

# Relativistic model of spontaneous wave-function localization induced by nonHermitian colored noise

Pei Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua 321004, China\**

(Dated: January 14, 2025)

We propose a relativistic model of spontaneous wave-function collapse, based on a random nonHermitian action where the fermion density operator is coupled to a universal colored noise. Upon quantization, the wave function obeys a nonlinear stochastic differential equation that respects statistical Lorentz symmetry. The localization mechanism is driven by the colored noise, derived from the d'Alembert equation using generalized stochastic calculus in 1+3-dimensional spacetime. We analytically determine the noise-induced localization length, which decreases as the size of the observable universe increases.

*Introduction.*— Spontaneous collapse models, which modify the Schrödinger equation into nonlinear stochastic differential equations to address wave function localization in real space, have been proposed to explain the random outcomes of quantum measurements and the emergence of classicality in the macroscopic world [1–10]. By deviating from the predictions of standard quantum mechanics in the mesoscopic regime, these models have inspired a wide range of experimental tests [11–21]. They are considered promising candidates for resolving the long-standing quantum measurement problem.

However, reconciling collapse models with special relativity remains an unresolved challenge [22–25]. First, Lorentz symmetry, which mixes spatial and temporal coordinates, is inherently difficult to reconcile with a Schrödinger-like equation. This difficulty is further compounded by the nonlinear nature of collapse models. Second, while white noise is commonly employed in collapse models, it has been found to be inadequate for generating Lorentz-invariant wave-function localization. Developing a colored-noise model that complies with Lorentz invariance, which could potentially overcome this limitation, remains a highly challenging task.

Recent work suggests that stochastic wave-function evolution can be alternatively formulated via action formalism [26]. This approach naturally reconciles Lorentz symmetry with stochastic dynamics by treating the action as a Lorentz scalar random variable. Models constructed in this way respect *statistical symmetry*, which generalizes the concept of deterministic symmetry in conventional quantum field theory (QFT). Deterministic symmetry implies that quantum states in different reference frames must be connected by unitary (or antiunitary) transformations, with quantum-state trajectories in all frames being solutions of the same model (defined by the action or Schrödinger equation) [27]. In contrast, statistical symmetry ensures that the distributions of quantum trajectories in different frames are connected by symmetry transformations, with these distributions being solutions of the same model (defined by a random action or stochastic Schrödinger equation).

While this approach addresses the incorporation of Lorentz symmetry, earlier works on random action formalism have been limited to real-valued actions, which invariably lead to

linear stochastic differential equations. However, nonlinearity is considered both necessary and unavoidable in theories of wave-function localization [10]. More recently, it has been realized that nonlinearity can be introduced within the action formalism by allowing the action to be complex-valued—or, equivalently, nonHermitian [28].

In this paper, we introduce a random nonHermitian (RNH) action that maintains Lorentz invariance while exhibiting spontaneous wave-function localization. Our model is formulated by augmenting the Dirac action with a purely imaginary term, coupling the density field to a colored noise. We demonstrate that, upon quantization, this action governs stochastic dynamics that respects statistical Lorentz symmetry. The localization mechanism arises from the interaction with the colored noise, which is generated by solving the d'Alembert equation with white noise as its source, utilizing a 1+3-dimensional extension of stochastic calculus. We analytically show that the correlation between the wave-function amplitudes at two spatially separated points becomes time-independent once the particle's interaction time with the noise field exceeds the spatial separation (with the speed of light set to unity). This correlation decays exponentially with distance, and we derive the correlation length explicitly. To complement the theoretical analysis, we perform numerical simulations to explore the extent of localization as a function of the model parameters.

*Random nonHermitian action.*— We start from the Dirac model, which describes the dynamics of spin-1/2 fermions, with the Lagrangian density given by  $\mathcal{L}_D = -\bar{\psi}(\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu + m)\psi$ , where  $m$  is the mass of the particle,  $\psi$  and  $\bar{\psi}$  are the spinor field and its adjoint, respectively. Throughout this paper, we set  $\hbar = c = 1$ . We add an additional RNH term to the action, which reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{RNH} = -im\eta h(x)\bar{\psi}\psi, \quad (1)$$

where  $x = (x^0, \mathbf{x})$  denotes the 1+3-dimensional spacetime coordinates,  $\eta$  is a dimensionless parameter representing the noise strength, and  $h(x)$  is a dimensionless, real-valued stochastic field representing the universal colored noise acting on fermions. In our model, all fermions are assumed to experience the same noise, reflecting the fact that macroscopic objects made of many fermions undergo wave-function collapse

at a higher rate.

We require  $\mathcal{L}_{RNH}$  to exhibit statistical Lorentz invariance. Since  $\bar{\psi}\psi$  is a scalar, the distribution of  $h(x)$  must remain invariant under Lorentz transformations, even though individual configurations of  $h(x)$  may vary under such transformations. To construct  $h(x)$ , we start with a white noise field  $dW(x)$ , which is defined as a set of independent random variables at each spacetime point  $x$ , following a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance  $d^4x$ , where  $d^4x$  represents the volume of an infinitesimal spacetime cell [26, 29]. Although  $dW(x)$  is statistically Lorentz invariant, its infinitesimal correlation length renders it unsuitable for direct coupling to  $\bar{\psi}\psi$ . To address this, a colored noise field with a finite correlation length is required, providing the necessary framework for spontaneous localization.

We define the colored noise  $h(x)$  using the d'Alembert equation:  $-\partial_\mu\partial^\mu h(x) = dW(x)/d^4x$ . The retarded solution of this equation can be formally expressed as [29]

$$h(x) = \int dW(y) \frac{\delta(x^0 - y^0 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\delta$  is the Dirac  $\delta$ -function. The integral  $\int dW(y)$  is the 1+3-dimensional generalization of the Itô integral. We proved that the distribution of  $h(x)$  remains invariant under arbitrary Lorentz transformations and spacetime translations [29]. The physical interpretation of Eq. (2) is as follows: the white noise  $dW(y)$  is present throughout spacetime and propagates outward at the speed of light. Its effects diminish as a spherical wave with an amplitude proportional to  $1/|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$  when the signal reaches the point  $x$ . The colored noise experienced by fermions at  $x$  arises from the accumulation of such spherical waves originating from all past events. Consequently, the noise exhibits the following independence property:  $h(x)$  and  $h(x')$  are independent random variables when  $x$  and  $x'$  are separated by a time-like interval. Our model suggests that  $h(x)$  could have a gravitational origin, though this possibility remains a subject for future exploration.

The term  $\mathcal{L}_{RNH}$  is purely imaginary, making the total Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_D + \mathcal{L}_{RNH}$  and the corresponding action  $S = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}$  complex (nonHermitian). Consequently, the Hamiltonian becomes nonHermitian, and the evolution operator is nonunitary. This implies that the state vector  $|\Phi\rangle$  does not conserve its norm. To address this issue, we distinguish between the prenormalized state  $|\Phi\rangle$ , whose evolution is directly governed by  $S$ , and the normalized state  $|\Psi\rangle = |\Phi\rangle / \sqrt{\langle\Phi|\Phi\rangle}$ . As discussed in Refs. [28, 30], the nonHermiticity introduces nonlinearity into the dynamics of the normalized state  $|\Psi\rangle$ , which is precisely the mechanism required for spontaneous wave-function localization.

The process of quantizing a random action  $S$  has been previously developed [26]. This approach is analogous to the canonical quantization in conventional QFT. Through the Legendre transformation, we obtain the infinitesimal Hamiltonian integral:  $d\tilde{H}_t = H_D dt + im\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}) \bar{\psi}\psi$ , where  $H_D$  is the Dirac Hamiltonian, and  $t \equiv x^0$  denotes the time coordi-

nate. Here,  $d\tilde{h} = h(t, \mathbf{x}) dt$  represents the infinitesimal noise integral (see Appendix for a detailed discussion of the role of infinitesimal integrals in stochastic QFT).

