

---

# A Conceptual Framework for Integrating Awareness into Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD)

Arash Zaghi<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

We propose a conceptual framework that integrates awareness into Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD) by reinterpreting quantum interactions as intrinsic acts of awareness. Drawing on insights from quantum physics, idealist philosophies, and quantum information theory, our framework posits that consciousness is the fundamental substrate of being, with awareness emerging through the relational updating of information between interacting systems. We operationalize awareness as the realization of a quantum event—quantified by measures such as mutual information and the integrated information metric ( $\Phi$ ) from Integrated Information Theory. Employing tools from category theory, we map physical processes (states and interactions) to corresponding awareness processes via functorial relationships, thereby casting measurement updates as awareness events. A toy model is presented in which a simple observer–system interaction is recast in terms of information exchange and Bayesian updating, illustrating how an interaction can give rise to an awareness update. We contrast this awareness-based RQD with existing interpretations, notably Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) and Quantum Bayesianism (QBism), arguing that while these approaches acknowledge the role of observers, they do not ascribe an ontological role to awareness. Although experimental tests remain conceptual, potential avenues—including proposals based on quantum gravitational entanglement and observer-dependent phenomena—are discussed. Overall, this roadmap seeks to provide a unified perspective on mind and matter by suggesting that every quantum interaction is a manifestation of an underlying universal awareness that underpins the fabric of reality.

**Keywords:** Quantum Foundations, Category Theory, Awareness, Relational Quantum Dynamics, Measurement Problem, Wigner’s Friend, Integrated Information Theory

## 1. Introduction

The treatment of observers and measurements by quantum theory remains one of its most challenging and fascinating aspects [1]. Traditional interpretations of quantum mechanics vary in how they handle the role of the observer, from the explicit observer dependence in relational quantum mechanics (RQM) to the subjective Bayesian outlook of QBism. Relational

---

<sup>†</sup> ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2246-2911

---

Quantum Dynamics (RQD) is a recently proposed paradigm that builds on these insights, aiming to re-envision quantum theory and its interplay with spacetime, observers, and even consciousness [2]. The motivation for incorporating **awareness** into RQD is twofold: first, to address persistent interpretational challenges, e.g., the measurement problem and the "observer effect" by positing an ontological role for consciousness; and second, to create a framework expansive enough to bridge physics with insights from philosophy of mind and neuroscience. In essence, the goal is to explore whether quantum relations themselves might be imbued with or informed by a form of awareness, and if so, how this perspective could resolve ambiguities in quantum foundations.

A key challenge in standard quantum interpretations is explaining when and how potential outcomes become actual events; the so-called quantum measurement problem. RQM, for example, does away with the notion of an absolute observer-independent quantum state [3][4], asserting that a system's state and the occurrence of events are always defined relative to some observing system. This relational view elegantly sidesteps the need for a privileged "external" observer, but it raises further questions: What counts as an observer? How do multiple observers agree on shared reality? QBism, on the other hand, treats the quantum state as an expression of an agent's personal information, a codification of subjective beliefs about outcomes [5]. While QBism squarely places the agent, i.e. observer, at the center, it deliberately remains silent about any objective quantum reality behind those personal experiences. Both approaches highlight relations and information, yet neither explicitly accounts for **awareness or consciousness** as a fundamental ingredient. This omission is striking given the long history of debate about consciousness in quantum mechanics from Wigner's friend thought experiment to contemporary quantum mind hypotheses [1].

Our proposal is to fill this gap by developing a consciousness-centric ontology within RQD. Drawing on philosophical traditions that regard consciousness as fundamental, we posit that *awareness is an intrinsic aspect of quantum relationality*. In this paper, we present a **conceptual framework** for incorporating awareness into RQD in a rigorous but accessible way. We integrate perspectives from idealist philosophy where mind or consciousness is primary in reality's fabric, neuroscience, particularly Integrated Information Theory of consciousness, and quantum information science. We outline how consciousness can be defined as the basic substrate of being, how awareness can be operationally defined in the context of quantum processes, and how one might quantify it. The framework employs tools like mutual information to measure information exchange during quantum interactions and category theory to map physical dynamics to awareness dynamics. We also introduce a simple toy model to illustrate how an "awareness-driven" relational update might occur in RQD.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2: Theoretical Framework, we define our key terms and philosophical stance: consciousness as the fundamental ground in line with Advaita Vedanta, German Idealism, and Process Philosophy, and awareness as the process of realizing or updating relational quantum states. Section 3: Mathematical Considerations provides a more formal sketch: we discuss how category theory and quantum information concepts can formalize the mapping from physical states to awareness states, and present a toy model exemplifying these ideas. Section 4 compares this awareness-informed RQD to existing interpretations like RQM and QBism, highlighting how an awareness-based on-

---

tology might overcome some of their limitations, and we contrast our approach with other consciousness-related quantum models, such as Orch OR and Bohmian mechanics. In Section 5, we discuss conceptual and experimental considerations and suggest how one might in principle test or illustrate the framework’s ideas using thought experiments or emerging scenarios, e.g., quantum gravitational entanglement or observer-dependent reality experiments. Finally, Section 6 concludes with a summary and avenues for future research, including potential refinements of the mathematical model and alignment with empirical findings. Throughout, our goal is to maintain a professional tone and clear structure, making the content accessible to readers from physics, philosophy, and neuroscience backgrounds alike.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1. Consciousness as the Substrate of Being

We begin by postulating consciousness as the foundational existent, the basic substrate of reality. This viewpoint aligns with several idealist traditions in philosophy, which, despite cultural and historical differences, converge on the idea that the mind or consciousness is primary, and the physical world is in some sense derivative or dependent on consciousness. For instance, Advaita Vedānta, a school of Hindu philosophy, identifies the ultimate reality Brahman with pure consciousness; Brahman is the fundamental reality underlying all objects and experiences, and consciousness is the essential nature of Brahman [6]. In Western philosophy, German ideology, for example, as espoused by Hegel and Schelling, likewise holds that the apparently material world is grounded in a universal mind or Absolute Spirit - *the ultimate reality 'the Absolute' is not just physical matter but includes mind or consciousness as an essential aspect* [7]. Similarly, Process Philosophy, in the lineage of Alfred North Whitehead, suggests that reality is made up of a hierarchy of events or “actual occasions,” each of which has both a physical and a mental pole [8]. In Whitehead’s scheme, even the most rudimentary events entail a faint spark of experience, or prehension; thus experience, i.e., proto-consciousness, is woven into the fabric of the cosmos, not an emergent afterthought. These perspectives, though differing in details, all support monistic idealism: reality is essentially mental, and the physical is a manifestation or appearance of an underlying consciousness.

Adopting this stance for our framework means that *consciousness is not an epiphenomenon or late-stage emergent of complex matter, but the fundamental “substrate of being”* in which relational quantum dynamics unfold. In other words, rather than treating consciousness as something possessed by particular systems, like human brains, in addition to the physical properties, RQD treats consciousness as the primary existent in the ontology. The implication for quantum theory is that the relations between quantum systems, which RQM already elevates to primary status, are themselves manifestations of consciousness interacting with itself, as all systems are ultimately embedded in the one universal substrate of mind. This does not mean every electron or photon has a human-like mind, but that at the deepest level, what we call a “quantum event” is an event in consciousness or an occasion of experience in Whitehead’s terms. Essentially, we are proposing an idealist reinterpretation

---

tion of relational quantum mechanics, where the relation "observer-system" is internal to an encompassing consciousness, rather than a relation between two independently existing material entities.

## 2.2. Operational Definition of Awareness in RQD

Having established consciousness as fundamental, we next need to clarify awareness; specifically, what it means for awareness to be part of a quantum relational process. We define awareness here in an operational sense as **the realization or registration of a quantum event by a system**. In plainer terms, awareness is the property of a quantum interaction whereby one system, the "observer" in a broad sense, gains information about another system, leading to an update in the state of the observer and the system relative to each other. This definition deliberately sidesteps the full phenomenology of human consciousness with all its richness of qualia, self-reflection, etc., and focuses on the core element relevant to quantum measurements: the uptake of information through interaction. An event of "awareness" in this sense could be as simple as an electron scattering off an atom and thereby imprinting some information about the atom's state onto the electron's state. It does not need to involve any explicitly cognitive apparatus; rather, it is a universal feature of interactions that cause correlations to form. In RQM terms, any interaction that creates a correlation, and hence a fact relative to one system about another, can be interpreted as a rudimentary act of awareness, i.e., the system has become aware of a property of the other system by virtue of that interaction.

