Geometry–Flow Gravity: From Slow Geometry to Poisson, PPN, and Solar–System Bounds

N. N. Yazdani

January 14, 2026

Abstract

Geometry–Flow (GF) is a modified–gravity framework in which the helicoid–catenoid associate family encodes the fast, unitary geometric sector, while matter is interpreted as the slow envelope of the same geometric flow. Critiques of the original formulation have correctly pointed out the absence of (i) an explicit matter–coupled field equation, (ii) a clear Newtonian limit and Poisson equation, and (iii) a Parameterized Post–Newtonian (PPN) analysis with quantitative constraints.

In this paper I address these points directly. First, I introduce a four–field system (ρ, S_1, S_2, S_3) describing the two–timescale geometry fluid and write down an effective action for the slow sector. Varying this action yields a continuity equation, an Euler/Hamilton–Jacobi equation, and—crucially—the Poisson equation $\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G_{\rm eff}\,\rho$ in the weak–field, slow–geometry regime. Second, I construct the asymptotic GF metric, write it in isotropic form, and derive general formulas for the PPN parameters γ and β in terms of the asymptotic coefficients. I then compare these with Solar–System bounds from Cassini tracking and Lunar Laser Ranging.

The result is that GF has a standard Newtonian limit provided the slow–geometry action is adopted and $G_{\rm eff}$ is identified with the measured Newton constant. Its PPN structure can be tuned to match current constraints. The strong–field throat and helicoid–catenoid structure then sit on top of a phenomenologically acceptable weak–field sector. I close by outlining the remaining stability and causality questions that GF must answer.

1 Motivation and Scope

The original Geometry–Flow construction starts from differential geometry: a one–form flow ω generating a helicoid–catenoid associate family, with black–hole–like throats appearing as purely geometric features of the flow. In that static, vacuum formulation, Newton's constant G is effectively traded for a geometric pitch parameter, and the integer spectrum arises from holonomy/winding rather than a potential well.

A fair critique is that, in this form, GF is "just a funny curved geometry": there is no explicit matter sector, no field equations that reduce to Poisson in the weak–field limit, and no PPN analysis to compare with Solar–System tests. Here I develop the minimal dynamical completion needed to address those points.

The philosophy is simple:

- Matter is not an extra ingredient; it is slow geometry.
- The helicoid/catenoid structure is the fast, unitary sector.
- The Newtonian limit should emerge as a slow, coarse–grained description of the same geometry.

2 Two–Timescale Geometry: Fields and Kinematics

I introduce four scalar fields on spacetime:

$$\rho(t,\mathbf{x}), \qquad S_a(t,\mathbf{x}), \quad a=1,2,3. \tag{1}$$

Here

- ρ is the slow geometric envelope, which will play the role of "mass density" in the Newtonian limit.
- S_a are the three fast helical phases associated with the triple–helix Geometry–Flow construction.

In the weak–field regime of interest for Solar–System tests, the three phases are nearly symmetric. To leading order we can replace them by an effective phase

$$\bar{S} = \frac{1}{3}(S_1 + S_2 + S_3). \tag{2}$$

The coarse–grained flow velocity is then

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{m_{\text{eff}}}\nabla\bar{S}, \tag{3}$$

where m_{eff} encodes geometric information (e.g. pitch) and sets the conversion between helical phase and physical velocity. In particular, m_{eff} is fixed by matching to a chosen reference solution (e.g. the Solar mass exterior) in the Newtonian limit; there is no new freely adjustable dimensionful constant beyond G_{eff}.

The detailed construction of the full GF metric $g_{\mu\nu}[\rho, S_a]$ and connection from the flow one–form ω is not needed for the Newtonian and PPN analysis; we only assume that, in the weak–field limit, the coarse–grained potential Φ defined below is related to g_{tt} in the standard way.

3 Slow–Geometry Action and Field Equations

The central technical input is an effective action for the slow sector, inspired by the Madelung transform of Schrödinger dynamics but interpreted here as a purely classical geometric fluid:

$$S_{\text{slow}}[\rho,\bar{S},\Phi] = \int dt\, d^3x \left[\rho\,\partial_t\bar{S} + \frac{\rho}{2m_{\text{eff}}}|\nabla\bar{S}|^2 - \rho\,\Phi - \frac{1}{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}}|\nabla\Phi|^2\right]. \tag{4}$$

There is no Planck's constant here; the appearance of $\bar{S}$ is not quantum mechanical. It is the coarse–grained phase of the geometry flow.

We now vary this action with respect to each field.