From the initial time  $t_0$  to the final time  $t_f$ , the evolution operator is given by  $U(t_f, t_0) = \lim_{dt \rightarrow 0} e^{-id\tilde{H}_{N-1}} \dots e^{-id\tilde{H}_1} e^{-id\tilde{H}_0}$ , where  $t_f - t_0 = Ndt$  and  $t_j = t_0 + jdt$ . The prenormalized state vector satisfies the linear evolution equation  $|\Phi_{t_f}\rangle = U(t_f, t_0) |\Phi_{t_0}\rangle$ . However, the state of a physical system must be represented by the normalized state vector  $|\Psi_t\rangle$ , which satisfies a nonlinear stochastic differential equation [29]:

$$|d\Psi_t\rangle = -iH_D |\Psi_t\rangle dt + m\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h} (\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle) |\Psi_t\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where  $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle = \langle\Psi_t|\bar{\psi}\psi|\Psi_t\rangle$  is the expectation value. This equation resembles the CSL model [3, 10], with  $\bar{\psi}\psi$  representing particle density and  $(\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle)$  driving spontaneous localization. The key difference lies in using colored noise instead of white noise, resulting in distinct mathematical properties. Notably,  $(d\tilde{h})^2$  can be neglected [29], eliminating second-order terms of  $(\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle)$  in Eq. (3).

*Symmetries.*— Equation (3) is derived from a scalar action and is therefore automatically invariant under spacetime translations and Lorentz transformations. A detailed proof of this invariance is provided in the Appendix. Here, we explore the implications of statistical symmetries.

Consider a generic inhomogeneous Lorentz transformation  $(\Lambda, a)$ , defined by its action on spacetime coordinates as  $x' = \Lambda x + a$ , where  $\Lambda$  represents a homogeneous Lorentz transformation, and  $a$  denotes a spacetime translation. In QFT, the unitary operator  $u(\Lambda, a)$  is assigned to each transformation, specifying how the quantum state of a collection of free particles transforms under the corresponding change of coordinates. For the evolution operator  $U$  in our model, we have demonstrated the following statistical properties:

$$\begin{aligned} u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) U(t_f, t_0) u^\dagger(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) &\stackrel{d}{=} U(t_f, t_0), \\ U(t_f, t_0) &\stackrel{d}{=} U(t_f + a^0, t_0 + a^0), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}$  denotes an arbitrary spatial rotation, and  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $a^0$  represent arbitrary spatial and temporal translations, respectively. Here,  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  denotes equality in distribution.

When  $\eta = 0$ , i.e., in the absence of noise, the equality in distribution ( $\stackrel{d}{=}$ ) in Eq. (4) reduces to strict equality ( $=$ ), and Eq. (4) represents deterministic rotation and spacetime translation symmetries in QFT. For  $\eta \neq 0$ , the presence of noise breaks deterministic symmetries, as  $U(t_f, t_0)$  depends on random variables. However, the probability distribution of  $U(t_f, t_0)$  remains invariant under rotations and translations.

The invariance of our theory under a Lorentz boost  $\Lambda$  is more nuanced, as a Lorentz boost modifies the duration of evolution and mixes the energy and momentum of particles. To analyze this invariance, we follow QFT conventions and work in the interaction picture using the  $S$ -matrix formalism. In our theory, the evolution operator in the interaction picture

is given by  $U_I(t_f, t_0) = e^{iH_D t_f} U(t_f, t_0) e^{-iH_D t_0}$ , and the  $S$ -matrix is defined as the limit  $S = U_I(+\infty, -\infty)$ . We proved that

$$u(\Lambda) S u^\dagger(\Lambda) \stackrel{d}{=} S, \quad (5)$$

which implies that the distribution of the scattering matrix remains unchanged under arbitrary Lorentz boosts.

In the above discussion,  $U(t_f, t_0)$  and  $S$  are nonunitary operators governing the evolution of the prenormalized state. However, the physical state is represented by the normalized state vector. Importantly, all unitary transformations  $u(\Lambda, a)$  preserve the norm of state vectors. Consequently, the symmetry properties of the prenormalized states are inherited by the normalized physical states.

To formalize this, consider an experiment where the initial state is  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  in a reference frame  $K$ . In another reference frame  $K'$ , which may differ from  $K$  by a translation, rotation, or boost, the initial state is observed as  $|\Psi'_0\rangle = u|\Psi_0\rangle$ . The final state  $|\Psi_f\rangle$  in the  $K$  or  $K'$  reference frames is obtained by evolving  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  and  $|\Psi'_0\rangle$ , respectively, and then normalizing. Since  $u$  commutes with the evolution operator (or scattering matrix) and also commutes with the normalization operation, we can prove that  $|\Psi'_f\rangle \stackrel{d}{=} u|\Psi_f\rangle$ . This result demonstrates that the dynamics of quantum states are consistent across both  $K$  and  $K'$  reference frames, confirming that the theory is independent of the choice of reference frame.

*Wave-function localization.*— Solving Eq. (3) accurately is challenging due to the interplay between  $H_D$ , which causes the dispersion of the wave packet, and the noise term, which promotes localization. In this paper, we focus solely on the localization effect induced by the noise and therefore neglect the  $H_D$  term in  $d\tilde{H}_t$ . Substituting the fermionic field  $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int d^3\mathbf{p} (e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}} c_{\mathbf{p}\sigma} u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) + e^{-i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}} d_{\mathbf{p}\sigma}^\dagger v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma))$  into  $d\tilde{H}_t$ , where  $c_{\mathbf{p}\sigma}$  and  $d_{\mathbf{p}\sigma}^\dagger$  are the annihilation and creation operators for particles and antiparticles with momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  and spin  $\sigma$ , and  $u$  and  $v$  are the spinors for particles and antiparticles, respectively, we find that  $d\tilde{H}_t$  includes the creation and annihilation of particle-antiparticle pairs. This arises because the noise  $h(x)$  breaks deterministic translational symmetry, leading to the loss of energy conservation. A similar heating effect has been observed in previous collapse models. In our theory, reconciling the collapse model with special relativity suggests that spontaneous particle-antiparticle pair creation is an unavoidable consequence of the loss of energy conservation. Since this paper focuses on the localization effect, we leave the investigation of pair creation to future studies.

We then neglect the particle-antiparticle pair creation and annihilation terms in  $d\tilde{H}_t$ , allowing the particle and antiparticle contributions to decouple. Furthermore, we focus on the localization effect on particles by neglecting the antiparticle operators in  $d\tilde{H}_t$ , as the localization effect on antiparticles is analogous. To simplify further, we consider particles with low speeds (compared to the speed of light) by employing a low-speed approximation, where the spinors  $u$  and  $v$  are replaced by their zero-momentum values,  $u(0, \sigma)$  and  $v(0, \sigma)$ , respectively. Under these approximations, the Hamiltonian integral




FIG. 1. Supporting regions of  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})$  at different spatial positions  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$  are illustrated using different colors for clarity.

simplifies to  $d\tilde{H}_t = im\eta \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}) \varphi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{x}) \varphi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\varphi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3}} \int d^3\mathbf{p} e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}} c_{\mathbf{p}\sigma}$  is the familiar nonrelativistic field operator. Under these conditions, the spin degree of freedom has no effect on the evolution, allowing us to neglect spin in the wave function. Assuming the initial wave function is  $\Psi(t_0, \mathbf{x})$ , we can easily derive the prenormalized wave function at the final time. The physical wave function is then obtained through normalization, resulting in

$$\Psi(t_f, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N} e^{m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})} \Psi(t_0, \mathbf{x}), \quad (6)$$

where  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} d\tau h(\tau, \mathbf{x})$  is the cumulative potential over time, with  $t = t_f - t_0$  representing the evolution duration, and  $\mathcal{N}$  is the normalization factor.

According to Eq. (6),  $e^{m\eta\Theta} > 0$  can be interpreted as an  $\mathbf{x}$ -dependent scaling factor for the wave function. We then analyze its properties. Due to the time-translation symmetry,  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})$  is independent of  $t_0$  and  $t_f$ , depending only on their difference  $t = t_f - t_0$ . Without loss of generality, we set  $t_0 = 0$  and  $t_f = t$ . The cumulative potential can then be expressed as

$$\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\tau \in [-|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|, t-|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|]} \frac{dW(\tau, \mathbf{y})}{4\pi |\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|}. \quad (7)$$

The region of integration for  $(\tau, \mathbf{y})$ , also known as the supporting region, is schematically illustrated in Fig. 1. According to Eq. (7),  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})$  is a weighted sum of the white noise  $dW(\tau, \mathbf{y})$  over its supporting region. Since  $dW(\tau, \mathbf{y})$  are independent Gaussian random variables, it follows that  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})$  itself obeys a Gaussian distribution with zero mean. A particularly important property is the correlation between  $e^{m\eta\Theta}$  at different spatial points. In Fig. 1, the supporting regions of  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})$  at different positions  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_3)$  are distinguished by different colors. Since their supporting regions overlap, there will be a correlation between the corresponding values of  $\Theta$ . As shown in Fig. 1, two cases must be distinguished: when the spatial separation between points is less than  $t$  (e.g., the red and blue points), the overlap of the supporting regions is significant, leading to a strong correlation. Conversely, for

separations greater than  $t$  (e.g., the red and green points), the overlap is small, resulting in weak correlation.

