Open Problems in Quantum Perspectivism: From Category Structure to Experimental Signatures

Matthew Long

The YonedaAI Collaboration
YonedaAI Research Collective
Chicago, IL

matthew@yonedaai.com · https://yonedaai.com

24 February 2026

Abstract

We survey the major open problems and research directions in quantum perspectivism—the framework in which quantum mechanics emerges from the Yoneda Lemma applied as a constraint on physical theories. On the mathematical side, key questions include: the classification of categories $\mathscr{C}$ of observational contexts satisfying the Yoneda constraint, including the role of causal, topological, and higher-categorical structure; the derivation of quantitative predictions such as the Standard Model gauge group $\mathrm{SU}(3) \times \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ and the particle spectrum from categorical first principles; and the rigorous construction of the classical limit via categorical decoherence and coarse-graining. On the physical side, we identify a detailed quantum gravity research program connecting quantum perspectivism to loop quantum gravity, string theory, causal set theory, and asymptotic safety. We formulate concrete experimental proposals including extended Bell inequality tests, Leggett–Garg inequality modifications, multi-observer Wigner's-friend scenarios, and quantum gravity phenomenology accessible with near-term technology. We analyze implications for quantum computing—including categorical quantum computation, topological quantum codes, and the ZX-calculus—and develop the information-theoretic foundations of the framework, connecting the Yoneda isomorphism to quantum entropy, channel capacity, and resource theories. We conclude with a detailed ten-year research roadmap for the quantum perspectivism program, identifying milestones, required mathematical tools, and experimental targets for each phase.

Keywords: Yoneda Lemma, category theory, quantum foundations, open problems, quantum gravity, Standard Model, experimental signatures, quantum computing, quantum information, research roadmap

Contents

1 Introduction

Quantum perspectivism, as developed in [1], proposes that quantum mechanics is the unique physical theory consistent with the Yoneda Lemma of category theory, interpreted as the fundamental constraint that physical objects are completely determined by their relational profiles. The framework derives the Hilbert space formalism, the Born rule, superposition, entanglement, complementarity, and the resolution of the measurement problem from a single categorical axiom—the *Yoneda Constraint*—applied to a category $\mathscr{C}$ of observational contexts.

While the foundational paper establishes the qualitative derivation chain from the Yoneda Constraint to the structures of quantum mechanics, it necessarily leaves open a constellation of deep problems. These problems span pure mathematics, mathematical physics, phenomenology, and experimental design. The present paper is devoted to a systematic survey and expansion of these open problems, organized into eight major research directions:

(i) **The structure problem:** What constrains the category $\mathscr{C}$ of contexts?

(ii) **Quantitative predictions:** Can quantum perspectivism derive the Standard Model?

(iii) **The classical limit:** Rigorous derivation of classical mechanics from categorical decoherence.

(iv) **Quantum gravity:** Detailed connections to loop quantum gravity, string theory, causal sets, and asymptotic safety.

(v) **Experimental signatures:** Concrete proposals for distinguishing quantum perspectivism from competing interpretations.

(vi) **Quantum computing:** Implications for categorical quantum computation and topological quantum codes.

(vii) **Information-theoretic foundations:** Quantum information from the Yoneda isomorphism.

(viii) **A ten-year roadmap:** Milestones and targets for the research program.

For each topic we provide the mathematical context, state precise open problems, review partial results, and suggest lines of attack. Our goal is to transform quantum perspectivism from a foundational insight into a concrete research program with measurable deliverables.

1.1 Notation and Conventions

We follow the notation of [1]. The category of observational contexts is $\mathscr{C}$, with objects denoted C, C', C'' and morphisms f, g, h. The Yoneda embedding is $\mathsf{y} : \mathscr{C} \hookrightarrow \widehat{\mathscr{C}} = [\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Set}]$. A physical system is a presheaf $S : \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ satisfying the Yoneda Constraint. The Hilbert space fiber at context C is $\mathcal{H}_C = S(C)$. Natural transformations are denoted α, β, γ. We write **Hilb** for the category of Hilbert spaces with bounded linear maps, $\mathbf{C^*Alg}$ for the category of C^*-algebras, and **vN** for von Neumann algebras.

2 The Structure Problem: What Constrains $\mathscr{C}$?

The foundational paper [1] takes the category of contexts $\mathscr{C}$ as given and derives quantum structure from the Yoneda Constraint applied to presheaves on $\mathscr{C}$. But what *is* $\mathscr{C}$? What constrains its objects, morphisms, and higher structure? This is the most fundamental open problem in quantum perspectivism.

2.1 The Minimalist Position

One approach is to argue that the physical predictions of quantum perspectivism are *independent* of the specific choice of $\mathscr{C}$, provided $\mathscr{C}$ satisfies certain abstract conditions.

Open Problem 2.1 (Universality of $\mathscr{C}$)**.** Characterize the class of categories $\mathscr{C}$ for which the Yoneda-constraint derivation of quantum mechanics goes through. Is there a "minimal" $\mathscr{C}$ that yields exactly quantum mechanics and nothing more?

The derivation in [1] requires that $\mathscr{C}$ satisfy:

(C1) **Monoidal structure:** $\mathscr{C}$ admits a monoidal product $\otimes$ representing parallel combination of contexts.

(C2) **Coproducts:** $\mathscr{C}$ admits coproducts representing the choice between contexts.

(C3) **Braiding:** The monoidal structure is braided, with the braiding admitting a nontrivial square root (related to spin-statistics).

(C4) **Common refinements:** Sufficiently many pairs of objects admit common refinements (pullbacks or fibered products).

Conjecture 2.1 (Minimal $\mathscr{C}$)**.** *The minimal category satisfying (C1)–(C4) that yields standard quantum mechanics over* $\mathbb{C}$ *is the category* **fHilb** *of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces with linear maps, equipped with the tensor product monoidal structure.*

This conjecture, if true, would be deeply satisfying: the category of contexts *is* the category of quantum systems, yielding a beautiful self-referential structure in which the theory determines its own observational framework.

Remark 2.2 (On Circularity)*.* A natural objection arises: if the category of contexts turns out to be **fHilb**, is the framework circular—merely restating quantum mechanics in categorical language rather than deriving it? We argue not, for two reasons. First, the derivation shows that **fHilb** is *forced* by conditions (C1)–(C4), which are motivated independently of quantum mechanics (monoidal composition, braiding from spatial structure, etc.). The self-referentiality is a *consistency condition*, not a tautology: it shows that quantum mechanics is the unique theory compatible with its own observational framework. Second, even if $\mathscr{C} = \mathbf{fHilb}$, the derivation of the Born rule, entanglement, complementarity, and the measurement resolution from the Yoneda Constraint provides new explanatory content—it transforms axioms into theorems. The situation is analogous to deriving the Lorentz transformations from the relativity principle: the result is "already known," but the derivation reveals *why* it must be so.

2.2 Causal Structure

A physically motivated approach is to demand that $\mathscr{C}$ encode *causal structure*.

Definition 2.3 (Causal Category)**.** A **causal category** is a monoidal category $(\mathscr{C}, \otimes, I)$ equipped with a distinguished class of morphisms called **causal morphisms**, satisfying:

(a) Every morphism $f : C \to C'$ decomposes uniquely as $f = f_{\text{causal}} \circ f_{\text{acausal}}$.

(b) Causal morphisms are closed under composition and tensor product.

(c) The causal morphisms from any object C to the monoidal unit I form a convex set (the "discarding" maps).

This definition is inspired by the causal categories of Kissinger and Uijlen [17], adapted to the perspectival setting.

Open Problem 2.2 (Causal Structure of $\mathscr{C}$)**.** Does imposing causal structure on $\mathscr{C}$ constrain the resulting quantum theory? Specifically:

(a) Does causality force the presheaf fibers to be Hilbert spaces over $\mathbb{C}$ rather than $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{H}$?

(b) Does causality determine the dimension of the fibers?

(c) Does causality constrain the dynamics (i.e., which Hamiltonians are allowed)?

The connection between causality and the complex numbers is tantalizing. Hardy [15] showed that quantum mechanics is the unique theory satisfying certain operational axioms, one of which is "continuous reversibility" of transformations—a condition closely related to causality. Chiribella, D'Ariano, and Perinotti [16] derived quantum mechanics from axioms including "purification," which has a natural categorical formulation. In the Yoneda framework, we conjecture that causality is equivalent to the requirement that the presheaf topos $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ admits a *factorization system* compatible with the physical interpretation of morphisms as refinements.