3.1 Variation with respect to $\bar{S}$Sbar: continuity

Consider a variation $\bar{S} \mapsto \bar{S} + \delta\bar{S}$. The variation of the action is

$$\delta_{\bar{S}} S_{\text{slow}} = \int dt\, d^3x \left[\rho\,\partial_t(\delta\bar{S}) + \frac{\rho}{m_{\text{eff}}}\nabla\bar{S}\cdot\nabla(\delta\bar{S})\right]. \tag{5}$$

Integrating by parts in t and $\mathbf{x}$, and discarding boundary terms, gives

$$\delta_{\bar{S}} S_{\text{slow}} = -\int dt\, d^3x \left[\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\rho}{m_{\text{eff}}} \nabla \bar{S}\right)\right] \delta \bar{S}. \tag{6}$$

Requiring $\delta_{\bar{S}} S_{\text{slow}} = 0$ for arbitrary $\delta \bar{S}$ yields

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0, \qquad \mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{m_{\text{eff}}} \nabla \bar{S}. \tag{7}$$

This is the continuity equation for the slow geometric density.

3.2 Variation with respect to ρrho: Hamilton–Jacobi / Euler

Now vary $\rho \mapsto \rho + \delta\rho$. From (4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\rho S_{\text{slow}} &= \int dt\, d^3x \left[\delta\rho\, \partial_t \bar{S} + \frac{\delta\rho}{2m_{\text{eff}}} |\nabla \bar{S}|^2 - \delta\rho\, \Phi\right] && (8) \\ &= \int dt\, d^3x\, \delta\rho \left[\partial_t \bar{S} + \frac{1}{2m_{\text{eff}}} |\nabla \bar{S}|^2 - \Phi\right]. && (9) \end{aligned}$$

Requiring $\delta_\rho S_{\text{slow}} = 0$ for arbitrary $\delta\rho$ gives

$$\partial_t \bar{S} + \frac{1}{2m_{\text{eff}}} |\nabla \bar{S}|^2 - \Phi = 0. \tag{10}$$

Taking the gradient of (10) and using $\mathbf{v} = \nabla \bar{S}/m_{\text{eff}}$ yields the familiar Euler form

$$\partial_t \mathbf{v} + (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v} = -\nabla \Phi. \tag{11}$$

3.3 Variation with respect to ΦPhi: Poisson

Finally, vary $\Phi \mapsto \Phi + \delta\Phi$. From (4),

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\Phi S_{\text{slow}} &= \int dt\, d^3x \left[-\rho\, \delta\Phi - \frac{1}{8\pi G_{\text{eff}}} 2\, \nabla\Phi \cdot \nabla(\delta\Phi)\right] && (12) \\ &= \int dt\, d^3x \left[-\rho\, \delta\Phi + \frac{1}{4\pi G_{\text{eff}}} (\nabla^2 \Phi)\, \delta\Phi\right], && (13) \end{aligned}$$

where we have integrated by parts in the second term and dropped the boundary term. Imposing $\delta_\Phi S_{\text{slow}} = 0$ for arbitrary $\delta\Phi$ gives

$$\nabla^2 \Phi = 4\pi G_{\text{eff}}\, \rho. \tag{14}$$

This is exactly the Poisson equation, with an effective Newton's constant G_{eff} determined by the Geometry–Flow pitch and normalization. In the remainder of the paper we identify G_{eff} with the observed Newton constant G by matching to Cavendish–type laboratory measurements, so that no new long–range coupling is introduced at low energies.

4 Newtonian Limit of Test–Particle Motion

To connect with Solar–System dynamics, we consider test–particle motion in a static, weak GF background. The metric can be written as

$$ds^2 = g_{tt}(\mathbf{x})\, c^2 dt^2 + g_{ij}(\mathbf{x})\, dx^i dx^j, \tag{15}$$

with

$$g_{tt}(\mathbf{x}) = -\left(1 + \frac{2\Phi(\mathbf{x})}{c^2}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Phi^2}{c^4}\right), \tag{16}$$

where Φ solves (14).

In the weak–field, slow–velocity limit ($|\mathbf{v}| \ll c$), the spatial geodesic equation reduces to

$$\frac{d^2 x^i}{dt^2} \approx -\partial_i \Phi, \tag{17}$$

so test particles experience the usual Newtonian acceleration generated by the geometric density ρ. This addresses the concern that GF lacks dynamics: once the slow–geometry action is adopted, Newtonian dynamics appear in the standard way.

5 Asymptotic Metric and PPN Form

To compare GF with precision tests of gravity, we write the exterior, static, spherically symmetric GF metric in isotropic coordinates:

$$ds^2 = -F(\rho)\, c^2 dt^2 + H(\rho)\, (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\Omega^2), \tag{18}$$

where $d\Omega^2$ is the metric on the unit 2–sphere.

In the PPN formalism, the metric functions are expanded for large ρ as

$$F(\rho) = 1 - 2U(\rho) + 2\beta\, U(\rho)^2 + \mathcal{O}(U^3), \tag{19}$$

$$H(\rho) = 1 + 2\gamma\, U(\rho) + \mathcal{O}(U^2), \tag{20}$$

with

$$U(\rho) = \frac{GM}{c^2 \rho}. \tag{21}$$

Here γ measures spatial curvature per unit mass, and β measures nonlinear self–interaction in g_{00}.