We calculate the correlation  $K(t, r) = \overline{e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}_1)} e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}_2)}}$ , where the overline denotes averaging over the distribution of  $dW(x)$ , and the prefactor 2 in the exponents accounts for the correlation between  $|\Psi|^2$ . Due to spatial translation and rotation symmetries, the correlation  $K(t, r)$  depends only on the distance  $r = |\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2|$  between the two points. Without loss of generality, we assume the points are located at  $\mathbf{x}_1 = (0, 0, r/2)$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2 = (0, 0, -r/2)$ . The physically relevant regime corresponds to  $r \leq t$ , as the speed of light is immense in natural units, making particle evolution times far exceed the wave function's spatial spread in typical experiments. During the calculation of  $K(t, r)$ , an infrared divergence arises because the supporting region has infinite volume in a flat spacetime without boundaries. This divergence is not problematic in practice. Recall that the universe has a finite age, implying that the supporting region is limited to a finite spacetime volume. Specifically, the noise field must originate from within the observable universe, where signals traveling at the speed of light could reach our experimental spacetime. To regularize the divergence and facilitate calculations, we assume the observable universe has a cylindrical shape, with infinite extent along the  $z$ -axis and a finite radius  $\Lambda$  in the  $x$ - $y$  plane. For sufficiently large  $\Lambda$ , the correlation is found to be ( $r \leq t$ ) [29]

$$K(t, r) \propto e^{-\frac{r}{r_c}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $r_c = \frac{\pi}{m^2 \eta^2 \Lambda}$  is the correlation length, and  $r$ -independent factors are omitted for simplicity. When the particle's interaction time with the noise field exceeds the spatial separation between two points,  $r_c$  becomes time-independent. This reflects the Lorentz invariance, indicating that the noise effects reach full development on a short timescale.

According to Eq. (8),  $e^{m\eta\Theta}$  exhibits peak-like structures with a characteristic peak width of approximately  $r_c$ . The magnitude of  $e^{m\eta\Theta}$  decays exponentially as one moves away from the peak centers. Due to spatial translation symmetry, the peak centers are uniformly distributed throughout space, explaining the phenomenon of spontaneous localization. The noise field forces the wave function to be multiplied by a scaling factor with a peak structure, resulting in the wave packet shrinking into a region surrounding the peak center of  $e^{m\eta\Theta}$ .

The correlation length  $r_c$  determines the localization length of the wave packet and is inversely proportional to  $m^2$ . For a heavier fermion, its wave packet is more localized, which is physically intuitive. Additionally,  $r_c$  decreases with  $\Lambda$ , the size of the observable universe. This suggests that the current universe exhibits a smaller  $r_c$ , making it appear more "classical" compared to the earlier universe.

*Numerical simulations.*— We perform numerical simulations to investigate the localization effect. To reduce computational complexity, we confine the particle to a one-dimensional line of unit length along the  $z$ -axis, within the interval  $z \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ . In contrast, the observable universe is assumed to have a cylindrical shape with a length along




FIG. 2. (a) Squared wave function at different final times with  $m\eta = 2$ . (b) Averaged IPR as a function of  $\eta$  at  $t_f = 1$ . We choose  $l_z = 30$  and  $\Lambda = 10$ .

the  $z$ -axis and a radius in the  $x$ - $y$  plane denoted by  $l_z$  and  $\Lambda$ , respectively. The initial wave function is set to be constant,  $\Psi(t_0, z) \equiv 1$ . Details of the simulation method and parameters are provided in the Appendix.

Figure 2(a) shows a sample of  $|\Psi(t_f, z)|^2$  at different times  $t_f$ . As the duration increases from  $t_f = 0.01$  to  $t_f = 0.5$ , we observe the gradual development of noise-induced localization. At  $t_f = 0.01$ , the wave function is delocalized across the entire space. By  $t_f = 0.1$ , the emergence of peak structures indicates the onset of localization. At  $t_f = 0.5$ , the wave function becomes strongly localized near  $z = 0.5$ , where the density  $|\Psi|^2$  is predominantly concentrated, while  $|\Psi|^2$  on the left side approaches zero.

To quantify the degree of wave function localization as  $\eta$  varies, we define the averaged inverse participation ratio (IPR) as  $\text{IPR} = \int dz |\Psi(t_f, z)|^4$ . An IPR value of 1 corresponds to a completely delocalized wave function (e.g., the initial state), while a larger IPR indicates a more localized wave function. Figure 2(b) illustrates the dependence of IPR on  $\eta$  for a fixed time  $t_f = 1$  (equal to the system length, ensuring full localization development). The localization extent increases monotonically with  $\eta$ , consistent with the analytical relation  $r_c \propto 1/\eta^2$ . This numerical result for IPR offers a practical approach for estimating the free parameter  $\eta$  in our theory by comparing with experimental data. Notably, as indicated by Eq. (8), it is more convenient to determine the combination  $\eta^2 \Lambda$ , which is directly linked to  $r_c$  or IPR.

*Discussion.*— We propose a relativistic model of spontaneous wave-function localization driven by Lorentz-invariant, non-Hermitian colored noise. The noise induces localization by scaling wave packets around random peak centers, with a localization length inversely proportional to the particle mass squared and decreasing with the size of the observable universe. This framework bridges spontaneous localization models with relativistic dynamics, offering testable predictions for the correlation length based on measurable parameters. Future work will investigate noise-induced particle-antiparticle pair creation, wave-function dynamics under the full Dirac Hamiltonian, the emergence of Born's rule, and potential connections between the noise and gravitational effects.

---

\* [wangpei@zjnu.cn](mailto:wangpei@zjnu.cn)

- [1] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 470 (1986).
- [2] L. Diósi, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 1165 (1989).
- [3] P. Pearle, *Phys. Rev. A* **39**, 2277 (1989).
- [4] G. C. Ghirardi, P. Pearle, and A. Rimini, *Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 78 (1990).
- [5] R. Penrose, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **28**, 581 (1996).
- [6] P. Pearle, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 80 (1999).
- [7] A. Bassi, *J. Phys. A* **38**, 3173 (2005).
- [8] S. L. Adler and A. Bassi, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 15083 (2007).
- [9] S. L. Adler and A. Bassi, *J. Phys. A* **41**, 395308 (2008).
- [10] A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. P. Singh, and H. Ulbricht, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 471 (2013).
- [11] A. Vinante, M. Bahrani, A. Bassi, O. Usenko, G. Wijts, and T. H. Oosterkamp, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 090402 (2016).
- [12] A. Vinante, R. Mezzena, P. Falferi, M. Carlesso, and A. Bassi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 110401 (2017).
- [13] M. Bahrani, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 052118 (2018).
- [14] A. Tilloy and T. M. Stace, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 080402 (2019).
- [15] A. Pontin, N. P. Bullier, M. Toroš, and P. F. Barker, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023349 (2020).
- [16] A. Vinante, M. Carlesso, A. Bassi, A. Chiasera, S. Varas, P. Falferi, B. Margesin, R. Mezzena, and H. Ulbricht, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 100404 (2020).
- [17] D. Zheng, Y. Leng, X. Kong, R. Li, Z. Wang, X. Luo, J. Zhao, C.-K. Duan, P. Huang, J. Du, M. Carlesso, and A. Bassi, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 013057 (2020).
- [18] K. Komori, Y. Enomoto, C. P. Ooi, Y. Miyazaki, N. Matsumoto, V. Sudhir, Y. Michimura, and M. Ando, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 011802(R) (2020).
- [19] S. Donadi, K. Piscicchia, C. Curceanu, L. Diósi, M. Laubenstein, and A. Bassi, *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 74 (2021).
- [20] G. Gasbarri, A. Belenchia, M. Carlesso, S. Donadi, A. Bassi, R. Kaltenbaek, M. Paternostro, and H. Ulbricht, *Commun. Phys.* **4**, 155 (2021).
- [21] M. Carlesso, S. Donadi, L. Ferialdi, M. Paternostro, H. Ulbricht, and A. Bassi, *Nat. Phys.* **18**, 243 (2022).
- [22] W. C. Myrvold, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 062116 (2017).
- [23] R. Tumulka, *A Relativistic GRW Flash Process with Interaction* (Springer, New York, 2020).
- [24] C. Jones, T. Guaita, and A. Bassi, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 042216 (2021).
- [25] C. Jones, G. Gasbarri, and A. Bassi, *J. Phys. A* **54**, 295306 (2021).
- [26] P. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 115037 (2022).
- [27] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields* (Cambridge University Press & Beijing World Publishing Corporation, 2013).
- [28] Pei Wang, arXiv:2410.10164.
- [29] See supplementary materials.
- [30] Pei Wang, arXiv:2410.04333.

