finite contrast. The link is tighter than a shared coordinate: the visibility factor *is* the binary Born weight, averaged over the unresolved basis. Writing the weight in fringe form,

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \theta),$$

and averaging over a realized basis $\theta = \theta_0 + \delta\theta$ with $\delta\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\theta^2)$ gives

$$\langle p \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + e^{-\sigma_\theta^2/2} \cos \theta_0\right) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + V_{\text{IOF}} \cos \theta_0), \quad V_{\text{IOF}} = e^{-\sigma_\theta^2/2}.$$

The Gaussian average attenuates only the coherent fringe, by exactly V_{IOF} . The Born weight is therefore the law at full contrast ($\sigma_\theta \rightarrow 0$, $V_{\text{IOF}} \rightarrow 1$); V_{IOF} is the contrast at which a finite-capacity observer reads that same weight, flattening to the uninformative $\frac{1}{2}$ as $V_{\text{IOF}} \rightarrow 0$. This is meaningful only when $\delta\theta$ is genuine unresolved physical variation of the realized reference, not private uncertainty about a sharp value. Ordinary dephasing attenuates the same fringe through an independent angular smearing, so the two convolve and their characteristic functions multiply: the observed visibility is $V_{\text{obs}} = V_{\text{std}} V_{\text{IOF}}$.

Thus, under the bridge, BLQC does not merely add noise to an otherwise unrelated probability rule. The same operational geometry determines:

- the calibrated binary law $p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2)$;
- the visibility factor $V_{\text{IOF}} = e^{-\sigma_\theta^2/2}$, that same law read at finite contrast;
- the metric in which finite-rate basis tracking succeeds or fails;
- the capacity coordinate $\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$.

These are tied to a single object: the Fisher geometry of the observer's binary record family.

8 Experimental Test of the Bridge

The bridge proposed here is empirically meaningful only if it can be separated from the narrower BLQC visibility-loss prediction. The comprehensive BLQC/Penrose protocol [9] therefore includes a dedicated *Fisher-homogeneity module* in addition to the mass-geometry and capacity sweeps.

The reason for the separation is simple. A visibility breakdown that scales with

$$\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$$

would support BLQC as a finite-rate basis-tracking mechanism, but it would not by itself validate the Born-rule bridge. The bridge requires the stronger claim of Assumption 1: that the useful part of C_{eff} reduces error specifically in Fisher-distinguishability units. Operationally, the experiment must therefore measure the record family $p(o | \theta)$, compute

$$I(\theta) = \sum_o \frac{1}{p(o | \theta)} \left(\frac{\partial p(o | \theta)}{\partial \theta} \right)^2,$$

and test whether $I(\theta)$ is approximately constant over the calibrated reference range (Assumption 3).

The protocol also requires reporting unresolved reference error in Fisher units,

$$\sigma_s^2 = I(\theta) \sigma_\theta^2,$$

or, over larger intervals,

$$s(\theta) = \int^\theta \sqrt{I(u)} du.$$

This makes the bridge falsifiable. A BLQC-positive but Fisher-negative result would validate finite-rate reference loss while rejecting the derivation of the binary Born rule proposed here. Conversely, simultaneous κ -scaling and Fisher homogeneity would support the claim that the same operational geometry controls both basis tracking and the binary probability law.

9 What This Does and Does Not Prove

It proves a conditional bridge. If BLQC capacity is Fisher-distinguishability capacity, and if the scalar BLQC threshold is homogeneous in the physical basis coordinate, then the calibrated binary probability law in θ is Born.

It does not prove BLQC experimentally. The BLQC experiment must still test whether visibility breakdown scales with κ . The bridge is logically downstream of BLQC: if BLQC fails as a finite-rate basis-tracking framework, the bridge is irrelevant.

It does not derive all of quantum mechanics. The paper does not derive:

- complex Hilbert space;
- full projective quantum geometry;
- tensor-product composition;
- unitary dynamics;
- the Standard Model Lagrangian;

- the ontic admissible-history measure μ_A of IOF;
- the multi-outcome Born rule for arbitrary projective measurements.

Those belong to a separate programme. The binary case is the cleanest place where the Born form can be isolated without deriving full Hilbert kinematics.

It removes one degree of freedom from the reconstruction problem. Once finite observer records have Fisher–Rao geometry and BLQC scalar-threshold homogeneity holds, the binary form is forced. The remaining burden is to derive the multi-outcome rule under additional structure (phases, projective equivalence, composition, context constraints), and to test the Fisher capacity bridge empirically.

10 Objections and Replies

Remark 1 (Is the Born form just a trigonometric identity?). *In the binary case, yes: once s is Fisher–Rao arclength, $p(s) = \cos^2(s/2)$ follows by elementary geometry. The substantive claims are upstream: finite observer record invariance selects Fisher–Rao geometry, and BLQC scalar-threshold homogeneity selects θ as a Fisher-arclength-affine coordinate.*

Remark 2 (Has the Hilbert angle been smuggled in?). *No. The angle s is a Fisher–Rao arclength coordinate on a classical probability simplex; θ is the physical basis coordinate of a BLQC experiment. The identification $s = \alpha\theta$ is a scalar-threshold calibration claim, not a Hilbert-space assumption. The two meet only at the level of the calibrated binary record.*

Remark 3 (Are the bridge assumptions too strong?). *They are strong, but they are not mathematical tautologies. They are empirical claims about how a finite-capacity physical reference channel behaves. If useful tracking capacity is allocated non-uniformly across the basis coordinate, the correct threshold is local, $\kappa(\theta)$, and the derivation fails in that coordinate. The assumptions are exposed as falsifiable calibration claims rather than hidden as definitions.*

