Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics, 2025, 13(8), 2557-2568
https://www.scirp.org/journal/jamp
ISSN Online: 2327-4379
ISSN Print: 2327-4352

Operator Convergence and the Structure of Physical Reality: Weak, Strong, and Uniform Limits as Models of Field, Mass, and Gravitation

Tafireyi Nemaura

Independent Researcher, Leicester, UK
Email: tnemaura@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Nemaura, T. (2025) Operator Convergence and the Structure of Physical Reality: Weak, Strong, and Uniform Limits as Models of Field, Mass, and Gravitation. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics*, **13**, 2557-2568.
https://doi.org/10.4236/jamp.2025.138144

Received: July 9, 2025
Accepted: August 5, 2025
Published: August 8, 2025

Abstract

We investigate bounded linear operators on separable Hilbert spaces and their convergence properties. We provide connections between uniform, strong, and weak convergence modes and interpret them in terms of gravitational, inertial, and field-based physical ontologies. Using a novel construct, the perturbation energy, we unify operator convergence theory with physical intuition. This paper contributes both a mathematical synthesis and an interpretive framework applicable to quantum mechanics, statistical mechanics, and emergent space-time theories.

Keywords

Convergence, Uniform, Strong, Weak, Quantum

1. Introduction

While operator convergence plays a fundamental role in several established areas—such as interacting fields in quantum field theory, equilibrium characterization via Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) states, asymptotic behavior in scattering theory, and spectral tracking in adiabatic quantum mechanics—the treatment of convergence types has remained largely fragmented and technically compartmentalized.

The novelty of our approach lies in offering a unified physical ontology for operator convergence, systematically interpreting uniform, strong, and weak convergence as analogues of spacetime geometry, inertial stability, and field-level observability, respectively. Moreover, we introduce the concept of perturbation energy, a scalar quantity defined as

$$E_{\text{pert}}(t) := \langle \psi, (T_t - T)\psi \rangle,$$

which encapsulates how a system's dynamics deviate from a limiting operator law. This provides not just a theoretical criterion, but a potentially measurable physical quantity in systems governed by time-dependent Hamiltonians or propagators. To our knowledge, this interpretive synthesis and the use of perturbation energy as a convergence diagnostic have not been previously articulated in the literature, marking a conceptual and methodological advancement in the study of operator limits.

Operator convergence plays a pivotal role in various branches of mathematical physics. The study of how operator families behave in the limit is essential for understanding the long-time dynamics of quantum systems [1] [2], the stability of solutions in partial differential equations (PDEs) [3], and ergodic properties in statistical mechanics—such as whether a system reaches equilibrium over time—are often analyzed using families of operators that describe time evolution. Convergence of these operators, especially in the weak or strong sense, helps determine whether a system relaxes, mixes, or remains stable in the long run [4]. Despite the foundational importance of operator convergence, standard presentations often treat the principal modes—norm, strong, and weak convergence—as technical constructs, disconnected from physical interpretation [5] [6].

This paper aims to address that gap by establishing a conceptual bridge between mathematical convergence theory and physical ontology. We argue that convergence behavior is not merely a functional analysis abstraction, but an important marker for physical stability across distinct ontological regimes. In particular, we propose that:

- **Uniform convergence** shows the preservation of geometric or spacetime background structure, where operator behavior remains stable across the entire Hilbert space [7].
- **Strong convergence** mirrors inertial or state-based dynamical consistency, similar to physical processes that evolve without abrupt changes in observables for bounded states [8].
- **Weak convergence** captures field-theoretic or observational features, where stability is retained under measurement contexts but not necessarily under full dynamics [9] [10].

This framework is developed to elucidate the physical significance of operator convergence. By rooting convergence in interpretive structures drawn from quantum mechanics, field theory, and general relativity, we propose a unified conceptual picture that informs both pure mathematical analysis and its applications in theoretical physics [11]-[13].

This work makes three primary contributions that unify operator theory with physically meaningful interpretations.