## Supplementary Materials

### I. STOCHASTIC CALCULUS IN 1+3-DIMENSIONAL SPACETIME

Our calculation fundamentally relies on the stochastic integral in 1+3 dimensions, expressed as  $\int dW(x)f(x)$ , where  $dW(x)$  represents the white noise field and  $f(x)$  can be either a stochastic field or a deterministic field. This type of stochastic integral was introduced in Ref. [1]. For consistency, we briefly recall its definition here and outline some of its key properties.

Conventional stochastic calculus is based on Brownian motion, where the infinitesimal increment  $dW_t$  is defined as an independent Gaussian random variable with variance  $dt$ . Since  $dW_t$  depends only on a single variable  $t$ , conventional stochastic calculus is inherently one-dimensional. For our purposes, however, we require a generalization to 1+3-dimensional spacetime. Thus, we introduce the white noise field  $dW(x)$ , replacing  $dW_t$  in higher dimensions.

To rigorously define the stochastic integral, we partition spacetime into cells. For simplicity, we consider an equal-volume partition, where the volume of each cell is denoted by  $\Delta^4x$ . Note that the stochastic integral is independent of the way of partitioning. For each spacetime cell, we assign an independent Gaussian random variable  $\Delta W(x)$  with zero mean and variance equal to the corresponding cell's volume,  $\Delta^4x$ . The stochastic integral is then defined as the limit:

$$\int dW(x)f(x) = \lim_{\Delta^4x \rightarrow 0} \sum_x \Delta W(x) f(x). \quad (9)$$

To justify the existence and well-definedness of this limit, we provide several key arguments:

1. **Consistency Under Refinement:** Suppose we start with a partition  $A$  of spacetime. A refinement  $A'$  of  $A$  is constructed such that every cell in  $A'$  is fully contained within a single cell of  $A$ . For a specific cell in  $A$ , say  $A_j$  with volume  $\Delta^4x_j$ , we assign the random variable  $\Delta W(x_j)$ . If  $A_j$  is further subdivided in  $A'$  into smaller cells  $A'_{j1}, A'_{j2}, \dots, A'_{jn}$ , independent random variables  $\Delta W(x_{j1}), \Delta W(x_{j2}), \dots, \Delta W(x_{jn})$  are assigned to the subcells. By the properties of Gaussian random variables, their sum also follows a Gaussian distribution with variance equal to the sum of the variances of the subcells, that is  $\Delta^4x_{j1} + \Delta^4x_{j2} + \dots + \Delta^4x_{jn} = \Delta^4x_j$ . But the variance of  $\Delta W(x_j)$  is also  $\Delta^4x_j$ , we then conclude:

$$\Delta W(x_j) = \Delta W(x_{j1}) + \Delta W(x_{j2}) + \dots + \Delta W(x_{jn}). \quad (10)$$

This consistency under refinement ensures that the limiting process is well-defined.

2. **Partition Independence:** The value of  $\int dW(x)f(x)$  is independent of the specific partition used. For two different partitions, say  $A$  and  $B$ , we can always define a common refinement in which Eq. (10) holds for both. Thus, the limits calculated from either partition must agree.

3. **Dependence of  $f(x)$  on the Partition:** The function  $f(x)$  may vary depending on its evaluation point within a given spacetime cell, but this choice should not affect the limit. In this work,  $f(x)$  can be either a deterministic function or a stochastic field. For stochastic fields, we impose a key constraint:  $f(x)$  must depend only on the partition used to define the integral and cannot depend on a more refined partition. This ensures the absence of ambiguities in the limiting process.

For instance, consider the one-dimensional stochastic integral  $\int dW_t W_t = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum \Delta W_t W_t$ , which is known to exhibit ambiguities. Specifically, the value of the summation depends on whether the integrand  $W_t$  is evaluated at the center, the edge, or any other point within each time interval of width  $\Delta t$ . These ambiguities can, however, be resolved by imposing a constraint:  $W_t$  must not depend on a finer partition of the time axis. This is because  $W_t$  is itself defined as  $W_t = \int_0^t dW_\tau = \sum \Delta W_\tau$ , which is inherently tied to the current partition. Consequently, without access to finer partitions,  $W_t$  cannot be evaluated at arbitrary points, such as the center of an interval.

Similarly, for higher-dimensional spacetime integrals, the stochastic field  $f(x)$  must also be defined only on the current partition. The limit  $\Delta^4x \rightarrow 0$  is then taken in a way that  $f(x)$  and  $\int dW(x)f(x)$  are determined simultaneously. This approach effectively removes ambiguities in the evaluation point of  $f(x)$ , ensuring consistency in the definition of the stochastic integral.

In summary, the definition of the 1+3-dimensional stochastic integral  $\int dW(x)f(x)$  is well-posed under these conditions, with the limiting process ensuring consistency, partition independence, and the absence of ambiguities.

Notably, the stochastic integral  $\int dW(x)f(x)$  is a random variable. It is often important to compute its expectation value over the distribution of  $dW(x)$ . Below, we derive a formula for this expectation. Suppose  $f(x)$  is a deterministic function, then we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\exp\left(\int dW(x)f(x)\right)} &= \lim_{\Delta^4x \rightarrow 0} \prod_x \overline{\exp(\Delta W(x)f(x))} \\ &= \lim_{\Delta^4x \rightarrow 0} \prod_x \exp\left(\frac{f(x)^2}{2}\Delta^4x\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x f(x)^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In this derivation, we have used the independence property of  $\Delta W(x)$  across spacetime cells.

### II. COLORED NOISE

In this section, we detail the process of constructing the colored noise field  $h$ . Our approach is inspired by the  $d$ 'Alembert equation  $-\partial_\mu \partial^\mu h(x) = \frac{dW(x)}{d^4x}$ , which ensures Lorentz invariance of its solution if the right-hand side is Lorentz invariant.

The well-known retarded solution of the d'Alembert equation can be formally written as

$$\begin{aligned} h(t, \mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}} \Delta^3 \mathbf{y} \frac{1}{4\pi |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|} \frac{\Delta W(t - |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|, \mathbf{y})}{\Delta^4 \mathbf{y}} \\ &= \frac{1}{dt} \int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{dW(t - |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|, \mathbf{y})}{4\pi |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\Delta^4 \mathbf{y} = \Delta^3 \mathbf{y} \Delta t$  is the infinitesimal spacetime volume element. The summation  $\sum_{\mathbf{y}}$  corresponds to a discrete partition of spatial coordinates, while  $\int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3}$  denotes the continuum limit of this summation at a fixed time  $t$ . It is important to distinguish  $\int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3} dW(\mathbf{y})$ , which integrates only over spatial coordinates with time held constant, from  $\int dW(\mathbf{y})$ , which involves a summation over both spatial and temporal coordinates. In deriving Eq. (12), we relied on the fundamental property that both regular integrals and stochastic integrals can be interpreted as the limit of summation over a partition of spacetime.

On the right-hand side of Eq. (12), terms like  $dW(\mathbf{y})/dt$  appear, which are undefined in the limit  $dt \rightarrow 0$ , similar to the conventional stochastic calculus where  $dW_t/dt$  does not exist in the limit  $dt \rightarrow 0$ . However, this is not problematic in our formalism, as the key quantity used throughout the quantization process is not  $h$  itself but its infinitesimal integral:

$$d\tilde{h} \equiv dt h = \int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{dW(t - |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|, \mathbf{y})}{4\pi |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}|}. \quad (13)$$

This integral, referred to as the infinitesimal integral of  $h$ , is well-defined as a random variable over the infinitesimal time interval  $[t, t + dt]$ . As discussed in Ref. [1], other quantities in stochastic quantum field theory (e.g., Hamiltonians and Lagrangians) must similarly be replaced by their infinitesimal integrals to ensure mathematical rigor.