Remark 4 (Did Wootters already do this?). *Wootters showed that statistical distance naturally reproduces the squared-cosine transition-probability form. The present paper asks why a physical observer’s finite-rate reference tracking should be calibrated in that geometry at all. The new ingredient is the BLQC bridge from useful tracking capacity to Fisher distinguishability, plus scalar-threshold homogeneity of the laboratory coordinate.*

Remark 5 (Is the experimental test circular?). *No. Measuring approximately constant $I(\theta)$ alone would only confirm Fisher homogeneity of the calibrated record family. The protocol also tests whether visibility breakdown scales with $\kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$, and whether unresolved reference error collapses best in Fisher units $s = \int^\theta \sqrt{I(u)} du$. The Born rule alone predicts neither t_{break} nor its dependence on C_{eff} and h_{KS} .*

Remark 6 (Is this already a derivation of quantum mechanics?). *No. It is a conditional derivation of the binary probability form in the physical basis coordinate of a BLQC experiment. It does not derive complex Hilbert space, composition, dynamics, or the multi-outcome Born rule. It removes one degree of freedom from the reconstruction problem by showing that, under the stated bridge assumptions, the squared-cosine binary form is forced.*

11 Related Work

The relation between statistical distance and quantum transition probabilities is not new. Wootters [3] showed that quantum distinguishability is naturally expressed in terms of statistical distance. This paper uses the logic in the opposite direction. It starts from finite observer record

constraints, invokes the Cencov uniqueness of Fisher–Rao geometry under sufficient Markov morphisms, and obtains the squared-coordinate binary form from the resulting record geometry. The BLQC bridge then identifies the laboratory basis coordinate as the Fisher-arclength-affine coordinate via the scalar-threshold reading.

The novelty claim should remain narrow. The paper does not claim to be the first observation that Fisher geometry and the Born rule are related. The proposed contribution is the directional chain

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{BLQC finite-rate basis tracking} \\
\longrightarrow \\
\text{Fisher capacity bridge} \\
\longrightarrow \\
\text{Cencov: Fisher–Rao on record manifold} \\
\longrightarrow \\
\text{square-root coordinates: } p(s) = \cos^2(s/2) \\
\longrightarrow \\
\text{scalar-threshold homogeneity: } s = \alpha\theta \\
\longrightarrow \\
p(\theta) = \cos^2(\theta/2) \text{ in the calibrated lab basis coordinate.}
\end{array}$$

This should also be distinguished from broader quantum reconstructions, including those that derive Hilbert-space structure from operational axioms [4, 5], purification principles, or agent-centred probability [6]. Those programmes aim at the full kinematics of quantum theory. The present paper isolates only the binary probability form available once the observer’s record geometry has been fixed and the lab basis coordinate has been pinned to it via BLQC.

12 Conclusion

The binary Born form in the laboratory basis coordinate θ can be read as the expression of Fisher–Rao record geometry in square-root coordinates for a calibrated finite record, with the lab coordinate pinned to the Fisher arclength by BLQC scalar-threshold homogeneity. On this reading, the squared cosine is not a separate quantum probability postulate at the level of the binary case. It is the coordinate form forced by invariant finite-record distinguishability together with the BLQC capacity bridge.

The conditional weight is carried by two named assumptions: the Fisher capacity bridge (Assumption 1) and scalar-threshold homogeneity (Assumption 3). Both are empirically meaningful and both are testable by the Fisher-homogeneity module of the BLQC protocol [9]. A BLQC-positive but Fisher-negative experiment would validate finite-rate reference loss while rejecting the derivation here. Simultaneous κ -scaling and Fisher homogeneity would support the claim that the same operational geometry controls both basis tracking and the binary probability law.

What is no longer a separate problem is the identification of the Fisher arclength coordinate with the laboratory basis angle. The earlier conditional derivation derived the binary Born form in Fisher arclength and explicitly deferred the lab-coordinate identification to a later paper. The BLQC bridge here is that later paper, and the present paper folds it back into the original derivation as a single coherent argument. The remaining burden is empirical: test the bridge.

References

- [1] N. N. Cencov, *Statistical Decision Rules and Optimal Inference*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 53, American Mathematical Society, 1982.

- [2] S. Amari and H. Nagaoka, *Methods of Information Geometry*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 191, American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [3] W. K. Wootters, Statistical distance and Hilbert space, *Physical Review D* 23 (1981), 357–362.
- [4] L. Hardy, Quantum theory from five reasonable axioms, arXiv:quant-ph/0101012 (2001).
- [5] G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Informational derivation of quantum theory, *Physical Review A* 84 (2011), 012311.
- [6] C. A. Fuchs, N. D. Mermin, and R. Schack, An introduction to QBism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics, *American Journal of Physics* 82 (2014), 749–754.
- [7] A. Dekker, *The Ignorant Observer: Formalizing Ignorance as a Physical Constraint on Observation*, Version 2.9, May 2026.
- [8] A. Dekker, *Bandwidth-Limited Quantum Control: A finite-rate phase-reference test in the Penrose-overlap regime*, Internal draft / OSF preprint, 2026.
- [9] A. Dekker, *Prospective Tests of Bandwidth-Limited Observer Dynamics: Experimental Protocol for the Ignorant Observer Framework*, Version 2.4, 2026.