1) **Perturbation energy as a diagnostic:** We introduce the concept of *perturbation energy*, a scalar quantity defined as

$$E_{\text{pert}}(t) := \langle \psi, (T_t - T)\psi \rangle, \tag{1}$$

which measures the deviation between a time-evolving operator T_t and its limiting operator T. This quantity serves as a practical and interpretable criterion for assessing dynamical stability, especially in quantum and asymptotic contexts where operator norm convergence may be too strong or experimentally inaccessible.

2) **Physical ontology of convergence types:** We propose a novel mapping between standard modes of operator convergence and core physical structures. Uniform convergence corresponds to geometric or spacetime consistency, strong convergence to inertial or material stability, and weak convergence to field-theoretic or observational agreement. This ontology enhances the interpretive clarity of convergence theory and connects abstract functional analysis to physically intuitive frameworks.

3) **Convergence hierarchy and examples:** We provide complete proofs of the hierarchy: uniform convergence implies strong convergence, which in turn implies weak convergence. These are supplemented with classical counterexamples to illustrate strict inclusions between the modes. This reinforces the logical structure of convergence types and validates their distinct roles in both mathematical and physical analysis.

We present a convergence-based operator framework unifying multiple physical behaviors under a single mathematical umbrella. By associating perturbation energy with control and convergence type with ontology, we gain interpretive and analytical leverage. This approach offers a geometric and field-theoretic perspective useful in quantum theory, classical analysis, and foundational physics. We embed this model within recent ontological discourse in quantum foundations. ψ is the system's informational state; ϕ is the directional lens of measurement; and $\langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle$ is the measurement outcome. The introduction of convergence types provides a bridge from quantum description to geometric and classical constraints.

2. Mathematical Framework

Let H be a separable complex Hilbert space. We consider a family of bounded linear operators $\{T_t : H \to H\}_{t\geq 0}$, which may represent time evolution, dissipative dynamics, or parametrized observables.

The *perturbation operator* is defined by

$$F(t) := T_t - T, \tag{2}$$

where $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ is the limiting operator. This operator quantifies the deviation of T_t from its long-time equilibrium.

The different types of convergence describe how the perturbation operator $F(t) = T_t - T$ behaves with respect to operator norm, action on states, and expectation values. In particular, its expectation between a detector state ϕ and a system state ψ is given by:

$$\langle \phi, F(t)\psi \rangle = \langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle - \langle \phi, T\psi \rangle \tag{3}$$

While mathematically a difference of expectation values, this quantity gains new physical interpretation within our framework: it represents the energy or information transferred through interaction with external fields, observation, or control processes within a time-varying environment. The limiting operator T refers to a stable, time-independent operator that governs the baseline structure of the system. It plays the role of:

A macroscopic law in the limit $\hbar \to 0$ (semi-classical regime).

A geometric constraint (e.g., Laplacian on a manifold).

Or an inertial frame that remains fixed while T_t varies under perturbations. This makes T the limit to which T_t converges, whether under uniform, strong, or weak regimes.

Let T_t be a time-dependent family of bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and T the limiting operator as $t \to \infty$, or under adiabatic or macroscopic limits. The convergence of T_t toward T can be characterized as follows:

• **Weak convergence:** $\langle \phi, T_t \psi \rangle \to \langle \phi, T\psi \rangle$ for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$.

Interpretation: Agreement of measurement outcomes; relevant to observational or statistical interaction.

• **Strong convergence:** $\| T_t \psi - T\psi \| \to 0$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$.

Interpretation: Agreement in the evolution of each state; corresponds to inertial or intrinsic structural behavior.

• **Uniform convergence:** $\| T_t - T \|_{\text{op}} \to 0$.

Interpretation: Global agreement of the entire operator; corresponds to uniform background forces such as gravitation or geometry.

These regimes define increasing levels of structural alignment between the dynamic environment and its static limit, with the inclusion of ϕ offering a directional or observational lens through which system behavior is revealed.