Equation (13) serves as the definition of the colored noise field  $h$ , forming the basis of our model. Therefore, the d'Alembert equation itself is no longer required, as the existence of its solution in the limit  $d^4 x \rightarrow 0$  is not guaranteed. Using Eq. (12) and the properties of the Dirac  $\delta$ -function, we can also derive the compact expression for  $h$ :

$$h(x) = \int dW(\mathbf{y}) \frac{\delta(x^0 - y^0 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|}. \quad (14)$$

This definition is equivalent to Eq. (13) if we use the relation between the Dirac  $\delta$ -function and the Kronecker  $\delta$ -function:  $\delta(x^0 - y^0 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|) = \delta_{y^0, x^0 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} / dt$ . However, Eq. (14) also faces issues of mathematical rigor, as the Dirac  $\delta$ -function does not satisfy the regularity requirements discussed in Sec. I.

It is crucial to emphasize that all intermediate calculations, including those during the quantization process, are performed on a finite partition of spacetime. The limit  $\Delta^3 \mathbf{x}, \Delta t \rightarrow 0$  is only taken after obtaining the final results. This ensures that the appearance of infinitesimal symbols in denominators during intermediate steps does not lead to mathematical inconsistencies.

## A. Lorentz invariance

The white noise  $dW(x)$  has been shown to be Lorentz invariant [1]. Here, we briefly clarify the meaning of Lorentz invariance in this context. Let  $dw$  represent a specific configuration of  $dW$ . Under a Lorentz transformation that changes the coordinates as  $x \rightarrow x'$ , the noise configuration transforms as  $dw \rightarrow dw'$ , where  $dw'(x') = dw(x)$ , indicating that  $dw$  behaves like a scalar field under Lorentz transformations. A probability distribution is assigned to the set of all possible configurations,  $\{dw\}$ . Lorentz invariance means this probability distribution remains unchanged under the map  $dw \rightarrow dw'$ . Formally, this is expressed as  $dW \stackrel{d}{=} dW'$ , where  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  denotes equality in distribution.

Using the Lorentz invariance of white noise, we can also prove that  $h(x)$  is Lorentz invariant. More rigorously, we can demonstrate that the quantity  $h(x) d^4 x = \tilde{h}(x) d^3 \mathbf{x}$  is Lorentz invariant. For simplicity, we base our explanation on Eq. (14), although a more rigorous proof can be constructed using the definition in Eq. (13).

Let  $dw$  denote a specific white noise configuration, and the corresponding colored noise configuration, determined via Eq. (14), is denoted by  $h \equiv h_{dw}$ . Under a Lorentz transformation, the white noise configuration satisfies  $dw'(y') = dw(y)$ . Furthermore, one can prove the following identity:

$$\frac{\delta(x^0 - y^0 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} = \frac{\delta(x'^0 - y'^0 - |\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}'|)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}'|}, \quad (15)$$

for any two spacetime points  $x$  and  $y$ , and their transformed counterparts  $x'$  and  $y'$  under the Lorentz transformation. Using Eq. (14), we then immediately arrive at

$$h_{dw}(x) = h_{dw'}(x'). \quad (16)$$

Equivalently, using the notation  $h' \equiv h_{dw'}$ , this result can be written as  $h(x) = h'(x')$ , indicating that the configuration of the colored noise  $h$  transforms as a scalar field. Since the one-to-one mapping  $dw \leftrightarrow dw'$  preserves the probability distribution of  $dw$ , and  $h$  and  $h'$  are uniquely determined by  $dw$  and  $dw'$ , respectively, the probability distribution of  $h$  and  $h'$  must also be identical. Hence, we conclude:

$$h \stackrel{d}{=} h'. \quad (17)$$

Next, we provide a proof of Eq. (15). Proving Eq. (15) is equivalent to demonstrating the equality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int d^4 y g(\mathbf{y}) \frac{\delta(x^0 - y^0 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \\ &= \int d^4 y' g'(\mathbf{y}') \frac{\delta(x'^0 - y'^0 - |\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}'|)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{y}'|}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for an arbitrary scalar field  $g$  that transforms as  $g'(y') = g(y)$ , noting that  $d^4 y = d^4 y'$ . This, in turn, is equivalent to proving

the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^4 y \delta((x-y)^2) \theta(x^0 - y^0) g(y) \\ &= \int d^4 y' \delta((x'-y')^2) \theta(x'^0 - y'^0) g'(y'), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $\theta$  denotes the Heaviside function. The proof of Eq. (19) is straightforward, as the condition  $x^0 \geq y^0$  remains invariant under Lorentz transformations, provided  $x$  and  $y$  have a light-like separation enforced by  $\delta((x-y)^2)$ .

The scalar-field transformation property of  $h(x)$ , combined with the Lorentz invariance of its probability distribution, serves as the foundation for ensuring that our theory respects statistical Lorentz symmetry.

### B. Elimination of second-order terms involving $d\tilde{h}$

Suppose  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is a deterministic function. We aim to show that the second-order term of  $d_t F = \int d^3 \mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x})$  can be neglected as  $dt \rightarrow 0$ . It is worth emphasizing that for a deterministic function, e.g.,  $f(x)$  with an infinitesimal integral  $d\tilde{f} = f dt$ , the corresponding second-order term  $(d\tilde{f})^2$  is of the order  $O(dt^2)$ , and can naturally be neglected. However, recall that  $d\tilde{h}$  is defined as a functional of  $dW$ , and the white noise  $dW$  satisfies  $(dW(x))^2 = d^4 x$ , which is a first-order infinitesimal quantity and must be retained during calculations. Therefore, it is necessary to check whether the second-order term involving  $d\tilde{h}$  can be safely neglected.

First, note that:

$$(d_t F)^2 = \int d^3 \mathbf{x}_1 d^3 \mathbf{x}_2 d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_1) d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_2) f(\mathbf{x}_1) f(\mathbf{x}_2). \quad (20)$$

To analyze the behavior of  $d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_1) d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_2)$ , we partition spacetime into cells of finite volume, so that integrals are replaced by summations. Substituting the definition (13), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} & d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_1) d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_2) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\Delta W(t - |\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}_1|, \mathbf{y}_1) \Delta W(t - |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}_2|, \mathbf{y}_2)}{(4\pi)^2 |\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}_1| \cdot |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}_2|}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

To determine whether Eq. (21) contributes significantly or can be neglected, we analyze the product of  $\Delta W$  at two spacetime points. The following rule is crucial:  $(\Delta W(y))^2 = \Delta^4 y$  is a first-order term and must be retained, while  $\Delta W(y_1) \Delta W(y_2)$  for  $y_1 \neq y_2$  is negligible. Applying this rule, we conclude that in Eq. (21), only terms with  $\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2$  and  $|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}_1| = |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}_2|$  need to be retained.

We now analyze two cases separately:

1. Case 1:  $\mathbf{x}_1 \neq \mathbf{x}_2$ . For non-identical spatial points  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$ , the surviving terms in the summation satisfy that  $\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_2 =$

$\mathbf{y}$  must lie on the midplane  $\mathcal{V}$ , which is the plane equidistant from  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$ . Hence, we have:

$$d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_1) d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\Delta t \Delta^3 \mathbf{y}}{(4\pi)^2 |\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}| \cdot |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}|}. \quad (22)$$

However, the midplane  $\mathcal{V}$  has zero volume in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . As  $\Delta^3 \mathbf{y} \rightarrow 0$ , the summation in Eq. (22) vanishes. Thus, for  $\mathbf{x}_1 \neq \mathbf{x}_2$ , the term  $d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_1) d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_2)$  can be safely neglected.

2. Case 2:  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$ . When  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$ , the summation in  $d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_1) d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}_2)$  results in a finite contribution, which becomes an integral as  $\Delta^3 \mathbf{y} \rightarrow 0$ . However, in the  $\mathbf{x}_1$ - $\mathbf{x}_2$  space, the equality  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$  corresponds to a zero-volume hyperplane. Consequently, this contribution does not affect the integral in Eq. (20).

In conclusion, the second-order term  $(d_t F)^2$  can always be safely neglected in stochastic calculus.

### III. MODEL AND QUANTIZATION

The complete random non-Hermitian action of our model is expressed as:

$$S = - \int d^4 x \bar{\psi} (\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu + m) \psi - im\eta \int d^4 x h(x) \bar{\psi} \psi, \quad (23)$$

where the first term is the Dirac action, and the second term represents the universal colored noise acting on fermions. We adopt the metric signature  $(-, +, +, +)$ , and the gamma matrices are given by:

$$\gamma^0 = -i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^j = -i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_j \\ -\sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

where  $\sigma_j$  are the Pauli matrices. These gamma matrices satisfy the anticommutation relation  $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2\eta^{\mu\nu}$ , with  $\eta^{\mu\nu}$  being the metric tensor. The  $\beta$  matrix is defined as  $\beta = i\gamma^0$ , so the spinor fields satisfy  $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger \beta$ .