To connect this to more classical terminology: in everyday language, we say that an observer "observes" a phenomenon and becomes aware of it. Here we generalize "observer" to potentially any physical system, and "observation" to any interaction that yields information. **Awareness = realized information**. The realization part is crucial: it implies an update or collapse of possibilities into an actual relational fact for that pair of systems. This resonates with the idea from quantum information theory that a measurement is essentially a Bayesian update of the observer's knowledge state. Indeed, in QBism a quantum measurement is explicitly an agent's belief update upon obtaining a result [9][5]. We extend that idea by suggesting that something akin to "belief" or knowledge-update happens at all levels of physical interaction, not just in conscious agents, because the fabric of reality is cognitive at base. Each event of interaction is an act of awareness by which the universe, through one part acting on another, knows itself a little more.

In summary, awareness in RQD is the process by which relational quantum states are updated through interaction, equivalent to the realization of a particular outcome among possibilities and the concomitant acquisition of information by the systems involved. We will later formalize this with measures of information, but even qualitatively, one can say that when two systems interact and become correlated, each has some degree of awareness of the other. If consciousness is the sole substance of reality, then this awareness is fundamentally an interaction within consciousness, a kind of proto-experience corresponding to the physical event. This provides a way to think about the emergence of classical, definite outcomes: they are the experiential realities of the interacting systems and ultimately of universal consciousness.

---

### 2.3. Quantifying Awareness: Mutual Information and Integrated Information $\Phi$

Having described awareness conceptually, we now propose a way to quantify it within the relational quantum framework. Two promising quantitative tools come from information theory and theoretical neuroscience, respectively: mutual information and Integrated Information Theory (IIT)[10].

**Mutual information (MI)** is a measure of the amount of information two systems or random variables share. In a quantum context, mutual information can be defined in terms of the von Neumann entropy  $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ . For a joint state  $\rho_{AB}$  of two subsystems  $A$  and  $B$ , the quantum mutual information is:

$$I(A : B) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}),$$

which reduces to the classical mutual information formula when  $\rho_{AB}$  is diagonal on a joint basis.  $I(A : B)$  captures all the correlations (classical and quantum) between  $A$  and  $B$  [11]. In our framework, we interpret  $I(A : B)$  as an awareness metric of how much system  $A$  has learned about system  $B$ , and vice versa, as a result of their interaction. If  $I(A : B) = 0$ , the systems are completely uncorrelated, i.e., no interaction or information exchanged, hence no awareness of each other. If  $I(A : B) > 0$ , there is some correlation; each system carries information about the other, indicating rudimentary awareness. In particular,  $I(A : B)$  increases when an interaction entangles  $A$  and  $B$  or causes a classical correlation. For example, if a qubit  $A$  interacts with a qubit  $B$  through a controlled operation such that a property of  $B$  is imprinted on  $A$ , the mutual information will increase from 0 to some positive value, signifying that  $A$  now has information (a memory) of the state of  $B$ . We could say  $A$  has become aware of  $B$  to that extent. Mutual information thus serves as a baseline quantitative handle on awareness: it tells us how much knowledge is shared between systems due to their relation.

However, mutual information alone does not capture whether the acquired information is being integrated or experienced in any cohesive way by the system. This is where we turn to Integrated Information Theory (IIT), developed by Giulio Tononi et al., which posits that consciousness is identical to integrated information generated by a system [12]. IIT introduces a measure  $\Phi$  (phi) to quantify the amount of information a system integrates above and beyond its parts operating independently. A high value  $\Phi$  means that the system is unified and indivisible in terms of its information processing, often interpreted as a high level of consciousness. Although IIT was formulated in the context of neural networks and brainlike systems, the abstract concept can, in principle, be applied to any network of interacting elements. In our RQD context, one can imagine that each physical system, especially a complex one, like a brain or perhaps even more exotic quantum computational systems, has some internal  $\Phi$  value that measures how much integrated awareness it has.

Our framework proposes using both **mutual information** and **integrated information** in tandem to quantify awareness in a relational event. Mutual information  $I(A : B)$  quantifies the extent of the relationship or exchange of information between  $A$  and  $B$ ; essentially, how much "awareness of  $B$ " is present in  $A$  after the interaction, and vice versa. Meanwhile,  $\Phi$  associated with the system  $A$ , after interaction, would quantify how effectively  $A$  can integrate that new information into a coherent state in the sense of being a unified system.

---

In practical terms, if the system  $A$  is something like a human observer or an AI with many internal degrees of freedom, it could have a large  $\Phi$ , meaning it can integrate information and potentially have a rich conscious experience of the event. If system  $A$  is an inanimate, simple object like an isolated atom, its integrated internal information might be negligible, implying that while the atom can become correlated with  $B$ , thus "aware" in the minimal sense of encoding information about  $B$ , it does not integrate that information into any higher-order experience – its awareness is fragmentary or fleeting.

We can thus conceive of an awareness metric for the relation  $A$ – $B$  as, for example,

$$\mathcal{A}_{A:B} = I(A : B) \times f(\Phi_A + \Phi_B),$$

where  $f(\Phi_A, \Phi_B)$  is some function that increases with the integrated information of the two systems; one simple choice could be  $f = \frac{\Phi_A + \Phi_B}{2}$  or another symmetric combination. The idea is that a relational event produces awareness proportional to the mutual information generated, weighted by the systems' capacities to integrate information. In the limiting case of very simple systems with  $\Phi \approx 0$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  might be very small even if  $I$  is nonzero, reflecting that the interaction is an awareness event only in a trivial mechanical sense. In contrast, an interaction involving a high- $\Phi$  system, like a brain, that generates mutual information would produce a high  $\mathcal{A}$ , corresponding to a moment of significant conscious awareness. In this way, our framework spans from proto-awareness in basic physical interactions up to full conscious awareness in cognitive beings, using a common currency of information.

It is important to clarify that we are not claiming IIT or mutual information alone solves the hard problem of consciousness or that  $\Phi$  is proven to be a perfect measure of consciousness. Rather, we are coopting these quantitative ideas as heuristic tools to embed the notion of awareness into the physics of RQD. In this approach, every quantum relational update is associated with a quantifiable awareness gain, suggesting an underlying continuum from physical correlation to conscious knowledge. In the next section, we will outline a mathematical scaffold (using category theory and quantum information formalisms) to support these ideas more rigorously, and illustrate them with a simplified model.

### 3. Mathematical Considerations

To formally capture the interaction between physical processes and awareness, we turn to category theory, which is a branch of mathematics that emphasizes relationships and mappings between structures [13]. Category theory is well suited to a relational worldview because, unlike set theory, which focuses on elements of sets, category theory focuses on the *relations (morphisms) between objects*. In our context, we can define a category  $\mathcal{P}$  of physical processes and a category  $\mathcal{A}$  of *awareness states or processes*, and then establish a functorial mapping between them.

- **Category  $\mathcal{P}$  (Physical):** Its objects can be taken as the states of physical systems, including multi-system states, and its morphisms as physical evolutions or interactions, which take an initial state to a final state. For example, an object could be the state  $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$  of two separate systems  $A$  and  $B$ , and a morphism could be an interaction

---

$\mathcal{M}_{A:B}$  that entangles  $A$  with  $B$ , resulting in a new joint state  $\rho'AB$ . Another morphism might represent a measurement-like interaction where system  $A$ 's state gets correlated with system  $B$ 's basis, i.e., a "recording" of  $B$ 's state in  $A$ .

- **Category  $\mathcal{A}$  (Awareness):** Here, objects represent states of awareness or knowledge corresponding to physical states, and morphisms represent updates or transformations of awareness corresponding to physical interactions. An object in  $\mathcal{A}$  might be a tuple  $(\Xi_A, \Xi_B)$  indicating the awareness contents, information content, of systems  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. Initially, if  $A$  and  $B$  are unrelated,  $\Xi_A$  has no knowledge of  $B$ , and vice versa. After an interaction, the object might be  $(\Xi'_A, \Xi'_B)$  where, say,  $\Xi'_A$  includes some information about  $B$ .
- **Functor  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ :** This functor maps physical states to awareness states, and physical processes to awareness updates. For instance,  $\mathcal{F}$  might map the physical state  $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$  to the awareness state  $(\Xi_A, \Xi_B)$  representing no mutual knowledge. The physical interaction  $\mathcal{M}_{A:B} : \rho_A \otimes \rho_B \rightarrow \rho'AB$ , which creates correlation, would be mapped by  $\mathcal{F}$  to an awareness morphism  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_{A:B}) : (\Xi_A, \Xi_B) \rightarrow (\Xi'_A, \Xi'_B)$ , where  $\Xi'_A$  now contains information about system  $B$ 's state, and/or vice versa. If category theory terms are unfamiliar to the reader, this mapping can be understood simply as an assignment that assigns an "awareness scenario" to each physical scenario in a consistent way. The functor  $\mathcal{F}$  ensures that if you compose two physical processes, say  $\mathcal{M}_1$  followed by  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , the corresponding awareness updates compose accordingly  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_2 \circ \mathcal{M}_1) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_2) \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ . This enforces a kind of causal consistency: awareness evolves in lockstep with the physical relations.