3. Main Theorem: Operator Convergence and Physical Analogy

Theorem 1 (Operator Convergence Hierarchy) *Let* $T_t, T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ *with perturbation* $F(t)$ *as in* (2). *Then*:

1) **Uniform Convergence**:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \| T_t - T \| = 0 \tag{4}$$

implies strong and weak convergence.

2) **Strong Convergence**:

$$\forall \psi \in H, \ \lim_{t \to \infty} \| T_t \psi - T\psi \| = 0 \tag{5}$$

implies weak convergence.

3) **Weak Convergence**:

$$\forall \phi, \psi \in H, \ \lim_{t \to \infty} \langle \phi, T_t \psi \rangle = \langle \phi, T\psi \rangle \tag{6}$$

does not imply strong or uniform convergence in general.

Proof

1) If $\|T_t - T\| \to 0$, then for any $\psi \in H$,

$$\|T_t\psi - T\psi\| \le \|T_t - T\| \cdot \|\psi\| \to 0,$$

which is strong convergence. Then for any $\phi, \psi \in H$,

$$\left|\langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle - \langle \phi, T\psi \rangle\right| \le \|\phi\| \cdot \|T_t\psi - T\psi\| \to 0,$$

giving weak convergence.

2) Strong convergence implies that $\|T_t\psi - T\psi\| \to 0$ for each ψ. Then for any $\phi \in H$,

$$\langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle \to \langle \phi, T\psi \rangle$$

by continuity of the inner product, so $T_t \to T$ weakly.

3) Weak convergence does not imply norm convergence. A standard counter-example is the sequence of unitary operators U_n on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ defined by $U_n(x_k) = x_{k+n}$. These converge weakly to zero but not strongly, and not in norm.

Illustration: Interpretive Framework in quantum mechanics

The behavior of quantum, classical, and field-like systems can be interpreted as different **convergence regimes** of a family of time-dependent operators T_t toward a reference or baseline operator T. The type and strength of convergence determine whether the system behaves more like a field, mass, or gravitational (geometric) structure.

Let $\psi \in H$ denote the **state of the system**, and let $\phi \in H$ denote the **question, measurement, or window** into the state. The expectation or observable quantity is expressed by the bilinear pairing:

$$\langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle,$$

which represents the measurement outcome at time t.

The interpretation of each component is as follows:

- T_t: A time-dependent operator modeling the **environment**, such as gravity, force, field, or evolving law.
- T: A time-independent reference operator representing the **classical law** or stable geometric structure.
- $F(t) = T_t - T$: The perturbation operator, encoding deviations or external influences at time t.
- ψ: The internal or intrinsic **state of matter or configuration**.
- ϕ: The **observer's perspective** or the mode of observation applied to the state.
- $\langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle$: The resulting **answer** to the measurement, shaped by interaction between environment, state, and observer.

Thus, the triad (T_t, ψ, ϕ) fully determines the dynamics of the system, while the nature of convergence between T_t and T determines the physical regime:

$$\text{Field-like}(\text{weak}) \;\to\; \text{Mass-like}(\text{strong}) \;\to\; \text{Gravitational}(\text{uniform}).$$

4. Perturbation Energy

We now introduce a scalar functional to quantify the deviation of an observable from its equilibrium due to the perturbation operator. This serves as a quantitative diagnostic of how convergence manifests for a fixed state.

Perturbation Energy: For any fixed $\psi \in H$, the perturbation energy is defined as

$$E_{pert}(t;\psi) := \langle \psi, F(t)\psi \rangle = \langle \psi, (T_t - T)\psi \rangle. \tag{7}$$

This scalar captures a state-dependent measure of deviation. When T_t is self-adjoint or unitary, this energy has a physical interpretation as an expectation difference, e.g., in Hamiltonians or observables.