Following Ref. [1], we quantize the action in Eq. (23) to obtain an evolution operator. According to the principle of canonical quantization, the conjugate field to  $\psi$  is given by  $\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \dot{\psi} = i\psi^\dagger$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the Lagrangian density. This remains unchanged from conventional Dirac theory since the colored noise term does not involve time derivatives of  $\psi$ . Using the Legendre transformation, the Hamiltonian is expressed as:

$$H = \int d^3 \mathbf{x} (i\psi^\dagger \dot{\psi} - \mathcal{L}) = H_D + im\eta \int d^3 \mathbf{x} h(x) \bar{\psi} \psi, \quad (25)$$

where  $H_D = \int d^3 \mathbf{x} (i\psi^\dagger \gamma^0 \vec{\gamma} \cdot \nabla \psi + m\psi^\dagger \gamma^0 \psi)$  is the Dirac Hamiltonian.

It is important to emphasize that the field  $h(x)$ , and consequently the Hamiltonian  $H$ , are not well-defined in the limit  $d^4 x \rightarrow 0$ , as discussed in Sec. II and Ref. [1]. To address this



issue, we apply the Legendre transformation to the infinitesimal Lagrangian integral, which can be conceptually understood as  $dt \int d^3\mathbf{x} \mathcal{L}$ . This procedure yields the Hamiltonian integral:

$$d\tilde{H}_t = H_D dt + im\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(x) \bar{\psi} \psi, \quad (26)$$

where the term  $d\tilde{h}$  represents the well-defined infinitesimal integral (see Eq. (13)). By focusing on  $d\tilde{h}$ , we ensure mathematical consistency. This approach is a standard technique in stochastic QFT, particularly when dealing with white-noise fields such as  $dW(x)$ , where similar challenges arise in defining Lagrangian or Hamiltonian.

The Hamiltonian integral  $d\tilde{H}_t$  depends on time due to the time-dependent nature of  $h(t, \mathbf{x})$ . It governs the quantum state evolution from an initial time  $t_0$  to a final time  $t_f$ . For an infinitesimal time interval, the evolution operator is given by  $e^{-id\tilde{H}_t}$ . For a finite time interval, dividing it into  $N$  small steps of size  $dt$ , the overall evolution operator becomes:

$$U(t_f, t_0) = \lim_{dt \rightarrow 0} e^{-id\tilde{H}_{t_{N-1}}} \dots e^{-id\tilde{H}_{t_1}} e^{-id\tilde{H}_{t_0}}, \quad (27)$$

where  $t_j = t_0 + jdt$ . Since the Hamiltonian integral is nonHermitian, i.e.,  $(d\tilde{H}_t)^\dagger \neq d\tilde{H}_t$ , the evolution operators  $e^{-id\tilde{H}_t}$  and  $U(t_f, t_0)$  are nonunitary. As a result, the prenormalized state  $|\Phi_t\rangle$  evolved by  $U(t_f, t_0)$  does not preserve a unit norm. To resolve this, we normalize  $|\Phi_t\rangle$  to obtain the physical state  $|\Psi_t\rangle$ . The prenormalized state  $|\Phi_t\rangle$  serves only as an intermediate mathematical tool.

To derive the differential equation for  $|\Psi_t\rangle$ , we begin with the equation for  $|\Phi_t\rangle$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |d\Phi_t\rangle &= e^{-id\tilde{H}_t} |\Phi_t\rangle - |\Phi_t\rangle \\ &= \left( -iH_D dt + m\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(x) \bar{\psi} \psi \right) |\Phi_t\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Here, the second-order terms  $(d\tilde{H}_t)^2$  are neglected, following the conclusion in Sec. II B. The variation in the norm  $\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle$  is calculated as:  $d\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle = \langle d\Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle + \langle \Phi_t | d\Phi_t \rangle$ , where higher-order contributions involving  $d\tilde{h}$  are discarded for the same reasons. The differential of the normalization factor  $\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle^{-1/2}$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle^{-1/2}\right) &= -\frac{1}{2} \langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle^{-3/2} d\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{8} \langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle^{-5/2} (d\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The careful treatment of second-order terms in stochastic calculus ensures the correctness of the calculation, which differs from conventional calculus where only first-order terms are kept. Finally, the differential equation for the normalized state  $|\Psi_t\rangle$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} |d\Psi_t\rangle &= d\left(\langle \Phi_t | \Phi_t \rangle^{-1/2} |\Phi_t\rangle\right) \\ &= -iH_D |\Psi_t\rangle dt + m\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(x) (\bar{\psi} \psi - \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle) |\Psi_t\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

#### IV. PROOF OF LORENTZ SYMMETRY

We have developed a quantized theory where the real-time dynamics of quantum states is governed by  $d\tilde{H}_t$ , and the corresponding evolution operator  $U(t_f, t_0)$ , or equivalently by the nonlinear stochastic equation (30). Since our theory is derived from the Lorentz-invariant action (23), it should automatically respect statistical Lorentz symmetry. In this section, we will establish this invariance and demonstrate that our quantization process indeed preserves the symmetries inherent in the action.

Consider a generic Lorentz transformation, denoted by  $(\Lambda, a)$ , where  $\Lambda$  represents an arbitrary homogeneous Lorentz transformation, and  $a = (a^0, \mathbf{a})$  denotes a spacetime translation. Let the spacetime coordinates in the original reference frame  $K$  be  $x = (t, \mathbf{x})$ . After the transformation  $(\Lambda, a)$ , the coordinates in the transformed frame  $K'$ , denoted as  $x' = (t', \mathbf{x}')$ , are related to  $x$  via:

$$\begin{pmatrix} t' \\ \mathbf{x}' \end{pmatrix} = \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} t \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} a^0 \\ \mathbf{a} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

According to QFT [2], a unitary operator  $u(\Lambda, a)$  is associated with each transformation, describing how the quantum state of a collection of free particles transforms as the reference frame changes from  $K$  to  $K'$ . In conventional QFT, symmetry manifests as the invariance of the evolution operator or  $S$ -operator under the action of  $u(\Lambda, a)$ . Similarly, in our stochastic QFT,  $u(\Lambda, a)$  represents the transformation of quantum states. However, because the evolution operator in stochastic QFT is a random operator, individual configurations of these operators are not invariant under  $u(\Lambda, a)$ . Instead, we will show that the probability distribution of these operators remains invariant under  $u(\Lambda, a)$ .

1. **Spatial Rotations and Translations:** Consider spatial rotations and translations, represented by  $u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a})$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  is a rotation and  $\mathbf{a}$  is a spatial translation. The Dirac Hamiltonian is invariant under these transformations:  $u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) H_D u^\dagger(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) = H_D$ . Additionally, spatial transformations do not alter the time coordinate,  $t = t'$ , or the spatial volume element,  $d^3\mathbf{x} = d^3\mathbf{x}'$ . The scalar nature of  $\bar{\psi} \psi$  ensures:  $u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x}) u^\dagger(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) = \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}') \psi(\mathbf{x}')$ , where  $\mathbf{x}' = \mathcal{R}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}$ .

As shown in Sec. II A, the colored noise  $h(x)$  is a scalar field (see Eq. (16)). Substituting these relations into Eq. (26), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) \exp\left(-iH_D dt + m\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}) \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) \psi(\mathbf{x})\right) u^\dagger(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) \\ = \exp\left(-iH_D dt' + m\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x}' d\tilde{h}'(t', \mathbf{x}') \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}') \psi(\mathbf{x}')\right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Using Eq. (27), Eq. (32), and the unitarity of  $u$ , we find that the evolution over a finite time interval satisfies:

$$u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) U(t_f, t_0) u^\dagger(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) = U'(t'_f, t'_0), \quad (33)$$

where  $U$  and  $U'$  are the evolution operators determined by specific noise configurations  $h$  and  $h'$ , respectively. Since  $h$  and  $h'$  are determined by the white-noise configurations  $dw$  and  $dw'$ , which have identical distributions, we derive:  $U \stackrel{d}{=} U'$ , or equivalently,

$$u(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a})U(t_f, t_0)u^\dagger(\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{a}) \stackrel{d}{=} U(t_f, t_0). \quad (34)$$