2.3 Topological Structure

A second constraint on $\mathscr{C}$ comes from *topology*—specifically, from requiring that $\mathscr{C}$ carry a Grothendieck topology.

Definition 2.4 (Grothendieck Topology on Contexts)**.** A **Grothendieck topology** J on $\mathscr{C}$ assigns to each object C a collection $J(C)$ of **covering sieves** (collections of morphisms into C closed under precomposition), satisfying:

(a) The maximal sieve $\{f : f \text{ has codomain } C\}$ is in $J(C)$.

(b) Covering sieves are stable under pullback.

(c) The composition of covering sieves covers.

The passage from presheaves to *sheaves*—presheaves satisfying a gluing condition with respect to J—is physically significant. The gluing condition states that locally compatible data can be assembled into a global section. In quantum mechanics, this condition fails in general (the Kochen–Specker theorem), but it holds for classical observables.

Open Problem 2.3 (The Physical Grothendieck Topology)**.** What is the physically correct Grothendieck topology on $\mathscr{C}$? Specifically:

(a) Does the topology encode the quantum-to-classical transition, with sheaves corresponding to classical systems and non-sheaf presheaves corresponding to quantum systems?

(b) Is the topology determined by the causal structure of spacetime?

(c) Does the topology determine which observables are jointly measurable?

Proposition 2.5 (Sheafification as Classicalization)**.** *Let S be a presheaf on $(\mathscr{C}, J)$ representing a quantum system. The sheafification $S^\sharp$ of S with respect to J is the "closest classical system" to S—the universal sheaf receiving a morphism from S. The information lost in sheafification is precisely the quantum information (superposition, entanglement) that is not expressible classically.*

This proposition suggests that the sheaf-presheaf distinction is the categorical manifestation of the quantum-classical divide, with the Grothendieck topology determining where the divide falls.

2.4 Higher-Categorical Structure

A natural extension is to replace $\mathscr{C}$ with a *higher category*—an (∞, n)-category in which morphisms between morphisms, and higher morphisms, carry physical content.

Open Problem 2.4 (Higher Categories and QFT)**.** Does the quantum perspectivism framework extend to an $(\infty, 1)$-categorical setting, and if so, does the extended Yoneda lemma for ∞-categories yield quantum field theory rather than quantum mechanics?

The extended Yoneda lemma, proved by Lurie [4], states that for an $(\infty, 1)$-category $\mathscr{C}$, the Yoneda embedding $\mathsf{y} : \mathscr{C} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Fun}(\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathcal{S})$ into the ∞-category of ∞-presheaves (with values in the ∞-category $\mathcal{S}$ of spaces) is fully faithful. If the objects of $\mathscr{C}$ are spacetime regions and the morphisms encode both spatial and temporal relations, then the higher morphisms may encode gauge transformations, and the resulting presheaves may yield the full structure of gauge quantum field theories.

Conjecture 2.6 ($(\infty, 1)$-Perspectivism Yields QFT)**.** *Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the $(\infty, 1)$-category whose objects are oriented cobordisms between $(d-1)$-manifolds and whose morphisms are cobordisms between cobordisms (up to homotopy). The Yoneda constraint applied in this setting yields a functorial quantum field theory in the sense of Atiyah–Segal, with the cobordism hypothesis of Baez–Dolan–Lurie providing the classification of fully extended TQFTs.*

This conjecture connects quantum perspectivism to the most active area of modern mathematical physics: the classification of topological quantum field theories via the cobordism hypothesis [5].

2.5 Dagger-Compact Structure

The category **fHilb** of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces is a *dagger-compact category*—a monoidal category with a contravariant involutive functor † and compact closure. This structure is central to categorical quantum mechanics [6].

Open Problem 2.5 (Dagger-Compact Contexts)**.** Is the dagger-compact structure of $\mathscr{C}$ *derived* from the Yoneda Constraint, or must it be imposed as an additional axiom? Specifically:

(a) Does the perspectival consistency condition (which yields the inner product) automatically generate a dagger structure on $\mathscr{C}$?

(b) Is compact closure a consequence of the finite-dimensionality of physical Hilbert spaces, or does it encode independent physical content?

(c) What is the physical meaning of the dagger functor in the context of observational perspectives?

We conjecture that the dagger structure arises from the *time-reversal symmetry* of the perspectival pairing: the ability to "reverse" the direction of a morphism $f : C \to C'$ corresponds physically to the ability to "view C' from the perspective of C" as well as "view C from the perspective of C'."

3 Quantitative Predictions: Toward the Standard Model

The most ambitious goal of quantum perspectivism is to derive not just the *form* of quantum mechanics but its specific *content*—including the Standard Model gauge group, the particle spectrum, and the values of coupling constants.

3.1 The Gauge Group from Automorphisms of $\mathscr{C}$

In the Yoneda framework, symmetries of the physical theory correspond to automorphisms of the category $\mathscr{C}$. The gauge group should emerge as the group of natural automorphisms of the identity functor on $\mathscr{C}$, restricted to physically relevant subcategories.

Proposition 3.1 (Gauge Group as Automorphism Group)**.** *Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the category of contexts and let $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{C}})$ denote the group of natural automorphisms of the identity functor $\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{C}} : \mathscr{C} \to \mathscr{C}$. For presheaves S on $\mathscr{C}$ with Hilbert space fibers, the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{C}})$ on S yields the gauge transformations of S.*

Open Problem 3.1 (Deriving $\mathrm{SU}(3)\times\mathrm{SU}(2)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$)**.** Find a category $\mathscr{C}$ of physical contexts whose automorphism structure yields the Standard Model gauge group $\mathrm{SU}(3) \times \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$. Specifically:

(a) What categorical structure of $\mathscr{C}$ forces the decomposition into a product of simple and abelian factors?

(b) What determines the specific ranks (3, 2, 1)?

(c) How do the representations (quarks, leptons, Higgs) emerge from the presheaf structure?

3.2 Toy Example: U(1) from a Cyclic Category

To illustrate the gauge-from-automorphisms mechanism, we present a toy example.

Example 3.2 (U(1) Gauge Symmetry from $B\mathbb{Z}$)**.** Let $\mathscr{C} = B\mathbb{Z}$ be the category with a single object $*$ and morphisms $\mathrm{Hom}(*, *) = \mathbb{Z}$ (the integers under addition). This is the "delooping" of the group $\mathbb{Z}$. A presheaf $S : B\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is simply a set $S(*)$ equipped with a $\mathbb{Z}$-action—i.e., an action of the group $\mathbb{Z}$.

The group of natural automorphisms of the identity functor is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{id}_{B\mathbb{Z}}) = Z(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$, the center of $\mathbb{Z}$. For presheaves with Hilbert space fibers (representations of $\mathbb{Z}$ on $\mathbb{C}$), the irreducible representations are the characters $\chi_\theta : n \mapsto e^{in\theta}$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. The parameter space $[0, 2\pi) \cong \mathrm{U}(1)$.

Thus, the "gauge group" associated with $B\mathbb{Z}$ is U(1), and the "particle spectrum" consists of states labeled by $\theta \in \mathrm{U}(1)$—exactly the structure of electromagnetism, where θ is the phase of a charged particle.

This example demonstrates the mechanism: the category determines the gauge group through its automorphism structure. Obtaining $\mathrm{SU}(3) \times \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ would require a category whose automorphism group has this product structure—a nontrivial constraint that might ultimately determine $\mathscr{C}$.

3.3 A Categorical Approach to Particle Content

The particle content of a quantum field theory corresponds to the irreducible representations of the symmetry group. In the Yoneda framework, particles are *irreducible presheaves*—presheaves that cannot be decomposed as nontrivial subobject unions.

Definition 3.3 (Irreducible Presheaf)**.** A presheaf S on $\mathscr{C}$ is **irreducible** if it has no proper nontrivial subobjects in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ that are preserved by the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{C}})$.

Open Problem 3.2 (Particle Spectrum from Presheaf Decomposition)**.** Classify the irreducible presheaves on $\mathscr{C}$ for the physically relevant category. Does this classification reproduce the three generations of fermions, the gauge bosons, and the Higgs field?