Case 1: Self-Adjoint Operators (Hamiltonians)

Suppose $T_t = \mathbf{H}_t$ and $T = \mathbf{H}$ are bounded self-adjoint operators (e.g., time-varying and stationary Hamiltonians). Then the energy expectation in state ψ is:

$$E_{\text{pert}}(t) = \langle \psi, \mathbf{H}_t \psi \rangle - \langle \psi, \mathbf{H}\psi \rangle. \tag{8}$$

This scalar thus directly measures the deviation in expected energy as the system evolves. If $\mathbf{H}_t \to \mathbf{H}$ strongly or uniformly, then $E_{\text{pert}}(t) \to 0$, indicating energetic stabilization of the system.

Case 2: Unitary Operators (Time Evolution)

Suppose $T_t = U_t = \mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{H}_t t}$, $T = U = \mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{H}t}$ are unitary operators generated by self-adjoint Hamiltonians. The perturbation energy becomes:

$$E_{\text{pert}}(t) = \langle \psi, (U_t - U)\psi \rangle. \tag{9}$$

Though not self-adjoint, the real part of this expression,

$$\operatorname{Re} E_{\text{pert}}(t) = \operatorname{Re}\langle \psi, U_t \psi \rangle - \operatorname{Re}\langle \psi, U\psi \rangle, \tag{10}$$

captures observable mismatches such as interference effects or quantum phase differences. If $U_t \to U$ weakly or strongly, then $E_{\text{pert}}(t) \to 0$, indicating convergence in the system's observable dynamics. The scalar $E_{\text{pert}}(t)$ serves as a state-dependent, physically interpretable quantity:

- For self-adjoint T_t, it measures the difference in energy expectation.
- For unitary T_t, it shows observable deviations (e.g., coherence, phase).
- Convergence of $T_t \to T$ (in any mode) implies $E_{\text{pert}}(t) \to 0$.

This energy-like scalar thus acts as a diagnostic of asymptotic physical stability or deviation from a governing law.

5. Physical Ontology of Convergence

To enrich the abstract convergence framework, we propose a physical interpretation see (Table 1):

Table 1. Physical interpretation of operator convergence modes.

Convergence Type	Physical Analogy	Observable Stability
Uniform (Norm)	Gravitational geometry	Full structure stable
Strong	Inertial evolution	State evolution stable
Weak	Field/Charge dynamics	Measurements stable

• **Uniform Convergence (4):** Represents complete structural stability, similar to a fixed background geometry in general relativity. In this operator convergence framework, **Special Relativity** corresponds to the case where the operator T_t governing dynamics is fixed and equal to T for all t; that is, $T_t = T$, and thus **uniform convergence is exact**. There is no perturbation: $F(t) = T_t - T = 0$, reflecting a *flat Minkowski spacetime* with no curvature. Our perturbation and convergence model permits time-dilation-like effects when T_t varies under relative frame evolution. In contrast, **General Relativity** involves time-varying operators T_t approaching a limiting operator T, with $F(t) \neq 0$, showing *spacetime curvature* and the dynamic geometry of gravitational fields. All observables behave stably regardless of initial states for uniform convergence. Uniform convergence $\|T_t - T\|_{\text{op}} \to 0$ maps naturally to spacetime curvature stabilizing globally which is consistent with general relativistic geometry.

• **Strong Convergence (5):** Shows inertial persistence in mechanics. The evolution of each initial state becomes indistinguishable from the limiting behavior.

• **Weak Convergence (6):** Reflects field-level measurement alignment, such as electric or magnetic field consistency. Only the projected observations converge.