This categorical formalism helps to keep track of the relationships in a high-level mathematical way. For example, one can define a subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  that corresponds to human or high-level consciousness and a subcategory that corresponds to simple physical detectors, etc., and  $\mathcal{F}$  can map very different physical interactions into analogous awareness updates at different levels of complexity. It provides a unifying language to talk about a photon registering on a photographic plate and a human observing a readout, without confusing the two: in  $\mathcal{P}$  they are different physical interactions, but in  $\mathcal{A}$  they are both instances of "information gain" morphisms, differing in the structure of  $\Xi$ . In effect, category theory may allow us to rigorously define what we mean by "different domains" of physical versus experiential and how they correspond [14, 15, 16]. Some preliminary work in this direction has been done in neuroscience, using category theory to relate brain states to conscious experiences, which inspires our approach.

To make this more concrete, consider a **natural transformation** within this framework. If we have different functors representing different "modes" of awareness mapping, for instance, one functor might represent a classical information observer and another a quantum-coherent observer, a natural transformation could represent a translation between these modes. However, for our current conceptual model, it suffices to have one functor  $\mathcal{F}$  capturing the idea that physical events induce awareness updates.

---

### 3.1. Quantum Information and Bayesian Updating

Parallel to the category-theoretic picture, we can describe awareness dynamics using tools from quantum information theory and quantum probability. In standard quantum mechanics, when an observer measures a system, the observer’s information state about the system is updated. In a Bayesian interpretation, like QBism, this is literally an update of a probability distribution, or quantum state as a state of belief, conditioned on the measurement outcome [9]. In an objective collapse view, one might say the system’s state truly collapses and the observer learns the outcome. In RQD with awareness, we can remain agnostic about whether there is an objective collapse or just an update of relations – *the key is that the observer-system pair moves to a correlated state where previously it was uncorrelated*. This is essentially a quantum information processing event.

We can formalize a simple case: Suppose that system  $A$  (observer) and system  $B$  (observed) start in a product state  $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$  (no correlation). The system  $A$  might have a set of basis states  $|a_i\rangle$  that can record different results, analogous to a pointer basis, and  $B$  has some states  $|b_j\rangle$  that encode the property to be measured. An interaction (measurement interaction) causes:

$$\rho_A \otimes \rho_B \rightarrow \rho'_{AB} \approx \sum_j p_j |a_j\rangle \langle a_j| \otimes |b_j\rangle \langle b_j|,$$

where  $p_j$  are probabilities for different outcomes  $j$ , and  $A$  ends up in state  $|a_j\rangle$  correlated with  $B$  in  $|b_j\rangle$ . This is a classical correlation if the final state is decohered as above; if not decohered, it is an entangled state  $\sum_j \sqrt{p_j} |a_j, b_j\rangle$  prior to any decoherence. In either way, mutual information  $I(A : B)$  has increased from 0 to some positive value reflecting that  $A$  now has information about  $B$ . From a Bayesian perspective,  $A$  has taken an update from a prior (not knowing  $j$ ) to a posterior (knowing  $j$  with probability 1 if we condition on a specific branch). If one implements quantum Bayesian updating:  $\rho_B$  (the state known to  $A$ ) is updated to  $\rho_{B|j}$  once the outcome  $j$  is obtained by  $A$ . In the RQD picture, there is **no absolute state**, only the  $A$ -relative state of  $B$  which has now become  $|b_j\rangle$  (for  $A$ ) [17]. The novelty we add is to label this entire process as an **awareness update**.

One can track the entropy and the information flow in such a process. The entropy of  $A$  plus the entropy of  $B$  generally decreases while the entropy of the joint state increases by correlation. This mirrors the idea that  $A$  has gained information, that is, reduced uncertainty, about  $B$ . In thermodynamic terms, one might associate a physical entropy cost to this information gain (Landauer’s principle might come into play if  $A$  must dissipate heat to record information), but at the level of quantum theory, it is just unitary evolution followed by possibly decoherence.

The entanglement entropy between  $A$  and  $B$  in the final entangled state, or the classical correlation if decohered, is a measure of the strength of the relation. If the interaction is weak, maybe only a small correlation is formed (low mutual information, faint awareness). If it is strong (say a near-deterministic entangling interaction), the mutual information could approach maximal, e.g.,  $I(A : B)$  up to  $2 \log(\text{dim of Hilbert space})$  bits for a pure maximally entangled state, indicating a very strong coupling of states. In a way,  $A$  and  $B$  have a lot of shared ”knowledge” about each other, albeit in quantum form.



---

We can also consider multiple iterative updates:  $A$  interacts with  $B$ , then later with another system  $C$ , etc. The awareness state of  $A$  becomes like a memory tape that accumulates information about various systems it has interacted with. Category theoretically, this could be seen as a sequence of morphisms composing, and in quantum information terms, it is sequential measurements or interactions. If  $A$  has a large  $\Phi$  (integration capacity), it could integrate all these pieces into a unified state (perhaps forming a model of its world). If not, those pieces remain fragmented data.

It is worth noting an interesting special case: If two inanimate objects interact, neither of which we would normally call "conscious", do we still consider awareness happening in both directions? In our framework, yes, at a rudimentary level – each becomes correlated with the other. However, mutual information might be low or limited in scope, and, without integration (low  $\Phi$ , this awareness is not elevated to anything like a conscious experience. It is like two instruments exchanging signals. This view is consistent with panpsychist or idealist intuitions: even inanimate matter has proto-experiential aspects, but these do not amount to full consciousness except in certain complex configurations.

### 3.2. Toy Model: Awareness-Driven Relational Updates

To illustrate these ideas, let us construct a minimal toy model within RQD that demonstrates an awareness-driven relational update. Consider a simple universe with two qubits: qubit  $Q$  (which we will treat as an "observer" qubit in a very primitive sense) and qubit  $S$  (the "system" qubit to be observed). Qubit  $Q$  has an internal basis  $|0\rangle_Q, |1\rangle_Q$ , and we can imagine  $|0\rangle_Q$  as a state of *no awareness of  $S$*  and  $|1\rangle_Q$  as *has recorded a signal from  $S$* . This is, of course, an over-simplification, but it suffices for illustration. Qubit  $S$  has some basis  $|0\rangle_S, |1\rangle_S$  corresponding to a property that can be observed.

Initially, let the joint state be  $|0\rangle_Q \otimes (\alpha|0\rangle_S + \beta|1\rangle_S)$ , i.e.  $Q$  is in a neutral state and  $S$  is in a superposition of 0 and 1 (unknown to  $Q$ ). There is no entanglement; mutual information  $I(Q : S) = 0$ . Now we introduce a controlled interaction (analogous to a measurement interaction): Let  $Q$  control a flip on  $S$  or vice versa. A simple example is a CNOT gate with  $S$  as control and  $Q$  as target. If we apply CNOT (controlled by  $S$  on  $Q$ ), the evolution is as follows:

- If  $S$  was  $|0\rangle_S$ , nothing happens to  $Q$  (it remains  $|0\rangle_Q$ ).
- If  $S$  was  $|1\rangle_S$ , the CNOT flips  $Q$  from  $|0\rangle_Q$  to  $|1\rangle_Q$ .