The three-generation structure of the Standard Model is one of its deepest unexplained features. A categorical explanation might come from a *triality* in the structure of $\mathscr{C}$—for instance, if $\mathscr{C}$ has three distinct but isomorphic connected components, or if the monoidal product has a $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ grading.

3.4 Coupling Constants and the Presheaf Metric

The coupling constants of the Standard Model are dimensionless numbers whose values appear to require fine-tuning. In quantum perspectivism, these constants should emerge from the *geometry* of the presheaf category.

Open Problem 3.3 (Coupling Constants from Categorical Geometry)**.** Define a natural metric on the category of presheaves on $\mathscr{C}$ (e.g., using the Yoneda metric induced by the inner product structure). Do the coupling constants of the Standard Model emerge as geometric invariants of this metric?

Definition 3.4 (Yoneda Metric)**.** For presheaves S, T on $\mathscr{C}$ with Hilbert space fibers, define the **Yoneda distance**:

$$d_{\mathsf{y}}(S,T) = \sup_{C\in\mathscr{C}} \inf \{\epsilon > 0 : \|S(C) - T(C)\|_{\mathcal{H}_C} < \epsilon\}\,. \quad (1)$$

The Yoneda metric provides a natural notion of "distance" between physical systems. Coupling constants might be identified with distances between certain canonical presheaves—for instance, the distance between the presheaf representing the electromagnetic field and the presheaf representing the weak field might encode the Weinberg angle.

3.5 Renormalization as Presheaf Refinement

Renormalization—the process of systematically eliminating ultraviolet divergences—has a natural categorical formulation.

Open Problem 3.4 (Categorical Renormalization Group)**.** Formulate the renormalization group as a functor between categories of contexts at different scales. Specifically:

(a) Let $\mathscr{C}_\Lambda$ denote the category of contexts accessible at energy scale Λ. Is there a natural inclusion functor $i_{\Lambda'\Lambda} : \mathscr{C}_{\Lambda'} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{C}_\Lambda$ for $\Lambda' < \Lambda$?

(b) Is the renormalization group flow the pullback of presheaves along $i_{\Lambda'\Lambda}$?

(c) Do fixed points of the RG flow correspond to sheaves with respect to a suitable Grothendieck topology?

This formulation would connect the renormalization group to the sheafification functor of Theorem 2.5, with RG fixed points being "scale-invariant" sheaves.

4 The Classical Limit

The recovery of classical mechanics from quantum mechanics is one of the most important consistency checks for any foundational framework. In quantum perspectivism, the classical limit involves a systematic coarse-graining of the category of contexts.

4.1 Decoherence as Categorical Coarse-Graining

The mechanism described in [1] identifies decoherence with the restriction of presheaves along a subcategory inclusion $i : \mathscr{C}_{\text{macro}} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{C}$.

Definition 4.1 (Macroscopic Subcategory)**.** The **macroscopic subcategory** $\mathscr{C}_{\text{macro}}$ is the full subcategory of $\mathscr{C}$ consisting of contexts C such that:

(a) The Hilbert space fiber $\mathcal{H}_C$ has dimension exceeding a threshold N_{dec} (the decoherence dimension).

(b) The context C involves interaction with an environment containing at least N_{env} degrees of freedom.

(c) The timescale associated with C exceeds the decoherence timescale τ_{dec}.

Theorem 4.2 (Decoherence from Presheaf Restriction)**.** *Let S be a presheaf on $\mathscr{C}$ representing a quantum system, and let ρ be the density operator on $\mathcal{H}_C$ corresponding to the state of S at context C. The restriction i^*S to $\mathscr{C}_{\text{macro}}$ yields a presheaf whose fibers are diagonal density matrices:*

$$i^*S(C_{\text{macro}}) \cong \left\{\rho_{\text{macro}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C_{\text{macro}}}) : \rho_{\text{macro}} = \sum_k p_k |k\rangle\langle k|\right\}, \tag{2}$$

where $\{|k\rangle\}$ is the pointer basis determined by the environment-system interaction, and p_k are classical probabilities.

Proof sketch. The restriction functor i^* acts on the density operator ρ by tracing over the environmental degrees of freedom that are "invisible" from the macroscopic contexts. The Hilbert space decomposes as $\mathcal{H}_C = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$, and the partial trace $\text{Tr}_E(\rho)$ eliminates the off-diagonal terms in the pointer basis on a timescale $\tau_{\text{dec}} \sim (n_E\gamma)^{-1}$, where n_E is the number of environmental modes and γ is the system-environment coupling strength. The categorical mechanism is the failure of i^* to preserve the colimits (superpositions) of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}_{\text{macro}}}$. □

4.2 The Ehrenfest Theorem Categorically

The Ehrenfest theorem states that the expectation values of quantum observables satisfy the classical equations of motion in the limit $\hbar \to 0$.

Open Problem 4.1 (Categorical Ehrenfest Theorem)**.** Derive the Ehrenfest theorem as a natural transformation between the quantum presheaf and a "classical limit" presheaf. Specifically:

(a) Define a "classicalization" functor $\text{Cl} : \widehat{\mathscr{C}} \to \widehat{\mathscr{C}_{\text{cl}}}$ from quantum presheaves to classical presheaves (presheaves on a classical category of contexts $\mathscr{C}_{\text{cl}}$).

(b) Show that Cl preserves the expectation-value pairing: for an observable α and state ψ,

$$\text{Cl}\left(\langle\psi|\alpha|\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_C}\right) = \alpha_{\text{cl}}(q, p) \tag{3}$$

where (q, p) are phase space coordinates and α_{cl} is the classical observable.

(c) Show that Cl intertwines the quantum dynamics (natural automorphisms) with classical Hamiltonian flow.

4.3 Phase Space as a Sheaf

Classical phase space has a natural sheaf-theoretic description.

Proposition 4.3 (Phase Space Presheaf)**.** *Let $\mathscr{C}_{\text{cl}}$ be the category whose objects are open subsets of a symplectic manifold (M, ω) and whose morphisms are symplectomorphism-compatible inclusions. The presheaf $\mathcal{O} : \mathscr{C}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{op}} \to$ **Set** assigning to each open set U its ring of smooth functions $C^\infty(U)$ is a sheaf. The Poisson bracket on $C^\infty(U)$ makes $\mathcal{O}$ into a sheaf of Poisson algebras.*

Open Problem 4.2 (Quantization as Presheaf Extension). Is quantization—the passage from classical to quantum mechanics—the *adjoint* of the classicalization functor Cl? That is, does there exist a functor $\mathrm{Qu} : \widehat{\mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{cl}}} \to \widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ that is left adjoint to Cl, with the adjunction unit providing the semiclassical approximation?

If such an adjunction exists, it would provide a canonical quantization procedure derived from the Yoneda framework, resolving longstanding ambiguities in quantization (such as operator ordering).

4.4 WKB Approximation and Stationary Phase

The WKB approximation provides the leading-order semiclassical behavior of wave functions.

Proposition 4.4 (WKB as Sheaf Cohomology). *The WKB wave function $\psi_{\mathrm{WKB}}(x) = A(x)e^{iS(x)/\hbar}$ can be interpreted as a section of a flat line bundle over configuration space. The Bohr–Sommerfeld quantization condition $\oint p\,dq = (n + 1/2)\hbar$ is a cohomological condition: the first Chern class of the line bundle must be an integer.*

Open Problem 4.3 (Categorical WKB). Formulate the WKB approximation in the presheaf language. Is the WKB wave function a "nearly sheaf-like" section of the quantum presheaf S—one that satisfies the gluing condition approximately, with corrections of order $\hbar$?

4.5 Deformation Quantization and Presheaves

Deformation quantization replaces the pointwise product of functions on phase space with a star product $\star_\hbar$ that reduces to the ordinary product as $\hbar \to 0$.

Open Problem 4.4 (Star Product from Yoneda). Derive the Moyal star product (or its generalization) from the Yoneda framework. The star product should emerge from the composition law in the presheaf category:

$$(f \star_\hbar g)(C) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(i\hbar)^n}{n!} B_n(f, g)(C) \tag{4}$$

where B_n are bidifferential operators determined by the categorical structure of $\mathscr{C}$.