• **Worked Example: Convergence of a Perturbed Harmonic Oscillator**

Consider the unperturbed harmonic oscillator:

$$T = -\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}x^2} + x^2 \tag{11}$$

and a perturbed family of operators:

$$T_t = T + \epsilon(t)x, \text{ where } \epsilon(t) = \frac{1}{t} \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty. \tag{12}$$

Define the perturbation operator:

$$F(t) = T_t - T = \frac{1}{t}x. \tag{13}$$

Let the initial state be the ground state of the harmonic oscillator:

$$\psi_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi^{1/4}}\mathrm{e}^{-x^2/2}. \tag{14}$$

1) Strong Convergence

We compute:

$$T_t\psi_0 = T\psi_0 + \frac{1}{t}x\psi_0 \tag{15}$$

So the norm difference is:

$$\|T_t\psi_0 - T\psi_0\| = \frac{1}{t}x\psi_0 = \frac{1}{t}\|x\psi_0\|. \tag{16}$$

Now,

$$\|x\psi_0\|^2 = \langle \psi_0, x^2\psi_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 |\psi_0(x)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{17}$$

Thus,

$$\|T_t\psi_0 - T\psi_0\| = \frac{1}{t} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty. \tag{18}$$

Strong convergence holds.

2) Weak Convergence

Let $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be an arbitrary test function. Then:

$$\langle \phi, T_t \psi_0 \rangle = \langle \phi, T\psi_0 \rangle + \frac{1}{t} \langle \phi, x\psi_0 \rangle \to \langle \phi, T\psi_0 \rangle \text{ as } t \to \infty. \tag{19}$$

Weak convergence holds. As $\epsilon(t) = \frac{1}{t} \to 0$, both strong and weak convergence $T_t \to T$ hold as $t \to \infty$. Physically, this illustrates a quantum system returning to its unperturbed harmonic oscillator behavior, with the perturbation energy vanishing in the limit.

We associate each convergence type with a physical phenomenon: In mathematical physics, different types of convergence correspond to distinct physical interpretations. **Weak convergence** represents field or charge effects, characterizing far-field influence without structural modification of the system. **Strong convergence** relates to mass or inertia, describing the intrinsic structure of a system and its resistance to change. **Uniform convergence** corresponds to gravity or geometry, representing a global, consistent background curvature that affects the entire domain uniformly. These convergence types provide a framework for understanding how different physical phenomena manifest mathematically.

6. Justification of Physical Analogies

Uniform Convergence→*Gravity*/*Geometry*: Uniform convergence, which ensures $\|T_t - T\|_{\text{op}} \to 0$, implies a global stabilization of the operator across the entire space. This mirrors the role of gravity or spacetime curvature, which governs consistent behavior across all matter and fields. Gravity, as shown in general relativity, provides the geometric background that uniformly influences all local physics.

Strong Convergence→*Mass*/*Inertia*: Strong convergence $|T_t\psi - T\psi| \to 0$ reflects how individual state evolutions align, much like mass determines how an object resists change in motion. This captures a system's internal structure or dynamics—thus aligning naturally with mass/inertial behavior.

Weak Convergence →*Field*/*Charge*: Weak convergence $\langle \phi, T_t\psi \rangle \to \langle \phi, T\psi \rangle$ shows agreement only in expectation. This subtle, non-invasive agreement is characteristic of fields or charges, which influence systems via potential without necessitating structural change.

7. Discussion

Operator convergence plays a foundational role across a wide spectrum of physical theories, particularly where asymptotic analysis or time evolution is central. The following examples highlight the diversity and depth of its relevance in theoretical physics.

In **quantum field theory**, operator convergence is essential for constructing interacting fields, especially within the algebraic and Wightman frameworks. Fields are typically defined as limits of operator-valued distributions acting on dense domains in Hilbert space. These limits must converge in either the strong or weak operator topology to ensure well-defined physical observables and causal structures [11] [14]. The convergence of sequences of smeared fields, often modulated by regularization or renormalization schemes, helps maintain locality and stability in the quantum theory. Within this context, the interpretive framework presented in this paper—linking convergence modes to ontological physical regimes—offers a new conceptual tool for analyzing interactions, especially where strict norm convergence may not hold.