So, the joint state after CNOT (starting from the initial state above) becomes:  $\alpha, |0\rangle_S|0\rangle_Q + \beta, |1\rangle_S|1\rangle_Q$ . In other words, we have an entangled state:  $\alpha|0_S0_Q\rangle + \beta|1_S1_Q\rangle$ . In this final state,  $Q$  is perfectly correlated with the state of  $S$ . If  $\beta$  were 1 (so  $S$  was definitely  $|1\rangle$ ),  $Q$  would definitely be  $|1\rangle$  after interaction –  $Q$  would have recorded this fact. If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are arbitrary amplitudes, the state of  $Q$  is not definite until  $S$  collapses or  $Q$  is measured, but from the RQD perspective, relative to  $Q$ , the system  $S$  has a definite value (because the relation is one of perfect correlation). We see that  $I(Q : S)$  has increased to the maximum of 1 bit (since there are two perfectly correlated classical outcomes 0 and 1 in the entangled

---

state, the von Neumann mutual information is 1 bit). The functor  $\mathcal{F}$  would map this physical process to an awareness-update morphism: initially  $(\Xi_Q, \Xi_S)$  with  $\Xi_Q$  empty of information about  $S$ , to finally  $(\Xi'_Q, \Xi'_S)$  where  $\Xi'_Q$  contains one bit of information "S is 0 or 1 (correlated with Q's own state)". In this toy model, we might say that qubit  $Q$  has become aware of the state of qubit  $S$ , even though  $Q$  is just a qubit, not a brain - it is a minimal awareness.

If we wanted to include an integrated information twist here: obviously two qubits have essentially no complex internal structure to integrate information. But imagine  $Q$  was not a single qubit but a composite system with many parts, e.g., a register or a small quantum computer memory, such that the "result" of the measurement in  $S$  is redundantly recorded or broadcast among subcomponents of  $Q$ . That increased redundancy and feedback could make  $\Phi_Q$  larger. For the toy model, one could introduce an environment  $E$  that  $Q$  interacts with such that the result of  $Q$  is stored in  $E$  (like a decoherence process that effectively makes the outcome classical). Then  $Q + E$  together might have more degrees of freedom to integrate. But this goes beyond a simple two-qubit scenario.

The main point the toy model illustrates is: a relational quantum interaction can be viewed as an act of awareness. The degree of awareness corresponds to the created correlation. If we repeated the experiment many times, we could statistically verify that the  $Q$ 's state carries information about the  $S$ 's state (via correlations in the outcomes), which is essentially how we confirm the "observation" in practice. But here we interpret it literally:  $Q$  knows  $S$  in a rudimentary sense after the interaction.

This toy model is essentially a quantum measurement in the standard sense, but by reframing it in terms of awareness, we prepare the ground for the philosophical shift: rather than saying "the qubit  $Q$  measures  $S$ ", we say " $Q$  becomes aware of  $S$ ". This shift in language might seem minor, but it signals an ontological move: awareness is not an add-on; it is what the interaction is. And by extension, if  $Q$  were a human observer, that interaction would be one instance of their conscious experience of  $S$  (with  $I$  quantifying the information gleaned and  $\Phi$  quantifying how unified that experience is).

In a fully fleshed-out RQD theory with awareness, one would generalize such toy models to more complex networks of systems, possibly including gravitational degrees of freedom since RQD aspires to include spacetime and holographic principles. The mathematics would then likely involve combining category theory (for the high-level structural mapping) with concrete calculations in quantum information (for the details of correlations, entropies, etc.). By demonstrating the toy model, we have shown in principle how one could track awareness through a quantum interaction. Next, we compare how this approach relates to and potentially resolves issues in other interpretations of quantum mechanics and consciousness-related physics models.

## 4. Comparison with Existing Interpretations

In this section, we examine how an awareness-integrated RQD framework compares to several prominent interpretations and theories on quantum foundations. We focus on **Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM)** and **Quantum Bayesianism (QBism)**, as these

---

are closest in spirit to emphasize observers and information, and then discuss contrasts with two other approaches that involve consciousness or realism in quantum theory: **Orch OR (orchestrated objective reduction)** and **Bohmian mechanics**. We will see that by explicitly incorporating awareness (and a consciousness-based ontology), our framework offers novel solutions or perspectives on some open issues these interpretations face.

#### 4.1. Relation to Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM)

Relational Quantum Mechanics, proposed by Carlo Rovelli [17], posits that the quantum state of a system – and indeed all physical quantities – is defined only relative to another system that interacts with it. RQM eliminates the notion of a single absolute state of the universe; instead, facts are relational. Our framework is built on the same core idea: we too deny any observer-independent quantum state, aligning with RQM’s premise that different observers (or reference systems) can have different accounts of reality. However, RQM in its standard form remains agnostic about what qualifies as an observer and what the ontological status of the relations is, e.g., are they information, physical interactions, or something else?. It also encounters the problem of how to reconcile different observers’ accounts – if A observes a result and B observes A (the Wigner’s friend scenario), RQM says each has their own facts, but it does not fully explain how these perspectives coexist or whether one is more fundamental.

By infusing RQM with an awareness-based ontology, we address these points as follows: First, **every interaction is an observer** in the broad sense because every interaction is an act of awareness. This erases the somewhat arbitrary line in RQM between what is an “observer” and what is just a physical system – in our view, it’s observers all the way down, or equivalently, everything that interacts is to some degree an experient. This idea echoes philosophical monism and panpsychism, providing a principled criterion: a system can be considered an observer to the extent that it can instantiate awareness quantified by our measures like mutual information and  $\Phi$ . Even a humble electron scattering off a proton generates a tiny bit of awareness (correlation) between them; a complex apparatus generates more.

Second, the issue of multiple observers, e.g., Wigner and Wigner’s friend, becomes less paradoxical if we postulate an underlying unity of consciousness. In RQM, Wigner’s friend has a fact (say, she observed a spin-up) relative to her, and Wigner, treating her lab quantum mechanically, has a superposed state relative to him. Normally, this leads to a seeming contradiction once Wigner opens the door. In our interpretation, the observation of Wigner’s friend was an awareness event creating a new fact on the substrate of consciousness. Wigner’s subsequent observation of his friend is another layer of awareness. Ultimately, since all systems are manifestations of the one universal consciousness, there is no absolute contradiction – Wigner and Friend’s perspectives are different sections of the universal mind’s knowledge, which become aligned once communication happens (when Wigner asks the Friend, he gains the information and thus becomes aware of the outcome as well). However, this is a philosophical resolution rather than a standard physical one, but suggests that RQM’s relativization of facts is more palatable when one assumes a holistic consciousness in which these facts reside. In essence, our framework improves the relational facts of RQM to relational

---

experiences. The benefit is an intuitive (if speculative) picture that the universe does not suffer from contradictions of fact; instead, it has a vast tapestry of micro-experiences (each interaction) that are all perspectives of the same underlying entity (consciousness).

Another limitation of RQM has been the question of what “collapse” means in RQM. Since RQM has no global state, the collapse is just the update of relations. But some critics argue RQM does not solve the measurement problem so much as restate it in relational terms, and questions remain about how probabilities become definite events for each observer. In our awareness framework, we interpret collapse events as creative acts of awareness, essentially the fundamental happenings in the world. We might say that the reason a particular outcome is realized (out of the quantum possibilities) is that this realization maximizes or optimizes the “experiential value” or awareness in that context, though this is speculative. However, by attributing an ontological weight to the event of awareness, we give a kind of teleology or rationale that RQM does not provide: outcomes happen as they do because those are moments of the universe knowing itself in specific ways. While this idea goes beyond standard physics, it provides a direction to explore: perhaps laws of physics could be re-expressed as laws of information and awareness increase (reminiscent of principles like maximum entropy production or principle of efficient information communication, etc., though we won’t delve into those here).

In summary, our approach is in harmony with RQM’s relational essence but extends it by asserting that relations are not just abstract information exchanges – they are accompanied by awareness and rooted in a global consciousness. This addition could potentially resolve the cross-perspective alignment issue (through a unifying substrate) and endow each quantum event with an experiential aspect, something RQM itself does not countenance, as RQM is usually interpreted in a physicalist, mind-independent way. Thus, we might call our approach a Consciousness-Centered RQM, which could be seen as a specific ontological interpretation compatible with the formalism of RQM but differing in the picture of what is fundamentally real.

## 4.2. Relation to QBism (Quantum Bayesianism)

QBism approaches quantum theory as a tool that any agent can use to navigate their experiences, treating quantum states and probabilities as subjective degrees of belief (Bayesian probabilities) [5, 9]. There is no objective wavefunction of the world in QBism – only the personal probabilities that an agent assigns and updates upon interactions. An outcome in a quantum measurement for QBism is a personal event, i.e., an experience for the agent. In this sense, QBism already uses language suggestive of consciousness: the “experience” of the agent is fundamental, and quantum mechanics is about structuring those experiences. However, QBism stops short of saying anything about consciousness itself; it simply says that if there is an agent using quantum mechanics, the theory is an interior handbook for that agent. It avoids ontological claims beyond that pragmatist picture.