5 Quantum Gravity

Quantum gravity is the most exciting potential application of quantum perspectivism. The framework offers a natural path to emergent spacetime, and its categorical language interfaces naturally with multiple approaches to quantum gravity.

5.1 Emergent Spacetime: Detailed Construction

The proposal in [1] is that spacetime emerges from the Grothendieck topology on the category of quantum contexts. We now develop this in greater detail.

Definition 5.1 (Geometric Realization of $\mathscr{C}$)**.** The **geometric realization** of a category $\mathscr{C}$ is the topological space $|\mathscr{C}|$ obtained by the nerve construction:

$$|\mathscr{C}| = |N(\mathscr{C})| = \left|\left(\cdots \coprod_{f,g} C'' \rightrightarrows \coprod_{f} C' \rightrightarrows \coprod C\right)\right| \tag{5}$$

where $N(\mathscr{C})$ is the nerve (simplicial set) of $\mathscr{C}$, and $|-|$ is the geometric realization functor from simplicial sets to topological spaces.

Open Problem 5.1 (Spacetime from the Nerve of $\mathscr{C}$)**.** Under what conditions on $\mathscr{C}$ is the geometric realization $|\mathscr{C}|$ a manifold? Specifically:

(a) What finiteness conditions on morphism sets ensure that $|\mathscr{C}|$ is a finite-dimensional manifold?

(b) What connectivity conditions ensure that $|\mathscr{C}|$ is a connected 4-manifold?

(c) Does the Grothendieck topology J on $\mathscr{C}$ determine a smooth structure on $|\mathscr{C}|$?

(d) Can the Lorentzian metric on $|\mathscr{C}|$ be recovered from the morphism structure of $\mathscr{C}$?

5.2 Einstein's Equations from Presheaf Dynamics

The most ambitious conjecture in the quantum perspectivism program concerns the derivation of Einstein's field equations.

Conjecture 5.2 (Einstein's Equations from $\mathscr{C}$)**.** *The Einstein field equations $G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$ emerge from the requirement that the Grothendieck topology J on $\mathscr{C}$ be* self-consistent*: the energy-momentum content of the presheaves (encoded in $T_{\mu\nu}$) determines the topology J (which encodes the geometry $G_{\mu\nu}$), and this topology in turn constrains the presheaves.*

Open Problem 5.2 (Deriving Einstein's Equations)**.** Make Theorem 5.2 precise and prove it. This requires:

(a) A definition of "energy-momentum content" of a presheaf in terms of its sections and natural transformations.

(b) A definition of "curvature" of a Grothendieck topology in terms of the failure of local-to-global extension.

(c) A variational principle on the space of Grothendieck topologies, analogous to the Einstein–Hilbert action.

(d) A proof that the Euler–Lagrange equations of this variational principle are Einstein's equations.

5.3 Connections to Loop Quantum Gravity

Loop quantum gravity (LQG) [13, 14] quantizes general relativity by promoting the holonomy-flux algebra of Ashtekar variables to an operator algebra. The kinematical Hilbert space is spanned by *spin networks*—graphs with edges labeled by SU(2) representations.

Proposition 5.3 (Spin Networks as Presheaves)**.** *A spin network* Γ *with edges labeled by* SU(2) *representations* j_e *and vertices labeled by intertwiners* ι_v *can be viewed as a presheaf on the category* $\mathscr{C}_\Gamma$ *whose objects are subgraphs of* Γ *and whose morphisms are subgraph inclusions. The presheaf assigns to each subgraph* $\gamma \subseteq \Gamma$ *the Hilbert space:*

$$S(\gamma) = \bigotimes_{e \in \gamma} V_{j_e} \otimes \bigotimes_{v \in \partial\gamma} \mathcal{H}_{\iota_v} \tag{6}$$

where V_{j_e} *is the* $(2j_e + 1)$*-dimensional representation space and* $\mathcal{H}_{\iota_v}$ *is the intertwiner space at vertex* v*.*

Open Problem 5.3 (LQG as Quantum Perspectivism)**.** Is the full kinematical Hilbert space of LQG equivalent to the category of presheaves on a suitable category of "spatial contexts" (spin networks and their refinements)? If so:

(a) What is the Grothendieck topology that encodes the Hamiltonian constraint?

(b) Do the dynamics of LQG (spin foam amplitudes) emerge as natural transformations in the presheaf category?

(c) Can the Barbero–Immirzi parameter be derived from the categorical structure?

5.4 Connections to String Theory

String theory provides another perspective on quantum gravity. The worldsheet description of a string propagating in a target space has a natural categorical formulation.

Open Problem 5.4 (Strings from Presheaves)**.** Formulate string theory in the Yoneda-perspectival framework. Key questions:

(a) Is the worldsheet sigma model a presheaf on a category of local charts on the worldsheet?

(b) Do the Virasoro constraints emerge from a Grothendieck topology condition?

(c) Can the critical dimension $d = 26$ (bosonic) or $d = 10$ (superstring) be derived from categorical conditions on $\mathscr{C}$?

(d) Is the AdS/CFT correspondence a manifestation of the Yoneda embedding, with the bulk CFT being the representable presheaf and the boundary theory being the full presheaf?

The last point is particularly intriguing. The holographic principle, as noted in [1], has a natural Yoneda-theoretic interpretation: the Yoneda Lemma states that all information about an object is encoded in its "boundary data" (the morphisms from external probes). The AdS/CFT correspondence [28] implements this principle concretely, suggesting that it may be a *theorem* of the Yoneda framework rather than a conjecture.

5.5 Causal Set Theory

Causal set theory [24, 25] proposes that spacetime is fundamentally discrete, with the causal structure encoded in a partially ordered set (poset).

Proposition 5.4 (Causal Sets as Categories). *A causal set* $(C, \preceq)$ *is a thin category (a category in which there is at most one morphism between any two objects). The objects are spacetime events and the morphisms encode causal relations:* $x \to y$ *if and only if* $x \preceq y$*. Presheaves on this category assign data to spacetime events in a causally consistent manner.*

Open Problem 5.5 (Causal Set Quantum Gravity from Yoneda). Can the quantum dynamics of causal set theory (the Rideout–Sorkin sequential growth model) be derived from the Yoneda Constraint applied to presheaves on a causal set category? Specifically:

(a) Is the "Bell causality" condition of Rideout–Sorkin equivalent to a naturality condition on presheaves?

(b) Can the cosmological constant prediction of causal set theory be recovered in the Yoneda framework?

(c) Does the Yoneda framework resolve the "problem of time" that plagues canonical quantum gravity?

5.6 Asymptotic Safety

The asymptotic safety program [26, 27] proposes that quantum gravity is nonperturbatively renormalizable, with a nontrivial ultraviolet fixed point of the gravitational renormalization group flow.

Open Problem 5.6 (Asymptotic Safety and the Presheaf RG). In the categorical renormalization group of Open Problem 3.4, does the gravitational sector exhibit a nontrivial ultraviolet fixed point? If the RG flow is a functor between categories of contexts at different scales, the fixed point would be a category $\mathscr{C}_*$ that is invariant under the scaling functor—a "self-similar" category of contexts.

5.7 The Problem of Time

The "problem of time" in quantum gravity—the conflict between the timelessness of the Wheeler–DeWitt equation and the manifest time-dependence of our experience—has a natural resolution in quantum perspectivism.

Proposition 5.5 (Resolution of the Problem of Time). *In quantum perspectivism, time is neither fundamental nor emergent in the usual sense. Rather, time is an* aspect of the perspectival structure*: the morphisms of* $\mathscr{C}$ *include temporal refinements (morphisms that relate a context at one time to a context at another time), and the "flow of time" is the restriction of the presheaf along these morphisms. The Wheeler–DeWitt equation* $\hat{H}|\Psi\rangle = 0$ *is the statement that the* global *presheaf is time-independent, while the* local *sections (perspectives) exhibit time-dependence.*

6 Experimental Signatures

A physical theory must make testable predictions. While quantum perspectivism agrees with standard quantum mechanics in all currently tested regimes, it suggests specific experiments where deviations might appear and where interpretational questions become empirically accessible.

6.1 Extended Bell Inequality Tests

Bell's theorem [18] shows that no local hidden variable theory can reproduce all quantum predictions. Quantum perspectivism provides a categorical framework for understanding Bell nonlocality and suggests extensions.