Considering, **quantum statistical mechanics**, convergence concepts emerge naturally in the theory of C^*-dynamical systems and in the definition of Kubo—Martin—Schwinger (KMS) states. These equilibrium states are characterized by specific analyticity and invariance properties under time evolution, which are shown in the weak-* convergence of the automorphism group on the algebra of observables [15]. This type of convergence reflects thermal stability and long-time averaging, making it especially suited for describing macroscopic equilibrium. The scalar perturbation energy proposed in this work provides a complementary diagnostic, quantifying the deviation from equilibrium in finite or intermediate-time regimes. Such a quantity could be used to distinguish between transient fluctuations and true phase transitions in nonequilibrium statistical systems.

Furthermore, **scattering theory**, operator convergence governs the behavior of wave operators that link free and interacting Hamiltonians. These operators are defined as strong or weak limits of unitary propagators as time approaches infinity, capturing the asymptotic states of a quantum system undergoing scattering processes [16]. Strong convergence ensures the physical continuity of evolving states, while weak convergence allows for stability in expectation values, even when the underlying states themselves vary. The classification of convergence types introduced in this paper helps clarify the physical significance of these limits and introduces perturbation energy as a novel indicator of scattering resonance strength or interaction asymptotics.

Finally, in **adiabatic quantum mechanics**, operator convergence is central to the adiabatic theorem and its various generalizations. Here, the strong convergence of time-dependent propagators ensures that the evolution of a system subject to slowly varying Hamiltonians closely tracks the instantaneous eigenstates of the system [17]. This adiabatic limit is crucial in both theoretical and applied quantum mechanics, such as quantum annealing, molecular dynamics, and quantum control. The scalar diagnostic proposed here—perturbation energy—serves as a quantifier of deviation from ideal adiabaticity and can potentially identify breakdowns in the adiabatic regime due to spectral crossings, degeneracies, or rapid parameter shifts.

8. Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a novel theoretical framework that unifies classical notions of operator convergence—uniform, strong, and weak—with physically interpretable analogies from quantum theory and field dynamics. By interpreting uniform convergence as spacetime or geometric alignment, strong convergence as inertial or mass-based stabilization, and weak convergence as a field-theoretic or observational effect, we bridge the mathematical structure of operator theory with key physical phenomena [1] [5] [6]. This unified perspective not only clarifies the relationships between different modes of convergence, but also positions them within a coherent ontological interpretation of physical law, inspired by recent trends in quantum foundations [10] [18] [19].

This work establishes a mathematical-physical correspondence between operator convergence regimes and fundamental physical phenomena—fields, mass, and geometry—through the lens of perturbation and measurement dynamics. By interpreting perturbation energy as a unifying control or coupling mechanism, we offer a flexible framework that integrates quantum information, classical behavior, and geometric structure under a common operator-theoretic language. This synthesis not only sharpens the analytical tools available for studying quantum-to-classical transitions, but also proposes a concrete formalism that engages foundational questions in quantum ontology and spacetime emergence. In doing so, our approach resonates with recent developments in relational quantum mechanics, emergent spacetime theory, and principle-based formulations of quantum mechanics [20]-[22]. A key proposition of this work is the introduction and justification of the *perturbation energy* $E_{\text{pert}}(t) := \langle \psi, (T_t - T)\psi \rangle$, which acts as a scalar diagnostic of dynamical stability. We showed that this quantity has a rich physical interpretation: for self-adjoint operators, it corresponds to a shift in energy expectations [2] [8], and for unitary operators, it shows phase or coherence deviations [9] [13]. Its convergence to zero under weak or strong convergence of operators provides both a mathematical marker and a physical criterion for equilibrium. This offers a new way to characterize the asymptotic behavior of quantum or dynamical systems with temporal evolution, especially where full norm convergence is too strong or inapplicable [1] [3].