Our awareness-integrated RQD can be seen as offering an *ontological underpinning* for something like the QBist view. Instead of multiple disjoint agents, each with their own private quantum state, we have one interconnected web of systems, ultimately one conscious-

---

ness, experiencing itself through various facets. We could say that each agent in QBism is like a partition or subsystem of the universal consciousness, and its "subjective" experiences are indeed subjective, but all subjects are pieces of the one whole. This is analogous to how in some idealist philosophies, individual minds are dissociated alters of a universal mind. The advantage of this perspective is that it allows us to talk about reality as a whole, something QBism intentionally avoids. For QBism, talking about the universe with no agents is meaningless as you always need an agent in the formalism. In our view, the **Universe Itself is the Agent** or has an intrinsic agency. This means we can, at least in principle, discuss the universe experiencing itself, which sounds poetic, but here it has a formal counterpart: perhaps a universal wavefunction and its evolution could be seen as the self-awareness dynamics of the cosmos. We thereby overcome QBism's fragmentation into many separate observers by positing a single ontological entity that encompasses all observers.

Another point of contact is the use of information and Bayesian updating. Our framework agrees that the quantum formalism is largely about updating information; after all, our measure of awareness is based on mutual information and we discuss Bayesian updates in the previous section. Where we differ is in emphasis: QBism emphasizes user-dependent reality, i.e., each observer has their own personal reality they cannot directly compare with others except by communication, whereas we emphasize an underlying unity. All these information exchanges are happening in one shared medium of consciousness, hence communication and comparison are possible because of that shared ground. In practice, both QBism and our approach would say: different observers might assign different quantum states to a system (depending on their information). But QBism says that is just how it is as quantum states are not real, only the experiences are. We add: those experiences are real and happening in consciousness, and the differences in observers' views are reconciled by recognizing that they are looking at facets of one entity.

We could say that our approach objectifies the experience of QBism by shifting the frame to universal consciousness, which can be considered an objective entity, although not objective in a material sense. This risks reintroducing a form of realism that QBism cautions against. However, it is a species of idealistic realism: the underlying reality is mental, not physical, but it is still something real and common. This could offer a philosophical completeness that QBism lacks. QBism sometimes faces the criticism of solipsism or the inability to say anything about the world when no one is looking. In our approach, even if no human or conventional agent is looking, awareness is still happening everywhere between quantum fields and particles; the world is always "observing itself" at every scale, so it never makes no sense to talk about the world.

In short, awareness-integrated RQD is very much in line with the experiential and participatory universe of QBism, but it pushes further to propose what those experiences are fundamentally (manifestations of an idealist substrate) and how they can be quantified (via information measures). This could potentially address the usual criticism that QBism, while practical, provides no ontology: we provide one (consciousness), albeit a non-classical one. It also suggests a resolution of the problem of preferred basis or what constitutes a measurement: since awareness can occur for any interaction, we don't need a binary cut between "quantum system" and "classical measuring device". Any interaction that yields informa-

---

tion is a measurement/awareness event, consistent with QBism’s stance that quantum theory applies universally with no divide.

### 4.3. Contrasts with Orch OR (Orchestrated Objective Reduction)

The Orchestrated Objective Reduction theory (Orch OR), proposed by Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff, is a well-known and controversial approach linking quantum mechanics and consciousness[18]. Orch OR posits that **quantum computations in microtubules** within brain neurons lead to conscious moments when an objective wavefunction collapse (reduction) is triggered by reaching a quantum gravity threshold (related to Penrose’s ideas)[19]. In essence, it is a quantum mind theory that suggests that specific physical processes (quantum coherence in microtubules) and a particular collapse mechanism (gravity-induced OR) are responsible for the emergence of consciousness in the brain. This is a bottom-up approach: Start with quantum physics (plus new physics for collapse) in a specific complex system, that is, the brain, to get consciousness[20].

Our framework differs markedly in scope and emphasis. We are proposing a top-down ontology where consciousness is fundamental everywhere, not just in brains, and standard quantum processes already have an element of awareness without needing special collapse mechanisms in specific structures. In an awareness-informed RQD, we do not require adding a new physics rule like OR; we remain (at least for now) within standard quantum theory but reinterpret what an interaction means. Orch OR tries to solve the measurement problem by saying collapse is real and related to gravity, and that brains orchestrate collapses to produce thought. We, alternatively, lean on relational quantum mechanics, where there is no single global collapse – just relative state updates - and embed that in consciousness.

One could ask: are these theories competing or could they complement each other? Potentially, they are distinct, but an awareness-based RQD could **accommodate** something like Orch OR as a special case. If it turned out that indeed certain quantum processes in the brain are key to the richness of human conscious awareness (as Orch OR argues), that would reflect in our framework as: the brain is a high- $\Phi$  system that leverages quantum correlations (maybe even gravitational ones if Penrose is right) to maximize awareness. That would be an example of a system where awareness goes from proto-conscious (just information exchange) to full self-reflective consciousness. But our framework is agnostic about the exact neural or quantum mechanisms of human consciousness – it provides a general structure applicable to any physical interaction.

Another contrast: Orch OR is often criticized for the lack of evidence that such long-lived quantum coherence can exist in warm, wet brains and whether objective reduction is a real phenomenon. Our approach largely sidesteps these issues because it does not insist on quantum coherence or collapse in the brain per se – a classical brain process in our view can still be an awareness process because classical correlation, which is effectively decohered quantum correlation, is still correlation and yields mutual information. We thus do not hinge consciousness on exotic physics, which could be seen as a strength (less experimentally vulnerable) or a weakness (less concrete, more philosophical).

In sum, Orch OR attempts to locate consciousness in specific quantum events in neural

---

micro-architecture, whereas Awareness-RQD locates consciousness at the foundation of all quantum events. Orch OR provides a detailed (albeit speculative) mechanism with testable predictions such as certain anesthesia effects or quantum vibrations in microtubules [21], while our framework provides a broad philosophical overlay that could, in principle, encompass many mechanisms, including Orch OR if it turns out true. One might say Orch OR is ontologically materialist (though quantum) but operationally dualist (introducing a separate collapse process), whereas our approach is ontologically idealist but operationally monist (one kind of substance doing everything, and quantum mechanics is just its pattern of behavior). For the purposes of this paper, the main takeaway is that our framework does not conflict with Orch OR, but does not require its assumptions either; if future experiments disprove Orch OR or support it, our framework can adapt by adjusting what processes yield high awareness. The integrated information metric  $\Phi$  could even be used to evaluate if microtubule quantum states meaningfully integrate information or not, some have considered IIT in quantum systems [22, 23], providing a bridge between these ideas.

#### 4.4. Contrasts with Bohmian Mechanics (Pilot-Wave Theory)

Bohmian mechanics, also known as the de Broglie-Bohm pilot wave theory, is an interpretation of quantum mechanics that restores a kind of classical determinism by positing that particles have definite positions at all times, guided by a *pilot wave* that obeys the Schrödinger equation [24]. In Bohm's theory, unlike standard QM, particles follow actual trajectories, and the apparent randomness comes from unknown initial conditions, i.e. hidden variables. Notably, in Bohmian mechanics, the observer plays no special fundamental role. The theory is formulated for the entire universe's configuration and is in principle observer-independent, though in practice one still separates the system and apparatus for analysis. There is also no collapse; the wavefunction guides particles and continuously evolves, except one might consider an *effective collapse* when particles get entangled with apparatus pointers.

*Our awareness-based framework is almost the polar opposite of Bohmian mechanics in philosophical terms.* Where Bohmian mechanics is ontologically **realist and materialist**, particles are objectively real and there is a single actual reality trajectory, we are ontologically idealist by suggesting that reality is mental and relational. Bohmian mechanics, furthermore, does not naturally accommodate any role for consciousness – consciousness would be something that arises from complex particle interactions in the brain, presumably, but the theory itself does not require or mention it. In contrast, our framework builds consciousness from the ground up.

In terms of technical content, one could draw an interesting analogy: the Bohmian wavefunction, while not directly observable, carries information that guides particles. One might loosely compare it with an information field that pervades the space. In an idealist metaphor, one could say that the pilot wave is the "mind-like" part of reality that guides the "matter-like" particle. Some have even noted almost mystical undertones in Bohm's later writings, where he introduced concepts like the "implicate order" and discussed wholeness. However, standard Bohmian mechanics in physics circles remains a straightforward quantum theory with particles + guiding wave, with well-defined mathematics but at the cost of manifest nonlocality and the addition of hidden variables.