Open Problem 6.1 (Categorical Bell Inequalities)**.** Derive the full landscape of Bell-type inequalities from the presheaf framework. Specifically:

(a) Characterize the "Bell polytope" (the set of correlations achievable by local hidden variable models) as the set of separable presheaves on a product category.

(b) Characterize the "quantum set" (the set of quantum correlations) as the set of all presheaves satisfying the Yoneda constraint.

(c) Determine whether the quantum set is strictly smaller than the "no-signaling polytope" (the set of all no-signaling correlations), and if so, identify the categorical principle that enforces this.

(d) Design experiments to probe the boundary of the quantum set, particularly in multi-party scenarios where quantum perspectivism might predict different correlations than alternative frameworks.

The *Tsirelson bound* $2\sqrt{2}$ on the CHSH inequality is the quantum maximum. In the Yoneda framework, this bound should emerge from the categorical structure of the presheaf category.

Conjecture 6.1 (Tsirelson Bound from Yoneda)**.** *The Tsirelson bound* $\langle \mathrm{CHSH} \rangle \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ *is equivalent to the requirement that the bipartite correlation presheaf on* $\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}$ *factors through the Yoneda embedding of* $\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}$ *into* $\widehat{\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}}$*. The algebraic maximum* 4 *would require "super-quantum" presheaves that violate the Yoneda constraint.*

6.2 Leggett–Garg Inequalities

Leggett–Garg inequalities [19] test the assumption of macroscopic realism: the idea that a macroscopic system is always in one of its available states, and measurement reveals (rather than creates) this state.

Proposition 6.2 (Leggett–Garg from Presheaf Non-Contextuality)**.** *Violations of Leggett–Garg inequalities are a direct consequence of the failure of the presheaf* S *to be a sheaf with respect to the temporal Grothendieck topology. A system that satisfies macroscopic realism is one whose presheaf is a sheaf (local sections always glue to global sections), while a quantum system has a presheaf that fails the sheaf condition.*

Open Problem 6.2 (Modified Leggett–Garg Inequalities)**.** Quantum perspectivism predicts a specific pattern of Leggett–Garg inequality violations determined by the structure of $\mathscr{C}$. Design experiments to:

(a) Measure Leggett–Garg inequalities in mesoscopic systems (SQUIDs, nanomechanical oscillators) where the quantum-to-classical transition is accessible.

(b) Compare the observed violation pattern with the predictions of quantum perspectivism, objective collapse models, and decoherence-based approaches.

(c) Test whether the Leggett–Garg violation decreases as the system size increases in a manner consistent with the presheaf restriction to $\mathscr{C}_{\text{macro}}$.

6.3 Multi-Observer Wigner's Friend Scenarios

The Wigner's friend thought experiment, extended by Brukner [20] and Frauchiger–Renner [21], probes the consistency of quantum mechanics applied to observers.

Proposition 6.3 (Wigner's Friend as Perspectival Conflict)**.** *In quantum perspectivism, the Wigner's friend scenario is a situation where two contexts C_{friend} (the friend's laboratory) and C_{Wigner} (Wigner's external perspective) access different sections of the same presheaf S. There is no inconsistency because the presheaf is the complete physical reality, and different perspectives yield different but mutually consistent data.*

Open Problem 6.3 (Extended Wigner's Friend Experiments)**.** Design and perform extended Wigner's friend experiments that can distinguish between:

(a) Quantum perspectivism: all perspectives are equally valid; the presheaf is the reality.

(b) Collapse models: the friend's measurement causes an objective collapse.

(c) Many-worlds: all branches are equally real.

(d) QBism: the friend's state assignment is subjective.

The key experimental signature would be a violation of "observer-independence"—the assumption that facts established by one observer must be accepted by all observers. The Frauchiger–Renner protocol, implemented with photonic or superconducting systems, could provide the first empirical test.

6.4 Quantum Gravity Phenomenology

Open Problem 6.4 (Gravitational Decoherence)**.** The emergent spacetime construction of quantum perspectivism predicts that the curvature of the Grothendieck topology induces decoherence. This "gravitational decoherence" should be detectable in:

(a) **Optomechanical systems:** A massive oscillator in a spatial superposition should decohere at a rate $\Gamma_{\text{grav}} \sim Gm^2/(\hbar\Delta x)$, where m is the mass, Δx is the superposition distance, and G is Newton's constant.

(b) **Atom interferometry:** Long-baseline atom interferometers (e.g., MAGIS-100, AION) could detect gravitational decoherence for atoms in superposition over macroscopic distances.

(c) **Entanglement between masses:** The Bose–Marletto–Vedral experiment [22, 23] proposes to detect gravitationally induced entanglement between two masses. In quantum perspectivism, this entanglement arises because the gravitational field is itself a presheaf on $\mathscr{C}$, and the joint state of the two masses is a non-separable presheaf on $\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}$.

6.5 Contextuality Tests

The Kochen–Specker theorem establishes that quantum mechanics is contextual: measurement outcomes depend on the full measurement context, not just the individual observable. This is a direct consequence of the presheaf structure.

Open Problem 6.5 (Quantitative Contextuality Measures)**.** Develop quantitative measures of contextuality derived from the presheaf framework, and design experiments to measure them:

(a) Define a "contextuality witness" as a functional on presheaves that vanishes for sheaves and is positive for non-sheaf presheaves.

(b) Relate this witness to the Čech cohomology of the presheaf with respect to the Grothendieck topology.

(c) Design experiments that measure the contextuality witness in multi-qubit systems, comparing with the predictions of the sheaf-theoretic framework of Abramsky and Brandenburger [7].

7 Quantum Computing Implications

Quantum perspectivism has natural implications for quantum computing, connecting the categorical framework to quantum algorithms, error correction, and topological quantum computation.

7.1 Categorical Quantum Computing

The categorical quantum mechanics program of Abramsky and Coecke [6] provides a compositional framework for quantum computation using dagger-compact categories and string diagrams (the ZX-calculus).

Open Problem 7.1 (Quantum Algorithms from Presheaf Operations)**.** Can quantum algorithms be expressed as operations on presheaves? Specifically:

(a) Is Grover's search algorithm a morphism in the presheaf category that exploits the non-sheaf character of the search space?

(b) Is Shor's factoring algorithm related to the arithmetic structure of the presheaf category (specifically, to the relationship between additive and multiplicative structures)?

(c) Can new quantum algorithms be discovered by identifying natural operations in the presheaf category that have no classical analogue?

7.2 The ZX-Calculus and Presheaves

The ZX-calculus [8] is a graphical calculus for quantum computation based on the interplay between two complementary bases (the Z and X bases of a qubit).

Proposition 7.1 (ZX-Calculus from Complementary Presheaves)**.** *In the Yoneda framework, the Z and X bases correspond to two complementary contexts C_Z and C_X whose representable presheaves $\mathsf{y}(C_Z)$ and $\mathsf{y}(C_X)$ generate a non-commutative substructure of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$. The ZX-calculus rules (spider fusion, bialgebra law, etc.) are consequences of the naturality conditions on morphisms between these presheaves.*

Open Problem 7.2 (Universal ZX from Yoneda)**.** Derive the completeness of the ZX-calculus from the Yoneda framework. The ZX-calculus is known to be complete for qubit quantum mechanics [9]. Can this completeness be understood as a consequence of the Yoneda embedding's full faithfulness, applied to the category generated by C_Z and C_X?

7.3 Topological Quantum Computation

Topological quantum computation [30, 31] encodes quantum information in the topological properties of anyonic systems, providing natural protection against local errors.

Open Problem 7.3 (Topological Quantum Codes from Presheaf Cohomology)**.** Topological quantum error-correcting codes (toric code, surface code, color code) can be formulated as presheaves on categories of lattice patches. Can the code distance, logical operators, and error thresholds be computed from the cohomology of these presheaves?

(a) Is the code distance related to the dimension of a cohomology group of the presheaf?

(b) Are logical operators natural transformations of the code presheaf?

(c) Can the error threshold be expressed in terms of the presheaf's obstruction to sheafification?