Future work may extend this framework to broader contexts such as unbounded operators when considering Hamiltonians with continuous spectra [1] [7], quantum channels in open systems [23] [24], or relativistic settings where space-time structure influences operator topology [11] [12]. The connections between operator convergence and generalized symmetries, gauge fields, or curvature operators in Hilbert bundles may yield further insight into the deep interplay between functional analysis and fundamental physics [25] [26]. In addition, empirical validation of perturbation energy as a measurable quantity in quantum experiments when considering using interferometry or spectroscopy, could help translate the theory into operational physics [27] [28]. This unified ontology opens the door to a more integrated understanding of law, evolution, and observation in quantum and geometric dynamics.

Acknowledgements

This work builds on prior scientific inquiry and the contributions of the research community. While conducted independently, it reflects the influence of this tradition. The author assumes full responsibility for the content.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] Reed, M. and Simon, B. (1980) Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol. 1: Functional Analysis. Academic Press.

[2] Blank, J., Exner, P. and Havlíček, M. (2008) Hilbert Space Operators in Quantum Physics. Springer.

[3] Yosida, K. (1995) Functional Analysis. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-61859-8

[4] Eisner, T., Farkas, B., Haase, M. and Nagel, R. (2015) Operator Theoretic Aspects of Ergodic Theory, Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16898-2

[5] Dunford, N. and Schwartz, J.T. (1988) Linear Operators, Part I: General Theory. Wiley-Interscience.

[6] Kadison, R. and Ringrose, J. (1997) Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras. American Mathematical Society. https://doi.org/10.1090/gsm/016

[7] Moretti, V. (2013) Spectral Theory and Quantum Mechanics. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-88-470-2835-7

[8] Ballentine, L.E. (2014) Quantum Mechanics: A Modern Development. World Scientific. https://doi.org/10.1142/9038

[9] Nielsen, M.A. and Chuang, I.L. (2010) Quantum Computation and Quantum Information. Cambridge University Press.

[10] Landsman, N.P. (2017) Foundations of Quantum Theory: From Classical Concepts to Operator Algebras. Springer.

[11] Wald, R.M. (1994) Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermo-Dynamics. University of Chicago Press.

[12] Haag, R. (2012) Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras. Springer.

[13] Zurek, W.H. (2003) Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **75**, 715-775. https://doi.org/10.1103/revmodphys.75.715

[14] Haag, R. (1996) Local Quantum Physics. Springer.

[15] Bratteli, O. and Robinson, D.W. (1987) Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics, Springer.

[16] Yafaev, D.R. (1992) Mathematical Scattering Theory. AMS.

[17] Messiah, A. (1999) Quantum Mechanics. Dover.

[18] Drezet, J.-M. (2021) The Ontology of Quantum Mechanics. Foundations of Physics.

[19] Hardy, L. (2001) Quantum Theory from Five Reasonable Axioms. arXiv: Quant-ph/0101012.

[20] Rovelli, C. (1996) Relational Quantum Mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, **35**, 1637-1678. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02302261

[21] Weinstein, S. (2006) Emergent Spacetime. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, **37**, 420-434.

[22] Barrett, J., Lorenz, R. and Oreshkov, O. (2019) Quantum Mechanics as a Principle Theory. *Physical Review A*, **100**, Article 052108.

[23] Rivas, Á. and Huelga, S.F. (2012) Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23354-8

[24] Breuer, H. and Petruccione, F. (2002) The Theory of Open Quantum Systems. Oxford University Press.

[25] Ashtekar, A. and Lewandowski, J. (1999) Quantum Theory of Geometry: I. Area Operators. Classical and Quantum Gravity.

[26] Baez, J. and Muniain, J.P. (1994) Gauge Fields, Knots and Gravity. World Scientific. https://doi.org/10.1142/2324

[27] Cronin, A.D., Schmiedmayer, J. and Pritchard, D.E. (2009) Optics and Interferometry with Atoms and Molecules. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **81**, 1051-1129. https://doi.org/10.1103/revmodphys.81.1051

[28] Haroche, S. and Raimond, J. (2006) Exploring the Quantum: Atoms, Cavities, and Photons. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198509141.001.0001