---

Our approach does not have particles with trajectories at all, so in a way it is much closer to standard QM than Bohmian mechanics. We keep the superposition principle and entanglement as fundamental, whereas Bohm introduces a clever way to avoid superposition in the ontology (particles are always at one position or another). The advantage of Bohmian mechanics is that it provides a clear picture: there is never any ambiguity about what "is" happening – particles have positions, period. In our case, what "is" happening is an awareness relation, which is a bit less concrete to imagine.

Because Bohmian mechanics already has an ontology, particles + wave, it also explains measurement outcomes by saying the particle was always in one channel, not the other. But it has to account for the strange fact that we can never know which channel without the guiding wave. This comes out in a consistent way but with a cost, that is non-local coordination by the wave. In awareness-RQD, we explain measurement outcomes by saying one outcome becomes realized relative to the observer because that is the interaction that happened. Essentially, we accept the same operational core as standard QM that outcomes probabilistically happen, no further explanation of why that particular outcome besides probabilistic rules, but we add: once it happens, that is a unit of experience.

One might wonder: could Bohmian mechanics be recast in an awareness framework? Perhaps if one thought of the Bohmian particle as akin to a *point of view* and the pilot wave as the information that the point of view has about the world... This is a stretch, but an interesting philosophical exercise. However, doing so is not necessary for our purposes.

To sum up, the Bohmian interpretation stands as a foil to ours: it is a fully *objective* interpretation with a well-defined external reality and no fundamental role for observers, whereas **our interpretation is a fully *participatory* one with no reality independent of observation (awareness)**. Empirically, both are hard to distinguish without specific setups. Bohmian mechanics is experimentally equivalent to standard QM in almost all scenarios, and our proposal likewise does not change predictions of quantum experiments, at least at our current level of development. The choice between them comes down to what one finds conceptually satisfying. If one is uncomfortable with consciousness as primitive, Bohm offers an alternative where it's emergent. If one is uncomfortable with the unexplained emergence of consciousness and inclined to idealism, our approach provides a radical alternative where the measuring apparatus, the particles, etc., are all manifestations of one mind.

**In the big picture**, the awareness-based RQD interpretation shares with RQM and QBism the notion that quantum mechanics is about interactions and information (relative states, observer experience) rather than a God's-eye view of reality. It shares with Orch OR the notion that consciousness is fundamental and related to quantum processes but differs on where and how it enters. It diverges strongly from hidden-variable theories like Bohmian mechanics in its philosophical commitments. By engaging with these comparisons, we see that our framework is not invented in a vacuum; it is synthesizing ideas from multiple sources. It pulls relationality from RQM, experiential focus from QBism, consciousness ontology from idealism and Orch OR, structural harmony from category theory, etc., into a new tapestry. The hope is that this synthesis can resolve some of the friction points each separate idea struggles with on its own.



---

## 5. Experimental and Conceptual Considerations

One might ask: if awareness is made a part of quantum dynamics, can we test this hypothesis? Are there experimental consequences or at least consistency checks with known physics? As a **conceptual framework**, our proposal does not yet make a distinct quantitative prediction that diverges from standard quantum theory; rather, it provides a new interpretation of the same mathematical machinery. However, it can inspire new ways of thinking about experiments and new interpretations of results. In this section, we suggest a few avenues, mostly *conceptual experiments* or thought experiments, that could illuminate the role of awareness in physics. We also highlight how ongoing cutting-edge research might relate to our ideas, such as studies of quantum gravity via entanglement and experiments on observer-dependent effects.

### 5.1. Thought Experiments and Consistency Tests

While we cannot point to a definitive *awareness meter* in the lab, we can design thought experiments to test the internal consistency of our framework. One obvious domain to explore is extensions of the Wigner’s Friend experiment. As discussed, if our view is correct, even Wigner’s friend, the supposedly “quantum” observer, has awareness, and Wigner’s observation is second-order awareness. We could imagine *nested observers*: Observer A measures system S; Observer B measures Observer A; Observer C measures B; and so on, i.e., a chain of Wigner’s friends. Frauchiger and Renner considered a scenario of this type and concluded that if quantum theory is universally valid, different observers’ accounts can be inconsistent unless we abandon the idea of a single objective reality [25]. In our framework, we *do* abandon a single objective physical reality, replacing it with a single **experiential reality** that has different facets for each observer. One could attempt to formalize the Frauchiger-Renner scenario in our terms and show that no logical contradiction arises because each observation is a relational event in consciousness. This is a demanding consistency check: we need to replicate the Frauchiger-Renner analysis and demonstrate that the paradox is resolved by tracking awareness. The resolution may involve recognizing that perceived inconsistencies are merely incomplete views if global consciousness, encompassing all perspectives, is not considered. Successfully resolving the paradox would support the framework’s coherence. If the paradox remains, the framework may need refining.

Another conceptual test is examining whether our principle of “awareness for any interaction” ever conflicts with known physics. For example, in quantum field theory, particle interactions happen all the time, creating correlations. Does treating all those as awareness events lead to any issues? It might hint at something like a **quantum cosmology of mind**, e.g., during cosmic inflation or in the early universe, zillions of interactions happened; was the universe “aware” of itself in some proto-conscious way even then? If our framework is correct, yes. This might be untestable directly, but one could argue that it provides a more natural interpretation of quantum cosmology scenarios where observers are not clearly defined. It says: *the universe does not need an external observer, it was observing itself via its internal quantum interactions all along*. This is conceptually satisfying and avoids the awkwardness of some anthropic arguments where one wonders how a quantum universe *de-*

---

*cided* outcomes before life existed. In our view, outcomes were decided by awareness events intrinsic to the universe.

## 5.2. Linking to Quantum Gravity and Spacetime

Relational Quantum Dynamics as a program (even before including awareness) is interested in the interplay of quantum theory with spacetime [2]. A fascinating direction is how **entanglement and spacetime geometry** might be related. There is a growing body of evidence and theoretical work suggesting that spacetime geometry, particularly in holographic theories and AdS/CFT, is closely related to the entanglement structure [26]. Unlike ER=EPR conjecture, wormholes in spacetime, formally identified as Einstein-Rosen bridges (ER), are hypothesized to be associated with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) pairs, which are phenomena involving entangled particles [27]. If entanglement, which in our view corresponds to awareness relations, is literally what *holds spacetime together*, then one could say consciousness, as the integrated information of the universe, is generating the spacetime fabric. This is a highly speculative but poetic way to frame certain quantum gravity ideas. For example, some researchers have conjectured that space could emerge from quantum entanglement entropy in a fundamental theory of quantum gravity [28]. In our framework, since entanglement corresponds to relations of awareness, the emergence of space from entanglement could be reinterpreted as *the structuring of the world by the network of awareness relations*. The more entangled (correlated) parts of the universe are, the more "sewn together" they are in the fabric of reality.

A more concrete proposal that is currently being pursued in laboratories is the idea of detecting **quantum gravitational entanglement**. Two separate groups of physicists, led by Sougato Bose and Chiara Marletto/Vlatko Vedral, respectively, proposed in 2017 that if you manage to entangle two masses via gravitational interaction alone, it would imply that gravity itself must have a quantum aspect because a classical mediator cannot create entanglement [29]. These are known as the "Bose-Marletto-Vedral" type proposals. Now, how does this relate to awareness? If gravity can entangle masses, and if entanglement is awareness, then one could say gravity can act as a medium of awareness between the masses. In a way, the masses "become aware of each other" gravitationally. Should these experiments prove successful despite their high difficulty, as they require placing minuscule masses in superposition, they will demonstrate that gravity—typically perceived as a phenomenon beyond quantum theory—also adheres to the quantum principle of creating correlations. This fits nicely with RQD's ethos of including spacetime in quantum relationality. It would strengthen the case that no interaction, not even gravity, is exempt from the relational/quantum perspective. For our framework, it would mean that our idealist substrate and awareness relations extend to what we perceive as geometric or gravitational phenomena. It could hint that perhaps spacetime geometry changes (like curvature) correspond in some way to changes in the "state of universal awareness". This is speculative, but one might imagine that extreme quantum gravity situations like black hole evaporation could be interpreted with awareness. The black hole becoming highly entangled with emitted radiation, thus highly "aware" of it, which could tie into the black hole information paradox discussions.