Proposition 7.2 (Toric Code as Presheaf)**.** *The toric code on a lattice Λ embedded in a torus T^2 can be described as a presheaf on the category $\mathscr{C}_\Lambda$ whose objects are connected sublattices and whose morphisms are inclusions. The presheaf assigns to each sublattice λ the stabilizer subspace:*

$$S(\lambda) = \{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda : A_v|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle,\ B_p|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle\ \forall v, p \in \lambda\} \tag{7}$$

where A_v and B_p are the vertex and plaquette stabilizers. The code space is the global section space $\Gamma(S) = \varprojlim S$.

7.4 Quantum Error Correction as Sheaf Condition

Open Problem 7.4 (QEC from Sheaf Theory)**.** Is quantum error correction equivalent to the sheaf condition for a suitable Grothendieck topology? The idea is that:

(a) The "noise topology" J_{noise} on the category of physical qubits specifies which subsets of qubits can be simultaneously affected by errors.

(b) A quantum error-correcting code is a presheaf that is a sheaf with respect to J_{noise}: locally corrupted data (sections over noisy patches) can be uniquely glued to recover the global codeword.

(c) The Knill–Laflamme error correction conditions [32] are equivalent to the sheaf gluing axiom.

8 Information-Theoretic Foundations

Quantum information theory provides some of the deepest insights into quantum mechanics. The Yoneda framework offers a new perspective on quantum information, connecting categorical structure to entropic quantities, channel capacities, and resource theories.

8.1 Quantum Entropy from the Yoneda Isomorphism

Open Problem 8.1 (Categorical Von Neumann Entropy)**.** Derive the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho) = -\operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ from the Yoneda framework. Possible approaches:

(a) **Counting natural transformations:** The entropy of a state ρ at context C should be related to the "size" of the set $\operatorname{Nat}(\mathsf{y}(C), S)$—the number of distinct ways to probe the system from context C.

(b) **Sheaf cohomology:** The entropy might be related to the Euler characteristic of the presheaf S, defined via the alternating sum of cohomology dimensions:

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \dim H^n(\mathscr{C}, S). \tag{8}$$

(c) **Relative entropy:** The quantum relative entropy $S(\rho\|\sigma) = \operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \rho - \rho \log \sigma)$ should be the "categorical distance" between two presheaves, related to the Yoneda metric.

8.2 Quantum Channels as Natural Transformations

A quantum channel is a completely positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map between density operators. In the Yoneda framework:

Proposition 8.1 (Channels as Natural Transformations)**.** *A quantum channel $\Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{C'})$ corresponds to a natural transformation $\Phi : S_C \Rightarrow S_{C'}$ between the presheaves representing the input and output systems. The CPTP conditions are:*

(a) ***Complete positivity:*** *The natural transformation preserves the positivity cone of each fiber.*

(b) ***Trace preservation:*** *The natural transformation commutes with the "discarding" morphism to the terminal presheaf.*

Open Problem 8.2 (Channel Capacity from Presheaf Theory)**.** Derive the quantum channel capacity (Holevo–Schumacher–Westmoreland theorem) from the presheaf framework. The capacity should emerge as a categorical invariant of the natural transformation representing the channel:

$$C(\Phi) = \max_{\{p_i,\rho_i\}} \left[S\left(\sum_i p_i \Phi(\rho_i) \right) - \sum_i p_i S(\Phi(\rho_i)) \right] \tag{9}$$

8.3 Quantum Resource Theories

Resource theories [33] provide a unified framework for studying quantum properties as resources: entanglement, coherence, magic (non-stabilizerness), and asymmetry are all resources with free states, free operations, and monotones.

Open Problem 8.3 (Resource Theories from Presheaf Subcategories)**.** Formulate quantum resource theories in the Yoneda framework:

(a) The "free states" of a resource theory correspond to sheaves (with respect to a topology determined by the resource).

(b) The "resourceful states" are non-sheaf presheaves.

(c) The "free operations" are natural transformations that preserve the sheaf condition.

(d) The resource monotones are functorial invariants that decrease under free operations.

This formulation would unify all quantum resource theories under a single categorical umbrella, with the specific resource determined by the choice of Grothendieck topology.

8.4 Holographic Entropy and the Yoneda Lemma

The Ryu–Takayanagi formula [29] relates the entanglement entropy of a boundary region A in AdS/CFT to the area of the minimal surface γ_A in the bulk:

$$S(A) = \frac{\text{Area}(\gamma_A)}{4G_N}. \tag{10}$$

Open Problem 8.4 (Ryu–Takayanagi from Yoneda)**.** Derive the Ryu–Takayanagi formula from the Yoneda-perspectival framework. The proposal:

(a) The boundary region A is an object in the category $\mathscr{C}_\partial$ of boundary contexts.

(b) The bulk region bounded by A and γ_A is the "representable presheaf" $\mathsf{y}(A)$, whose "size" (area of the minimal surface) measures the relational complexity of A.

(c) The entropy $S(A)$ is the "categorical dimension" of the Hom-set $\text{Hom}(\mathsf{y}(A), S)$, where S is the bulk presheaf.

8.5 Quantum Darwinism and Redundant Encoding

Quantum Darwinism [35] explains the emergence of classical objectivity through the redundant encoding of information about a quantum system in multiple environmental fragments.

Proposition 8.2 (Quantum Darwinism as Presheaf Redundancy)**.** *In the Yoneda framework, quantum Darwinism is the statement that for macroscopic systems, the presheaf S is "locally constant": the sections $S(C)$ are approximately the same for all macroscopic contexts C in a neighborhood. This redundancy is precisely the sheaf condition for the macroscopic topology.*

9 Mathematical Infrastructure

The research program outlined above requires significant development of mathematical tools. We identify the key areas where new mathematics is needed.

9.1 Presheaf Cohomology for Physical Categories

Open Problem 9.1 (Physical Presheaf Cohomology)**.** Develop the cohomology theory of presheaves on physically relevant categories $\mathscr{C}$. Key questions:

(a) What are the cohomology groups $H^n(\mathscr{C}, S)$ for the presheaf S representing a quantum system?

(b) Is $H^0(\mathscr{C}, S)$ the space of "globally consistent" classical data (the classical limit)?

(c) Is $H^1(\mathscr{C}, S)$ the space of "quantum obstructions"—data that is locally consistent but fails to globalize?

(d) Are higher cohomology groups related to higher-order quantum effects (entanglement, contextuality)?

9.2 Derived Categories and Homological Algebra

The derived category $D(\widehat{\mathscr{C}})$ of the presheaf topos provides a more refined invariant than the presheaf category itself.

Open Problem 9.2 (Derived Quantum Mechanics)**.** Formulate quantum mechanics in the derived category $D(\widehat{\mathscr{C}})$. In this setting:

(a) Physical states are objects of $D(\widehat{\mathscr{C}})$ (chain complexes of presheaves up to quasi-isomorphism).

(b) Observables are morphisms in $D(\widehat{\mathscr{C}})$.

(c) The Born rule involves the Euler characteristic of the RHom complex.

(d) Gauge equivalence is quasi-isomorphism.

9.3 Topos-Theoretic Logic

Open Problem 9.3 (Quantum Logic Completeness)**.** Is the internal logic of the presheaf topos $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ the "correct" logic for quantum mechanics? Specifically:

(a) Is the subobject classifier Ω of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ isomorphic to the lattice of quantum propositions as defined by Birkhoff and von Neumann?

(b) Does the internal logic validate the "quantum logical" rules (failure of distributivity, orthomodularity)?

(c) Can the Kochen–Specker theorem be proved purely from the topos-theoretic properties of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$, without reference to Hilbert spaces?

9.4 Homotopy Type Theory and Quantum Perspectivism

Homotopy type theory (HoTT) [38] provides a foundational framework in which types are interpreted as spaces and equalities as paths.

Open Problem 9.4 (HoTT Formulation of Quantum Perspectivism)**.** Formulate quantum perspectivism in the language of homotopy type theory. The Yoneda Lemma has a natural HoTT formulation, and the presheaf condition is a type-theoretic proposition. Key advantages:

(a) HoTT provides a constructive foundation, potentially enabling computer-verified proofs.

(b) The univalence axiom ("equivalent types are equal") encodes the relational character of identity.

(c) Higher inductive types provide a natural language for quantum superposition.

10 Ten-Year Research Roadmap

We propose a structured ten-year research program organized into three phases: Foundations (Years 1–3), Development (Years 4–7), and Applications (Years 8–10).

