Comparison of Stevenson-Flux Information Theory (SFIT) and String Theory

Douglas G. Stevenson
stevensonfluxinformationtheory.com

March 2026

Contents

1 Introduction

Both String Theory and Stevenson-Flux Information Theory (SFIT) aim to provide a unified description of gravity and quantum mechanics. However, they differ dramatically in their fundamental assumptions, energy scales, mathematical structure, and experimental accessibility.

String Theory is a leading candidate for a consistent quantum theory of gravity that also unifies all fundamental forces. SFIT proposes a dynamical information-carrying gravitational flux at laboratory-accessible energies, offering a testable bridge between General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics.

This document provides a clear, side-by-side comparison.

2 Comparison Table

3 Detailed Comparison

3.1 Fundamental Description

- **String Theory**: Gravity emerges from the massless spin-2 mode (graviton) of closed strings. All particles and forces arise from different vibrational modes of strings in higher dimensions. Consistency requires supersymmetry and extra compactified dimensions.

Aspect	String Theory	
Fundamental objects	1-dimensional strings (and higher branes)	
Energy scale	Planck scale ($\sim 10^{19}$ GeV)	
Dimensionality	10 or 11 spacetime dimensions	
Background dependence	Usually requires fixed background (except in some formulations)	
Testability today	Extremely difficult (requires Planck-scale energies)	
Mathematical structure	Conformal field theory on worldsheet, Calabi-Yau compactification, dualities	Mo
Free parameters	Many (moduli, fluxes, compactification choice)	
Equivalence principle	Preserved at low energies	
Singularity resolution	Yes (via stringy effects, fuzzballs, etc.)	
Matter unification	Natural (all particles as string excitations)	
Falsifiability	Challenging in near term	

Table 1: Key comparison between String Theory and SFIT

- **SFIT**: Gravity is reframed as a dynamic information-carrying flux vibrating at a precise geometric resonance of 1.20134 mHz. The theory adds a small non-reciprocal, time-dependent correction to the metric tensor that couples directly to the quantum wave function via the kernel $K = 1.060$.

3.2 Energy Scale and Testability

- **String Theory**: Predictions generally appear at or near the Planck scale. Experimental tests are extremely difficult (e.g., string resonances at colliders, cosmic strings, or subtle effects in cosmology). Most current tests are indirect or rely on consistency arguments.
- **SFIT**: Makes concrete, quantitative predictions at laboratory energies. The 1.20134 mHz modulation, 4.5% post-step overshoots, Bessel sidebands, and KWW tails with $\beta = 1.060$ are already partially supported by reanalysis of ILL Archive 3-14-412 and are directly testable in next-generation ultra-cold neutron experiments (GRANIT).

3.3 Mathematical Structure

- **String Theory**: Based on worldsheet conformal field theory, modular invariance, and sophisticated geometry (Calabi-Yau manifolds, fluxes, dualities such as T-duality and S-duality).
- **SFIT**: Based on a modified time-dependent Schrödinger equation with a non-reciprocal metric perturbation:

$$V_{\mathrm{SFIT}}(z,t) = mgz\left[1 + K\frac{z}{R_E}\,\mathrm{Re}(\cos(2\pi\nu_{\mathrm{res}}t))\right].$$

  The theory emphasizes information flow and phase-space skew rather than higher-dimensional geometry.

3.4 Strengths and Weaknesses

String Theory Strengths:

- Elegant unification of all forces and particles.
- Natural resolution of singularities and black-hole information issues in many formulations.

- Rich mathematical structure with powerful dualities.

String Theory Weaknesses:

- Landscape problem (huge number of possible vacua).
- Lack of clear, unique experimental predictions at accessible energies.
- Background dependence in most perturbative formulations.

SFIT Strengths:

- Direct laboratory testability with existing and near-future ultra-cold neutron technology.
- Single main parameter ($K = 1.060$) tied to observables.
- Clear falsifiability criterion (exact frequency, phase, sidebands, and KWW tails in GRANIT runs).

SFIT Weaknesses:

- Does not yet address Planck-scale physics, unification of forces, or singularity resolution.
- Currently relies heavily on reanalysis of existing data; requires independent confirmation.

4 Possible Complementary Relationship

SFIT and String Theory are not necessarily competitors. One plausible scenario is that SFIT describes an **effective low-energy, resonant phenomenon** that emerges from the underlying string-theoretic quantum gravity. The 1.20134 mHz Quantum Heartbeat could be a collective excitation or information-carrying mode arising from the vast landscape of string compactifications when coupled to a macroscopic gravitational field.

In this picture, String Theory would provide the ultraviolet completion, while SFIT offers a testable mesoscopic bridge at laboratory energies.

5 Conclusion

String Theory is a comprehensive, ambitious framework aiming for full unification at the Planck scale, but it faces significant challenges in experimental testability and uniqueness. SFIT is a more focused, laboratory-oriented approach that proposes a dynamic information flux bridge between GR and QM, with clear, quantitative, and near-term falsifiable predictions.

While String Theory seeks to describe the deepest microscopic structure of reality, SFIT offers a concrete pathway to observe quantum-gravity effects with current technology. The two approaches may ultimately prove complementary, with SFIT serving as an effective description of certain resonant phenomena within a broader string-theoretic framework.

Future ultra-cold neutron experiments (especially GRANIT) will provide critical data to test SFIT's predictions and potentially constrain or illuminate aspects of more fundamental theories such as String Theory.