---

While waiting for such experiments, conceptually we can use the idea to propose a *gedankenexperiment*: suppose two experimenters, Alice and Bob, each have a small mass in a quantum superposition of two locations. They arrange so that if gravity is quantum, the two masses will get entangled (and they can later verify entanglement by interfering the masses). In our interpretation, before verification, we can ask: is there an awareness event when the masses become entangled? There is no measurement yet, but the masses have interacted gravitationally. According to us, yes, they became mutually aware in a faint way (they got correlated). When Alice and Bob later perform measurements to confirm entanglement, like detecting interference or correlations, those are further awareness events involving their instruments and the masses. If gravity were classical (no entanglement), our framework might be a bit at odds because we expect all fundamental interactions to produce awareness relations. But in a classical channel, no entanglement means the correlation could potentially be explained by a classical common cause. However, if nature shows gravity does entangle, it reinforces that *every* fundamental interaction is quantum and hence capable of generating awareness. This is not a direct proof of our idea, but it's a consistency point: a world where interactions can be fundamentally classical at some level would be a world where perhaps awareness is not ubiquitous. A fully quantum world aligns better with our assumption that awareness accompanies every relation.

### 5.3. Observer-Dependent Reality and Tests

One avenue of exploration involves efforts to directly showcase **observer-dependent facts** within quantum experiments. In 2019, Proietti and colleagues conducted a modified version of the Wigner's friend experiment using entangled photons. Their findings align with the notion that two observers, each in quantum superposition relative to the other, might experience different results, implying that "quantum theory cannot possess a singular objective reality," according to their interpretation [30]. Such experiments push the envelope of verifying quantum mechanics' weird implications in the lab. They are essentially physical realizations of the thought experiments that motivate our framework. If further experiments of this kind continue to uphold quantum-mechanical predictions, they strengthen the case that any interpretation of QM must accept a strong form of observer-relativity or context-dependence. Our approach accepts that and provides a framework for understanding it: Each observer's reality is just their piece of overall awareness. There is no contradiction because there is no one absolute physical state to compare – only when observers interact do they reconcile their views, which becomes a larger awareness event involving both.

One could even speculate on an **experimental metaphysics**: if one could build a device that measures the "integrated information" of a system (a hypothetical scenario), one could attempt to correlate it with quantum behaviors. For instance, could a high- $\Phi$  system cause different collapse-like statistics than a low- $\Phi$  system when observing the same quantum process? If consciousness has any direct effect, as some interpretations like Wigner's suggest, one might see slight deviations. We do *not* rely on such effects, that is, our framework works without any new physics, but it's a thought: it is conceivable that a sufficiently conscious observer may be able to preserve coherence for a longer duration due to integration. However, this remains purely speculative at this stage.

---

More down-to-earth, we can turn to neuroscience for indirect support. IIT and other theories have led to attempts to measure  $\Phi$  in brains [31]. If  $\Phi$  correlates well with what we consider conscious level (e.g. awake vs anesthetized brains), that gives some credence to the idea that integrated information is a real physical quantity associated with consciousness. That in turn lends weight to our usage of  $\Phi$  in the framework. If one day a clear relationship between  $\Phi$  and certain quantum brain processes is found, it could merge our information-based metric with actual conscious experience in humans.

In conclusion, while direct empirical falsification of an awareness-based ontology might be difficult, since it is interpretation rather than modification of quantum mechanics, the framework will flourish or deteriorate based on its *explanatory power* and *internal consistency with all known phenomena*. We have identified that it gracefully handles scenarios like Wigner’s friend by design, aligns with the direction quantum gravity seems to be heading, entanglement as fundamental, perhaps emergent spacetime, and is not contradicted by any current experiment. Future research might pinpoint more tangible ways to test the influence of ”awareness”. For example, quantum experiments are conducted using automated observers of growing complexity, ranging from photodetectors to AI-based systems, to determine whether there is any transition in information processing. Even if no new physics is found, simply framing these experiments in terms of awareness can yield insights. At the very least, it provides a rich conceptual playground for exploring the unity of physical law and conscious experience.

## 6. Conclusion and Future Directions

In this paper, we present a conceptual framework that weaves **awareness (consciousness)** into the fabric of **Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD)**. Beginning with the motivation that current quantum interpretations either omit or sideline the role of consciousness, we drew upon idealist philosophies (Advaita Vedanta, German Idealism, Process thought) to propose that consciousness is the fundamental substrate of reality, and that quantum relational interactions are best understood as exchanges of information **within** that conscious substrate. We operationally defined **awareness** as the realization of quantum events – essentially the gain of information when two systems interact – and suggested that this can be quantified by tools such as mutual information to measure the extent of acquired correlation / knowledge, and integrated information  $\Phi$ , to measure the degree of integrated holistic processing associated with that knowledge.

We then outlined a mathematical scaffolding for these ideas: using **category theory** to formalize a functorial mapping from physical processes to awareness processes, ensuring that our language of *awareness updates* can be made as rigorous as ordinary quantum evolution, at least in principle. We illustrated with a **toy model** of two qubits how an interaction creates a correlation that can be interpreted as a minimal awareness event, and showed how one might track awareness through quantum information theoretic terms. i.e., entropies and Bayesian updates. This demonstrated concretely how even a simple quantum system can embody the principles of awareness when examined through the right lens.

In comparing our approach to existing interpretations, we found that it *integrates* well

---

with relational and information-centric interpretations such as RQM and QBism, while providing solutions to some of their open problems by positing a unifying conscious ontology. The awareness framework **extends RQM** by giving every relation an experiential aspect and positing a global coherence (in consciousness) that resolves the multiplicity of viewpoints. It **grounds QBism** by explaining what an "agent" fundamentally is, not an ad hoc user of the theory, but a manifestation of the one mind gaining experience. We also contrasted it with Orch OR, noting that we offer a more universal (less biology-specific) and less experimentally conjectural insertion of consciousness into physics, yet Orch OR could be seen as a special high-complexity case within our broader scheme. In Bohmian mechanics, we recognize a fundamentally different viewpoint. For those who lean towards a purely objectivist ontology, our method may not be attractive. However, for individuals open to an idealist perspective, it offers a consistent alternative that might be considered more straightforward, as it avoids the necessity of hidden variables or extra mechanisms. Although consciousness is admittedly a broad concept, it stands as a single assumption replacing numerous unexplained shifts from quantum to classical events in other frameworks.

The **potential impact on quantum foundations** is significant if these ideas are developed further. By incorporating awareness, we can reformulate the measurement problem in a way that dissolves it: measurement (collapse, outcome selection) is just what an interaction *feels like* from the inside – it's an event in consciousness. This reframing could redirect conversations from focusing on "when does collapse happen?" towards the question "how are different awareness events related and combined?" This is potentially a more manageable inquiry as it transforms a metaphysical enigma into a matter of information dynamics. Furthermore, an idealist foundation might naturally lead to a more cohesive understanding of quantum mechanics and gravity, since spacetime geometry could originate from information geometry. This approach resonates with John Wheeler's well-known aphorism 'it from bit' - with the addition that *bit* is actually *experienced bit*, connecting the 'it' and the 'bit' through awareness.

Of course, much work remains to turn this conceptual framework into a full-fledged theory. **Future directions** that we envision include:

- **Refining the Mathematical Model:** The category-theoretic perspective can be expanded into a detailed framework. This might entail establishing particular categories for quantum systems and conscious states, determining the suitable functor—potentially informed by prior studies connecting neural processes with categorical models of experience—and making sure this functor maintains the probabilistic framework, thereby allowing us to retrieve the Born rule as analogous to a law of conditional expectation within the awareness category. Furthermore, examining the application of **topos theory** or other sophisticated categorical frameworks could assist in integrating the logical dimensions of quantum theory with those of conscious experience. Some researchers have contemplated whether quantum logic and perception logic share an underlying structure.
- **Linking to Integrated Information Theory formally:** Right now, we borrowed IIT ideas heuristically. A more rigorous approach would try to formulate an **Integrated Information measure for quantum systems**. Recent studies have begun

---

to apply Integrated Information Theory (IIT) to quantum systems, a direction we could further explore. By calculating  $\Phi$  for a quantum observer, such as a small quantum computer or an artificial intelligence in a quantum environment, we can examine its relationship with entanglement and mutual information. This approach would provide more rigorous foundations for our awareness metric. Should it be found that  $\Phi$  reaches its highest values in quantum systems due to specific structures, like error-correcting codes or particular entangled states, it might suggest why certain physical entities, such as brains, exhibit high levels of consciousness — potentially functioning as error-correcting networks that optimize integrated information.