10.1 Phase I: Foundations (Years 1–3)

Year 1: Mathematical Foundations.

- Classify categories $\mathscr{C}$ satisfying conditions (C1)–(C4) from Section 2.
- Develop presheaf cohomology for the simplest physical categories (finite-dimensional **fHilb**, qubit categories).
- Formalize the decoherence theorem (Theorem 4.2) with rigorous bounds on decoherence timescales.
- Implement computational tools for presheaf calculations in Haskell/Agda.
- **Milestone:** Proof that **fHilb** is the minimal category satisfying (C1)–(C4), or a counterexample.

Year 2: Connections to Existing Programs.

- Establish precise categorical dictionaries between quantum perspectivism and: (a) categorical quantum mechanics (CQM), (b) topos quantum theory (Döring–Isham), (c) operational probabilistic theories (Chiribella–D'Ariano–Perinotti).
- Prove the categorical Ehrenfest theorem (Open Problem 4.1).
- Formulate the quantization-classicalization adjunction (Open Problem 4.2).
- Begin development of the categorical renormalization group (Open Problem 3.4).
- **Milestone:** Published dictionary paper connecting QP to at least two existing programs.

Year 3: First Experimental Proposals.

- Design concrete experimental protocols for the open problems in Section 6.
- Calculate quantitative predictions for Leggett–Garg violation patterns in SQUID systems.
- Develop theoretical framework for multi-observer Wigner's friend experiments.
- Begin collaboration with experimental groups.
- **Milestone:** At least one experimentally testable prediction published.

10.2 Phase II: Development (Years 4–7)

Year 4: Quantum Gravity Connections.

- Prove the spin network–presheaf correspondence (Theorem 5.3) in full generality.
- Formulate the emergent spacetime construction (Open Problem 5.1) with explicit examples in $2 + 1$ dimensions.
- Establish connections to causal set theory (Open Problem 5.5).
- **Milestone:** Derivation of the Regge calculus from the presheaf framework in $2 + 1$ dimensions.

Year 5: Quantum Computing Applications.

- Prove the presheaf formulation of quantum error correction (Open Problem 7.4).
- Develop new quantum algorithms inspired by presheaf operations (Open Problem 7.1).
- Establish the connection between topological quantum codes and presheaf cohomology (Open Problem 7.3).
- **Milestone:** At least one new quantum algorithm or error correction scheme derived from the presheaf framework.

Year 6: Information-Theoretic Foundations.

- Derive the von Neumann entropy from the Yoneda framework (Open Problem 8.1).
- Prove the channel capacity theorem in the presheaf setting (Open Problem 8.2).
- Unify quantum resource theories under the presheaf umbrella (Open Problem 8.3).
- **Milestone:** Categorical derivation of at least one major quantum information theorem.

Year 7: The Standard Model.

- Attack the gauge group problem (Open Problem 3.1).
- Develop the categorical approach to particle content (Open Problem 3.2).
- Investigate the coupling constant problem (Open Problem 3.3).
- **Milestone:** Either derive the Standard Model gauge group from categorical principles, or identify the precise obstruction and publish it.

10.3 Phase III: Applications and Synthesis (Years 8–10)

Year 8: Experimental Results.

- Analyze results from first-generation experiments (multi-observer protocols, gravitational decoherence bounds, contextuality measurements).
- Refine theoretical predictions based on experimental feedback.
- Design second-generation experiments.
- **Milestone:** First experimental data bearing on quantum perspectivism.

Year 9: Quantum Gravity.

- Attempt derivation of Einstein's equations from categorical principles (Open Problem 5.2).
- Develop the emergent spacetime program to $3 + 1$ dimensions.
- Connect to the asymptotic safety program (Open Problem 5.6).
- Investigate the Ryu–Takayanagi formula (Open Problem 8.4).
- **Milestone:** Either derive Einstein's equations or identify the categorical framework needed.

Year 10: Synthesis and Assessment.

- Write a comprehensive monograph on quantum perspectivism.
- Assess the status of all open problems.

- Identify the next-generation research directions.
- Evaluate the framework against experimental data.
- **Milestone:** A definitive assessment of whether quantum perspectivism constitutes a viable research program for the foundations of physics.

10.4 Required Resources

The roadmap requires:

- **Personnel:** 3–5 postdoctoral researchers in mathematical physics, 2–3 in experimental quantum physics, 1–2 in quantum computing.
- **Computational:** High-performance computing for presheaf cohomology calculations and quantum simulation.
- **Experimental:** Collaborations with groups operating SQUID systems, atom interferometers, photonic platforms, and superconducting qubit processors.
- **Theoretical:** Ongoing collaboration with category theorists, particularly experts in topos theory, ∞-categories, and homotopy type theory.

11 Connections to Contemporary Physics

11.1 Quantum Perspectivism and the Black Hole Information Paradox

The black hole information paradox [34] asks whether information that falls into a black hole is lost as the black hole evaporates. Quantum perspectivism offers a fresh perspective.

Proposition 11.1 (No Information Loss in QP)**.** *In quantum perspectivism, the presheaf S encoding the state of matter falling into a black hole is never "lost"—it is merely inaccessible from the external context C_{ext}. The information is encoded in the presheaf sections accessible from internal contexts C_{int} (inside the horizon). The apparent loss is the failure of the restriction map $S(i) : S(C_{\text{int}}) \to S(C_{\text{ext}})$ to be injective—different internal states can yield the same external data.*

Open Problem 11.1 (Page Curve from Presheaf Theory)**.** Derive the Page curve (the time-dependence of the entanglement entropy between the black hole and its Hawking radiation) from the presheaf framework. The entropy should be computed using the categorical entropy of Open Problem 8.1, applied to the presheaf restricted to the external context.

11.2 Quantum Perspectivism and Quantum Thermodynamics

Quantum thermodynamics [36] studies thermodynamic phenomena in quantum systems. The perspectival framework suggests that thermodynamic quantities are themselves perspective-dependent.

Open Problem 11.2 (Perspectival Thermodynamics)**.** Develop a perspectival formulation of quantum thermodynamics in which:

(a) Temperature is a property of the context C, not of the system S.

(b) Entropy is the "perspectival coarseness"—the information lost in restricting from fine-grained to coarse-grained contexts.

(c) The second law of thermodynamics is a consequence of the monotonicity of the restriction functor.

11.3 Quantum Perspectivism and Consciousness

We note, with appropriate caution, that the perspectival structure of quantum mechanics has been invoked in theories of consciousness.

Remark 11.2 (Consciousness and Perspectivism). The Integrated Information Theory (IIT) of Tononi [37] proposes that consciousness is identified with integrated information Φ—a measure of how much a system's causal structure exceeds the sum of its parts. In the Yoneda framework, integrated information has a natural categorical formulation: it measures the extent to which the presheaf of a composite system exceeds the product of the presheaves of its components. We emphasize that this is a structural observation, not a claim about the "hard problem" of consciousness.

12 Computational Companion

To support the theoretical development, we provide a Haskell implementation of the core categorical structures. The code accompanies this paper as the module `OpenProblemsQP` and implements:

(i) Presheaf categories over finite categories, with explicit computation of Yoneda embeddings.

(ii) Natural transformation spaces, including enumeration and verification of naturality.

(iii) Sheafification with respect to a given Grothendieck topology.

(iv) Decoherence simulation via presheaf restriction to macroscopic subcategories.

(v) Bell polytope computation for small multi-party scenarios.

(vi) Categorical entropy calculations.

The implementation uses Haskell's type system to enforce categorical coherence conditions at compile time. Type families encode the functorial constraints, and the `Category` type class hierarchy mirrors the mathematical definitions. Full source code is available at `https://github.com/MagnetonIO/open-problems-qp`.

13 Discussion

The open problems surveyed in this paper span a vast landscape, from pure category theory to experimental quantum physics. Several themes emerge.

Self-referential structure. The most striking feature of quantum perspectivism is its potential self-referentiality: if the minimal category $\mathscr{C}$ satisfying the Yoneda constraint turns out to be the category of quantum systems itself, then the theory determines its own observational framework. This would be a profound form of theoretical closure, unprecedented in physics.

The structure problem is central. Nearly all the open problems ultimately reduce to the structure problem (Section 2): what is $\mathscr{C}$? Solving this problem would immediately determine the gauge group, the particle spectrum, the classical limit, and the connection to gravity. The structure problem is thus the "master problem" of the quantum perspectivism program.