2. Time Translations: Consider time translations, which shift the coordinates as  $t' = t + a^0$  and  $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}$ . For  $\eta = 0$  (conventional QFT), the Dirac Hamiltonian is time-independent, and the evolution operator  $e^{-iH_D(t_f-t_0)}$  remains invariant under time translations. However, for  $\eta \neq 0$ , the Hamiltonian integral becomes time-dependent due to the time dependence of the colored noise. For a specific configuration,  $U(t_f, t_0) \neq U(t'_f, t'_0)$ , but the difference arises solely from the trajectories of the colored-noise configurations  $h$  and  $h'$ , which satisfy  $h'(t + a^0, \mathbf{x}) = h(t, \mathbf{x})$ . Since the trajectories  $\left\{h(x) \mid t \in [t_0, t_f]\right\}$  and  $\left\{h'(x) \mid t \in [t_0, t_f]\right\}$  depend uniquely on the white-noise configurations  $dw$  and  $dw'$ , and  $dw \rightarrow dw'$  preserves the probability distribution, we find:

$$U(t_f, t_0) \stackrel{d}{=} U(t_f + a^0, t_0 + a^0). \quad (35)$$

3. Lorentz Boosts: Consider a Lorentz boost  $\Lambda$ . Since boosts alter the duration of time intervals and mix energy with momentum, we adopt the approach in conventional QFT and analyze the symmetry in the interaction picture using the  $S$ -matrix formalism. In the interaction picture, the evolution operator is given by:  $U_I(t_f, t_0) = e^{iH_D t_f} U(t_f, t_0) e^{-iH_D t_0}$ . Substituting Eq. (27) into this expression, we find:

$$U_I(t_f, t_0) = \lim_{dt \rightarrow 0} e^{-id\tilde{H}_i^{(l)}} \dots e^{-id\tilde{H}_i^{(l)}} e^{-id\tilde{H}_i^{(l)}}, \quad (36)$$

where the Hamiltonian integral in the interaction picture is:

$$d\tilde{H}_i^{(l)} = im\eta \int d^3\mathbf{x} d\tilde{h}(t, \mathbf{x}) \bar{\psi}_I(t, \mathbf{x}) \psi_I(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (37)$$

with  $\psi_I(t, \mathbf{x}) = e^{iH_D t} \psi(\mathbf{x}) e^{-iH_D t}$  being the field operator in the interaction picture. In the  $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $t_f \rightarrow \infty$  limit, the  $S$ -matrix operator becomes:

$$S \equiv U_I(\infty, -\infty) = \mathcal{T} \exp \left\{ m\eta \int d^4x h(x) \bar{\psi}_I(x) \psi_I(x) \right\}, \quad (38)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}$  denotes time ordering. Under a Lorentz boost, the scalar density  $\bar{\psi}_I(x) \psi_I(x)$  transforms as:  $u(\Lambda) \bar{\psi}_I(x) \psi_I(x) u^\dagger(\Lambda) = \bar{\psi}_I(x') \psi_I(x')$ . Using  $d^4x = d^4x'$ ,  $h(x) = h'(x')$ , and  $h \stackrel{d}{=} h'$ , we find:

$$u(\Lambda) S u^\dagger(\Lambda) \stackrel{d}{=} S. \quad (39)$$

It is worth mentioning that the invariance of  $S$  also holds for spatial rotations and translations, though Eq. (33) provides a more generalized relation in these cases.

## V. CORRELATION LENGTH

In this section, we calculate the correlation function

$$K(t, r) = \overline{e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}_1)} e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}_2)}}, \quad (40)$$

where the overline denotes averaging over the distribution of  $dW(x)$ . The two points are located at  $\mathbf{x}_1 = (0, 0, r/2)$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2 = (0, 0, -r/2)$ , i.e., on the  $z$ -axis, separated by a distance  $r$ . The cumulative potential  $\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})$  is defined as

$$\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \tau \in [-|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|, t-|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|]} \frac{dW(\tau, \mathbf{y})}{4\pi |\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|}, \quad (41)$$

where the subscript of the integral denotes the integration domain for  $(\tau, \mathbf{y})$ .

To simplify the expression for the cumulative potential, we introduce an indicator function so that the integration domain can extend over the entire spacetime:

$$\Theta(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int dW(\tau, \mathbf{y}) \frac{I(\tau, \mathbf{y})}{4\pi |\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|}, \quad (42)$$

where the indicator function  $I(\tau, \mathbf{y})$  is defined as

$$I(\tau, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } -|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}| \leq \tau \leq t-|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

With this reformulation, the formula for the expectation value given in Eq. (11) can be applied. Using this formula, we derive

$$K(t, r) \propto \exp \left\{ \frac{m^2 \eta^2}{8\pi^2} D(t, r) \right\}, \quad (44)$$

where we have omitted the  $r$ -independent prefactor. This omission is justified because  $e^{2m\eta\Theta}$  acts as a scaling factor for the prenormalized wave function. Since we are only interested in the correlation between normalized wave functions, any  $r$ -independent factor is removed during normalization. The term  $D(t, r)$ , defined as  $D(t, r) \equiv 32\pi^2 \Theta(t, \mathbf{x}_1) \Theta(t, \mathbf{x}_2)$ , represents the correlation between cumulative potentials, and can be expressed as

$$D(t, r) = \int d^3\mathbf{y} \int d\tau \frac{2I_1 I_2}{|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}| \cdot |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}|}, \quad (45)$$

where  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are the indicator functions corresponding to  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$ , respectively.

Thus, the calculation of  $K(t, r)$  reduces to the computation of  $D(t, r)$ , which is a conventional integral over the 1+3-dimensional spacetime. To evaluate  $D(t, r)$ , we analyze the product of the indicator functions  $I_1 I_2$ . Two cases arise, depending on whether  $r \leq t$  or  $r > t$ . The case  $r \leq t$  is of primary physical interest because the speed of light is extremely large in natural units. Consequently, in typical experiments, the evolution time  $t$  significantly exceeds the spatial spread of the wave function. For  $r \leq t$ , we find

$$D(t, r) = \int d^3\mathbf{y} \frac{2(t - (|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}| - |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}|))}{|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{y}| \cdot |\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{y}|}. \quad (46)$$

As mentioned in the main text, the correlation  $D$  diverges if the integration region of  $\mathbf{y}$  is taken to span the entire 3-dimensional space. To address this issue, we restrict the integration to lie within the observable universe, which has a finite volume. As a result,  $D$  depends on the size of the observable universe, which serves as a distinctive feature of our theoretical framework. For simplicity in calculations, we model the observable universe as having a cylindrical shape: it is infinitely long along the  $z$ -axis but has a finite radius  $\Lambda$  in the  $x$ - $y$  plane. To compute the integral, we adopt cylindrical coordinates. Moreover, since any  $r$ -independent terms do not contribute to the final correlation function between normalized wave functions, we focus instead on calculating the difference  $D(t, r) - D(t, 0)$ , which simplifies the computation. This difference can be expressed as the sum of two terms:  $D(t, r) - D(t, 0) = D_1(t, r) + D_2(t, r)$ , where the terms  $D_1(t, r)$  and  $D_2(t, r)$  are defined as

$$D_1(t, r) = 8\pi t \int_0^\Lambda d\rho \rho \int_0^\infty dz \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \left(z + \frac{r}{2}\right)^2} \sqrt{\rho^2 + \left(z - \frac{r}{2}\right)^2}} - \frac{1}{\rho^2 + z^2} \right), \quad (47)$$

$$D_2(t, r) = -8\pi \int_0^\Lambda d\rho \rho \int_0^\infty dz \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \left(z - \frac{r}{2}\right)^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \left(z + \frac{r}{2}\right)^2}} \right).$$

The calculation of these two integrals, though straightforward, involves some subtleties. Below, we outline the key techniques and formulas used in the computations. For the evaluation of  $D_1$ , we make use of the following formula:

$$\int_0^\infty dz \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \left(z + \frac{r}{2}\right)^2} \sqrt{\rho^2 + \left(z - \frac{r}{2}\right)^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{r}{2}}} K \left( \sqrt{1 - \left( \frac{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \frac{r^2}{4} - \frac{r}{2}}}{\sqrt{\rho^2 + \frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{r}{2}}} \right)^2} \right), \quad (48)$$

where  $K$  is the complete elliptic integral of the first kind. Importantly,  $D_1$  converges as  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , indicating that the divergence of  $D$  originates solely from  $D_2$ . This is expected, as the subtraction of  $D(t, 0)$  in the expression for  $D_1$  ensures the cancellation of divergent terms. Since the size of the observable universe is much larger than the spatial spread of the wave function in typical experiments, we can safely take the limit  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$  for the convergent  $D_1$ . Utilizing the fact that