- **Empirical Correlations:** Although we do not anticipate discovering new breaches of quantum theory, our method may encourage the investigation of subtle correlations. For instance, does the mind utilize quantum effects to achieve consciousness? Orch OR represents one radical perspective, yet there could be more moderate alternatives, such as quantum-like processing in neural networks. Should experiments reveal quantum processes involved in cognition, it would support the notion of a continuous link between physical awareness and human consciousness. Alternatively, even if the brain operates entirely within classical parameters yet still produces consciousness, it would remain aligned with our model, as classical correlations are considered degenerate forms of quantum correlations. In either case, the results would provide valuable insights for refining our framework.
- **Interdisciplinary Dialogue:** Our goal was to design a framework that can be easily understood by physicists, philosophers, and neuroscientists. Moving forward, a more vibrant conversation between these disciplines could refine the questions at hand. Philosophers of mind might challenge whether we have truly tackled the hard problem—we somewhat bypassed it by postulating that consciousness is fundamental, thus eliminating the need to generate it, but the inquiry remains as to why certain physical structures are linked to specific experiences. Neuroscientists could test whether mutual information or  $\Phi$  is associated with reported consciousness in experiments (for instance, is there a minimum level of integrated information necessary for a stimulus to be consciously perceived?). Physicists might explore the consequences for quantum computing (does an observer who is also a quantum computer possess advantages or face limitations if awareness is a factor? Is it possible to represent an aware observer within a quantum algorithm?).
- **Philosophical Clarifications:** The framework connects the domains of physics and metaphysics. It is important to clarify the philosophical perspectives: Are we considering panpsychism (wherein everything is believed to have some level of consciousness), cosmopsychism (the idea of a unified cosmic consciousness), or an entirely different theory? How should we address the combination problem, that is, how do numerous minor consciousness instances coalesce into a more extensive one? Integrated Information Theory (IIT) seeks to address this through  $\Phi$ , which acts to distinguish between different levels. Additionally, it is vital to examine potential criticisms, such as the pairing problem: how can we determine which physical system corresponds to which

---

particular locus of awareness? Our functor  $\mathcal{F}$  could provide a solution by aligning them systematically, but it is crucial to ensure that this alignment is not arbitrary.

In closing, we reiterate the key insight that emerged from this work: **the quantum world, at its most fundamental, can be viewed not as a collection of particles or waves, but as a web of interrelated experiences or acts of awareness.** This bold reinterpretation carries a unifying promise – that the divide between the knower and the known, the subjective and objective, can be healed by a theory that acknowledges only relations and sees those relations as intrinsically experiential. If successful, such a framework could transform our understanding of consciousness from an anomaly in a physical world to the very medium through which physical reality is instantiated. Although this paper has only sketched the broad strokes of this vision, we hope it provides a compelling argument that incorporating awareness into quantum dynamics is both feasible and potentially revolutionary. The next steps will involve collaborative efforts to develop these ideas further, confront them with logical and empirical scrutiny, and perhaps inch closer to a scientific synthesis of **mind and matter** – a quest as old as human inquiry, now finding a new form in the language of quantum relations.

**Acknowledgement:** I acknowledge that the core concepts, theoretical constructs, and novel arguments presented in this article are a synthesis and concretization of my own original ideas. At the same time, in the process of assembling, interpreting, and contextualizing the relevant literature, I used OpenAI’s GPT as a tool to help organize, clarify, and refine my understanding of existing research. In addition, I utilized OpenAI reasoning models and sought their assistance in refining the mathematical derivations. The use of this technology was instrumental for efficiently navigating the broad and often intricate body of work in quantum theory, Category Theory, and IIT. However, the final direction, interpretation, and conclusions remain my own.

## References

- [1] Wayne Myrvold. Philosophical Issues in Quantum Theory. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Fall 2022 edition, 2022.
- [2] Arash E. Zaghi. Consciousness-centered ontology of relational quantum dynamics (rqd). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05979*, 2024.
- [3] Carlo Rovelli. Relational quantum mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8):1637–1678, 1996.
- [4] Carlo Rovelli. Relational Quantum Mechanics. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Spring 2025 edition, 2025.

- 
- [5] Christopher A. Fuchs, N. David Mermin, and Rüdiger Schack. An introduction to qbism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics. *American Journal of Physics*, 82(8):749–754, 2014.
- [6] Sangeetha Menon. Advaita vedanta. <https://iep.utm.edu/advaita-vedanta/>. Accessed: 2025-02-12.
- [7] The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. Absolute idealism. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Absolute-Idealism>, 2018. Accessed: 2025-02-12.
- [8] Jr. John B. Cobb. An introduction to whitehead’s philosophy. In *A Christian Natural Theology Based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead*. Westminster Press, 1978.
- [9] Christopher A. Fuchs and Rüdiger Schack. A quantum-bayesian route to quantum-state space. *Foundations of Physics*, 41(3):345–356, 2011.
- [10] Giulio Tononi, Melanie Boly, Marcello Massimini, and Christof Koch. Integrated information theory: from consciousness to its physical substrate. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 17(7):450–461, 2016.
- [11] Myeongjin Shin, Junseo Lee, and Kabgyun Jeong. Estimating quantum mutual information through a quantum neural network. *Quantum Information Processing*, 23(2):57, 2024.
- [12] Giulio Tononi. Consciousness as integrated information: a provisional manifesto. *The Biological Bulletin*, 215(3):216–242, 2008.
- [13] David Reutter and Jamie Vicary. Categorical quantum mechanics: An introduction. Lecture notes by Chris Heunen and Jamie Vicary, Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, Hilary Term 2019, 2019.
- [14] Johannes Kleiner and Sean Tull. Category theory in consciousness research: An example from the integrated information theory. *Foundations of Physics*, 50(10):1005–1030, 2020.
- [15] Johannes Kleiner. Mathematical approaches in the scientific study of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 30(1-2):6–33, 2023.
- [16] Angus Leung and Naotsugu Tsuchiya. Separating weak integrated information theory into inspired and aspirational approaches. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, 2023(1):niad012, 05 2023.
- [17] Ricardo Muci no, Elias Okon, and Daniel Sudarsky. Assessing relational quantum mechanics. *Synthese*, 200(5):1–26, 2022.
- [18] Stuart Hameroff and Roger Penrose. Consciousness in the universe: A review of the ‘orch or’ theory. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1):39–78, 2014.



- 
- [19] Adrien Doerig, Aaron Schurger, and Michael H. Herzog. Response to commentaries on 'hard criteria for empirical theories of consciousness'. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12(2):99–101, 2020.
- [20] Scott Hagan, Stuart R. Hameroff, and Jack A. Tuszynski. Quantum computation in brain microtubules? the penrose–hameroff 'orch or' model of consciousness. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 356(1743):1869–1896, 2002.
- [21] Stuart Hameroff. 'orch or' is the most complete, and most easily falsifiable theory of consciousness. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12(2):74–76, 2020.
- [22] Ed Gibney. Consciousness 14 — integrated information theory. <https://www.evphil.com/blog/consciousness-14-integrated-information-theory>, 2020. Accessed: 2025-02-12.
- [23] Zhen Ruan and Hong Li. Two levels of integrated information theory: From autonomous systems to conscious life. *Entropy*, 26(9):761, 2024.
- [24] Sheldon Goldstein. Bohmian Mechanics. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2024 edition, 2024.
- [25] Daniela Frauchiger and Renato Renner. Quantum theory cannot consistently describe the use of itself. *Nature Communications*, 9(1):3711, 2018.
- [26] Marcelo Botta Cantcheff. Spacetime topology from holographic entanglement. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2023(7):227, 2023.
- [27] Juan Maldacena and Leonard Susskind. Cool horizons for entangled black holes. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 61(9):781–811, 2013.
- [28] Paolo Faglia. Relational quantum mechanics does not resolve the problem of measurement, 2025.
- [29] Sougato Bose, Anupam Mazumdar, Gavin W. Morley, Hendrik Ulbricht, Marko Toroš, Mauro Paternostro, Andrew A. Geraci, Peter F. Barker, M. S. Kim, and Gerard Milburn. Spin entanglement witness for quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 119:240401, Dec 2017.
- [30] Massimiliano Proietti, Alexander Pickston, Francesco Graffitti, Peter Barrow, Dmytro Kundys, Cyril Branciard, Martin Ringbauer, and Alessandro Fedrizzi. Experimental test of local observer-independence. *Science Advances*, 5(9):eaaw9832, 2019.
- [31] Heecheon Kim, Joseph R. Maltagliati, George A. Mashour, and UnCheol Lee. Estimating the integrated information measure phi from high-density electroencephalography during states of consciousness in humans. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 12:42, 2018.