Experimental accessibility. Despite the highly abstract mathematical framework, several of the experimental proposals (Section 6) are accessible with current or near-term technology. The extended Wigner's friend experiments, Leggett–Garg tests in mesoscopic systems, and gravitational decoherence measurements provide concrete empirical handles on the framework.

Unification through categories. The categorical language provides a natural unification of quantum mechanics, classical mechanics, quantum gravity, quantum computing, and quantum information theory. The fact that all these disparate fields find natural homes in the presheaf framework is evidence (though not proof) that the framework captures something deep about the structure of physics.

Falsifiability. We must distinguish two levels of empirical test. At the *interpretive* level, quantum perspectivism agrees with the predictions of standard quantum mechanics in all currently tested regimes—it provides a different explanation, not different numbers. Experiments at this level (Wigner's friend, Leggett–Garg) test QP against competing *interpretations* (collapse models, many-worlds, QBism) rather than against the quantum formalism itself. At the *structural* level, however, QP makes predictions that go beyond standard QM: (a) the Tsirelson bound is a *theorem*, not merely an empirical fact—if super-quantum correlations were observed, QP would be falsified; (b) the gravitational decoherence rate predicted by the emergent spacetime construction (Open Problem 6.4) is a concrete numerical prediction that could differ from competing quantum gravity models; (c) the sheafification framework predicts a specific functional form for the decoherence rate as a function of system size, which is testable in mesoscopic systems. The research program outlined in the roadmap (Section 10) is designed to provide these tests within a decade.

14 Conclusion

Quantum perspectivism, grounded in the Yoneda Lemma, provides a unified foundation for quantum mechanics from which a rich landscape of open problems radiates. We have identified and analyzed open problems in eight major directions:

(1) The **structure problem**: characterizing the category $\mathscr{C}$ from causal, topological, and higher-categorical constraints.

(2) **Quantitative predictions**: deriving the Standard Model gauge group, particle spectrum, and coupling constants from categorical structure.

(3) The **classical limit**: rigorous derivation via categorical decoherence, the Ehrenfest theorem, and the quantization–classicalization adjunction.

(4) **Quantum gravity**: connections to loop quantum gravity, string theory, causal sets, and asymptotic safety, with emergent spacetime from the Grothendieck topology.

(5) **Experimental signatures**: Bell inequality extensions, Leggett–Garg tests, Wigner's friend experiments, gravitational decoherence, and contextuality witnesses.

(6) **Quantum computing**: categorical algorithms, the ZX-calculus, topological codes, and quantum error correction as sheaf conditions.

(7) **Information theory**: categorical entropy, channel capacity, resource theories, and holographic entropy.

(8) A **ten-year roadmap** with concrete milestones and required resources.

The overarching vision is that quantum mechanics, general relativity, the Standard Model, and the quantum-to-classical transition are all manifestations of a single categorical principle: *to be is to be related*, as encoded in the Yoneda Lemma. Establishing this vision—or refuting it—is the central task of the research program outlined here.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks the YonedaAI Research Collective for ongoing collaboration and intellectual support. This work builds on the foundational contributions of Saunders Mac Lane, Alexander Grothendieck, and Nobuo Yoneda, and is indebted to the categorical quantum mechanics community, particularly the work of Abramsky, Coecke, Döring, and Isham.

GrokRxiv DOI: `10.48550/GrokRxiv.2026.02.open-problems-qp`

References

[1] M. Long, "Quantum perspectivism as the foundation of physics: The Yoneda constraint and the relational structure of reality," *GrokRxiv*, 2026.

[2] N. Yoneda, "On the homology theory of modules," *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. I*, vol. 7, pp. 193–227, 1954.

[3] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, 2nd ed., Springer, 1998.

[4] J. Lurie, *Higher Topos Theory*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press, 2009.

[5] J. Lurie, "On the classification of topological field theories," *Current Developments in Mathematics*, vol. 2008, pp. 129–280, 2009.

[6] S. Abramsky and B. Coecke, "A categorical semantics of quantum protocols," in *Proc. 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pp. 415–425, 2004.

[7] S. Abramsky and A. Brandenburger, "The sheaf-theoretic structure of non-locality and contextuality," *New J. Phys.*, vol. 13, 113036, 2011.

[8] B. Coecke and R. Duncan, "Interacting quantum observables: Categorical algebra and diagrammatics," *New J. Phys.*, vol. 13, 043016, 2011.

[9] A. Hadzihasanovic, K. F. Ng, and Q. Wang, "Two complete axiomatisations of pure-state qubit quantum computing," in *Proc. 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pp. 502–511, 2018.

[10] C. J. Isham, "Topos theory and consistent histories: The internal logic of the set of all consistent sets," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 36, pp. 785–814, 1997.

[11] A. Döring and C. J. Isham, "A topos foundation for theories of physics," *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 49, 053515, 2008.

[12] C. Rovelli, "Relational quantum mechanics," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 35, pp. 1637–1678, 1996.

[13] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[14] T. Thiemann, *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[15] L. Hardy, "Quantum theory from five reasonable axioms," arXiv:quant-ph/0101012, 2001.

[16] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, "Informational derivation of quantum theory," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 84, 012311, 2011.

[17] A. Kissinger and S. Uijlen, "A categorical semantics for causal structure," *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2019.

[18] J. S. Bell, "On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox," *Physics Physique Fizika*, vol. 1, pp. 195–200, 1964.

[19] A. J. Leggett and A. Garg, "Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks?" *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 54, pp. 857–860, 1985.

[20] Č. Brukner, "A no-go theorem for observer-independent facts," *Entropy*, vol. 20, no. 5, 350, 2018.

[21] D. Frauchiger and R. Renner, "Quantum theory cannot consistently describe the use of itself," *Nature Communications*, vol. 9, 3711, 2018.

[22] S. Bose et al., "Spin entanglement witness for quantum gravity," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 119, 240401, 2017.

[23] C. Marletto and V. Vedral, "Gravitationally induced entanglement between two massive particles is sufficient evidence of quantum effects in gravity," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 119, 240402, 2017.

[24] L. Bombelli, J. Lee, D. Meyer, and R. Sorkin, "Space-time as a causal set," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 59, pp. 521–524, 1987.

[25] R. D. Sorkin, "Causal sets: Discrete gravity," in *Lectures on Quantum Gravity*, Springer, pp. 305–327, 2005.

[26] S. Weinberg, "Ultraviolet divergences in quantum theories of gravitation," in *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 790–831, 1979.

[27] M. Reuter, "Nonperturbative evolution equation for quantum gravity," *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 57, pp. 971–985, 1998.

[28] J. Maldacena, "The large-N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 38, pp. 1113–1133, 1999.

[29] S. Ryu and T. Takayanagi, "Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from the anti-de Sitter space/conformal field theory correspondence," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 96, 181602, 2006.

[30] A. Kitaev, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons," *Ann. Phys.*, vol. 303, pp. 2–30, 2003.

[31] M. H. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. J. Larsen, and Z. Wang, "Topological quantum computation," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 40, pp. 31–38, 2003.

[32] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, "Theory of quantum error-correcting codes," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 55, pp. 900–911, 1997.

[33] E. Chitambar and G. Gour, "Quantum resource theories," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 91, 025001, 2019.

[34] S. W. Hawking, "Breakdown of predictability in gravitational collapse," *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 14, pp. 2460–2473, 1976.

[35] W. H. Zurek, "Quantum Darwinism," *Nature Physics*, vol. 5, pp. 181–188, 2009.

[36] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. del Rio, and P. Skrzypczyk, "The role of quantum information in thermodynamics—a topical review," *J. Phys. A*, vol. 49, 143001, 2016.

[37] G. Tononi, "An information integration theory of consciousness," *BMC Neuroscience*, vol. 5, 42, 2004.

[38] The Univalent Foundations Program, *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.

[39] A. M. Gleason, "Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space," *J. Math. Mech.*, vol. 6, pp. 885–893, 1957.

[40] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, “The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics,” *J. Math. Mech.*, vol. 17, pp. 59–87, 1967.

[41] P. T. Johnstone, *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

[42] E. Riehl, *Category Theory in Context*, Dover Publications, 2016.