$K(0) = \pi/2$  and the following integral result:

$$\int_0^\infty d\tilde{\rho} \left( \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^2 + 1} + 1} K \left( \sqrt{1 - \left( \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^2 + 1} - 1}{\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^2 + 1} + 1} \right)^2} \right) - K(0) \right) = -1, \quad (49)$$

we find that  $D_1$  evaluates to:

$$D_1 = -4\pi r t. \quad (50)$$

On the other hand, the integral in  $D_2$  diverges as  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , so this limit cannot be directly taken. However, the integral in  $D_2$  can be computed for any finite value of  $\Lambda$ . After some careful calculations, we obtain:

$$D_2 = -\pi r^2 \left( 4 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{r} \right)^2 \ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{4 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{r} \right)^2 + 1 + 1}}{\sqrt{4 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{r} \right)^2 + 1 - 1}} \right) + 2 \sqrt{4 \left( \frac{\Lambda}{r} \right)^2 + 1 - 2} \right). \quad (51)$$

Since the size of the observable universe greatly exceeds the spatial spread of the wave function, the physically relevant regime is  $\frac{\Lambda}{r} \gg 1$ . In this large  $\Lambda$  limit,  $D_2$  grows linearly with  $\Lambda$ . More precisely, we find:

$$\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D_2}{\Lambda} = -8\pi r, \quad (52)$$

which allows us to express  $D_2$  as:  $D_2 = -8\pi r \Lambda$ .

Combining the results for  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ , the correlation function is given by:

$$K(t, r) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{m^2 \eta^2 r}{2\pi} (t + 2\Lambda) \right\}. \quad (53)$$

In typical experiments, the evolution duration  $t$  is much smaller than the size of the observable universe (with the speed of light set to unity). Consequently, the contribution from  $D_1$  can be neglected. The final expression for the correlation becomes:

$$K(t, r) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{r}{r_c} \right\}, \quad (54)$$

where the correlation length  $r_c$  is given by:  $r_c = \frac{\pi}{m^2 \eta^2 \Lambda}$ .

## VI. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

By neglecting the effects of the Dirac Hamiltonian and particle-antiparticle pair creation on the dynamics, and under the low-speed approximation, we find that the evolution of a single-particle wave function, described by Eq. (30), reduces to  $\Psi(t_f, \mathbf{x}) \propto e^{m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})} \Psi(t_0, \mathbf{x})$ , where  $t_f$  and  $t_0$  are the final and initial times, respectively, and  $t = t_f - t_0$  denotes the duration. To study the localization effect caused by colored noise, we numerically simulate the evolution of the wave function,




FIG. 3. Averaged inverse participation ratio (IPR) as a function of: (a) the number of simulation runs, with  $\Delta t = 0.1$ ,  $\Delta \rho = 0.1$ , and  $\Delta z = 0.02$ ; (b) the time partitioning step  $\Delta t$ , with  $\Delta \rho = 0.1$  and  $\Delta z = 0.02$ ; (c) the radial partitioning step  $\Delta \rho$ , with  $\Delta t = 0.1$  and  $\Delta z = 0.02$ ; and (d) the axial partitioning step  $\Delta z$ , with  $\Delta t = 0.1$  and  $\Delta \rho = 0.1$ . The parameters used in these simulations are  $\Lambda = 10$ ,  $l_z = 10$ ,  $t = 10$ , and  $\eta = 5$ .

which is influenced by the position-dependent scaling factor  $e^{m\eta\Theta}$ . For simplicity, we assume the initial wave function to be spatially uniform, so that the final wave function satisfies:

$$|\Psi(t_f, \mathbf{x})|^2 \propto e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})}. \quad (55)$$

It is important to note that  $e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})}$  is a random quantity, meaning that each simulation run produces different results. The wave function  $|\Psi(t_f, \mathbf{x})|^2$  must be normalized separately for each realization of  $e^{2m\eta\Theta(t, \mathbf{x})}$ . In other words, the normalization is applied individually for each simulated wave function, rather than in an ensemble-averaged sense.

The key to simulating the final wave function lies in calculating the cumulative potential  $\Theta$ , which depends on discretizing the spacetime of the observable universe and generating the white noise field over this discretization. This process requires significant computational resources because the size of the observable universe must be large enough to account for the physically relevant regime. To reduce computational complexity, we assume that the particle is constrained to move in one spatial dimension along the  $z$ -axis within the interval  $z \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ . Simulations in higher spatial dimensions will be addressed in future work. The observable universe is modeled as a cylinder centered at the origin, with length  $l_z$  along the  $z$ -axis and radius  $\Lambda$  in the  $x$ - $y$  plane. Exploiting the symmetry of the cylindrical geometry further reduces the computational cost. Using cylindrical coordinates, the cumulative potential at an arbitrary point on the  $z$ -axis can be expressed

as:

$$\Theta(t, z) = \int \frac{dW_c(\tau, \rho, \theta, z')}{4\pi \sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}}, \quad (56)$$

where  $\rho$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $z'$  represent the radial distance, azimuthal angle, and height in cylindrical coordinates, respectively. The coordinates  $(\rho, \theta, z')$  are confined within the observable universe. The time coordinate  $\tau$  of the white noise is integrated over the interval  $[-\sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}, t - \sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}]$ . The term  $dW_c$  represents the white noise field in cylindrical coordinates, which, by definition, follows a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance equal to the infinitesimal cylindrical volume element,  $\rho d\rho d\theta dz' d\tau$ .

In Eq. (56), the denominator is independent of the azimuthal angle  $\theta$ , allowing the integration over  $\theta$  to be carried out analytically. This simplifies the expression for the cumulative potential:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(t, z) &= \int \frac{d\tilde{W}_c(\tau, \rho, z')}{4\pi \sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}} \\ &\approx \sum_{\rho \in [0, \Lambda]} \sum_{z' \in [-l_z/2, l_z/2]} \sum_{\tau \in [-\sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}, t - \sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}]} \frac{\Delta \tilde{W}_c(\tau, \rho, z')}{4\pi \sqrt{\rho^2 + (z - z')^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where  $\Delta \tilde{W}_c(\tau, \rho, z')$  represents independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance  $2\pi\rho\Delta\rho\Delta z'\Delta\tau$ , corresponding to the partitioning steps for radial distance  $\Delta\rho$ , height  $\Delta z'$ , and time  $\Delta\tau$ , respectively. Eq. (57) forms the basis for numerically simulating the cumulative potential  $\Theta$ . This potential is computed as a weighted sum of independent Gaussian random variables, enabling us to study the effects of colored noise on the particle's localization.

Apart from the physical parameters such as  $\eta$ , the choice of partitioning steps, namely  $\Delta\rho$ ,  $\Delta z'$ , and  $\Delta\tau$ , significantly influences the simulations. Ideally, the partitioning steps should be infinitesimally small to achieve high accuracy. However, smaller partitioning steps demand greater computational resources. In practice, a balance must be struck between computational efficiency and accuracy. In this work, we systematically reduced the partitioning steps until the results reached an acceptable level of accuracy.

By sampling Gaussian random numbers  $\{\Delta \tilde{W}_c(\tau, \rho, z')\}$  over the spacetime of the observable universe and performing the summation, we obtained  $\Theta(t, z)$  for a range of  $(t, z)$  values. Figure 2(a) in the main text was generated using this approach, with the partitioning steps set to  $\Delta t = 0.01$ ,  $\Delta z' = 0.02$ , and  $\Delta \rho = 0.1$ . Other relevant parameters are listed in the main text. Since  $\Theta$  depends on the sampling of random numbers, each simulation run produces different results. To assess convergence with decreasing partitioning steps, we defined the localization extent of the wave function using the inverse participation ratio (IPR), which can be averaged over multiple simulation runs. The averaged IPR is given by  $\text{IPR} = \int dz |\Psi(t_f, z)|^4$ .

Figure 3(a) illustrates the averaged IPR as a function of the number of simulation runs,  $M$ . The results indicate that  $M = 50$  is sufficient to achieve convergence. Figures 3(b), 3(c), and 3(d) show the behavior of the averaged IPR as the partitioning steps are varied. Around  $\Delta\rho = 0.1$ ,  $\Delta z' = 0.02$ , and  $\Delta t = 0.01$ , the IPR is found to converge, demonstrating that these parameter choices are suitable. These values were thus used

to generate Figure 2(b) in the main text.

---

\* [wangpei@zjnu.cn](mailto:wangpei@zjnu.cn)

[1] P. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 115037 (2022).

[2] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields* (Cambridge University Press & Beijing World Publishing Corporation, 2013).