On the other hand, we can simply expand F and H as

$$F(\rho) = 1 + \frac{f_1}{\rho} + \frac{f_2}{\rho^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^3}\right), \tag{22}$$

$$H(\rho) = 1 + \frac{h_1}{\rho} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^2}\right). \tag{23}$$

Matching the two expansions gives

$$1 + \frac{f_1}{\rho} + \frac{f_2}{\rho^2} + \ldots = 1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2 \rho} + 2\beta \frac{G^2 M^2}{c^4 \rho^2} + \ldots, \tag{24}$$

so

$$f_1 = -\frac{2GM}{c^2}, \qquad f_2 = 2\beta\, \frac{G^2 M^2}{c^4}. \tag{25}$$

Similarly,

$$1 + \frac{h_1}{\rho} + \cdots = 1 + 2\gamma \frac{GM}{c^2\rho} + \ldots, \tag{26}$$

so

$$h_1 = 2\gamma \frac{GM}{c^2}. \tag{27}$$

Solving these for γ and β in terms of the asymptotic coefficients f_2 and h_1 yields

$$\gamma = \frac{h_1 c^2}{2GM}, \qquad \beta = \frac{f_2 c^4}{2G^2M^2}. \tag{28}$$

Equations (22), (23), and (28) are completely general: once the GF metric is written in isotropic form and expanded at large ρ, the PPN parameters follow algebraically.

6 Perihelion Precession in Terms of γgamma and βbeta

The anomalous perihelion precession of a bound orbit in a static, spherically symmetric metric can be expressed in PPN language as

$$\Delta\varpi = \frac{6\pi GM}{a(1-e^2)c^2}\,\frac{2+2\gamma-\beta}{3}, \tag{29}$$

per orbit, where a is the semi–major axis and e the eccentricity. For GR, $\gamma = \beta = 1$ and the factor in parentheses is exactly 1. Measurements of Mercury's perihelion shift thus constrain the combination $2 + 2\gamma - \beta$ and hence deviations of GF from GR in the weak field.

7 Solar–System Bounds on γgamma and βbeta

Solar–System experiments constrain γ and β to be extremely close to their GR values:

- Cassini tracking of the Shapiro time delay yields $(\gamma - 1) = (2.1 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-5}$ [1].
- Lunar Laser Ranging, combined with the Cassini value of γ and the Nordtvedt parameter, gives $(\beta - 1) = (1.2 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-4}$ [2].

Interpreted as bounds, this implies approximately

$$|\gamma - 1| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-5}, \qquad |\beta - 1| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-4}, \tag{30}$$

at the 1–2σ level.

In terms of the asymptotic GF coefficients, these become

$$\left| \frac{h_1 c^2}{2GM} - 1 \right| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-5}, \tag{31}$$

$$\left| \frac{f_2 c^4}{2G^2M^2} - 1 \right| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-4}. \tag{32}$$

Thus, any GF metric that differs from Schwarzschild only in the strong–field interior and matches its $1/\rho$ and $1/\rho^2$ coefficients at large ρ will automatically satisfy current Solar–System constraints. Conversely, deviations in f_2 and h_1 are tightly bounded.

7.1 A simple GF exterior ansatz

In isotropic coordinates ρ, the Schwarzschild solution can be written as

$$ds^2 = -\left(\frac{1-\frac{M}{2\rho}}{1+\frac{M}{2\rho}}\right)^2 c^2dt^2 + \left(1+\frac{M}{2\rho}\right)^4 (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\Omega^2),$$

with $M = GM_\odot/c^2$. Its large–ρ expansion is

$$F_{\text{Schw}}(\rho) = 1 - \frac{2M}{\rho} + \frac{2M^2}{\rho^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\rho^3}\right), \tag{33}$$

$$H_{\text{Schw}}(\rho) = 1 + \frac{2M}{\rho} + \frac{3M^2}{2\rho^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\rho^3}\right). \tag{34}$$

As a minimal Geometry–Flow deformation we keep the $1/\rho$ terms fixed and allow deviations only at order $1/\rho^2$:

$$F_{\text{GF}}(\rho) = 1 - \frac{2M}{\rho} + \frac{2(1+\varepsilon_F)M^2}{\rho^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\rho^3}\right), \tag{35}$$

$$H_{\text{GF}}(\rho) = 1 + \frac{2M}{\rho} + \frac{3(1+\varepsilon_H)M^2}{2\rho^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\rho^3}\right), \tag{36}$$

with dimensionless deformation parameters $\varepsilon_F, \varepsilon_H$. In the limit $\varepsilon_F = \varepsilon_H = 0$ we recover Schwarzschild.

7.2 PPN parameters and bounds for the GF exterior ansatz

Comparing the GF ansatz with the PPN template

$$F = 1 - 2U + 2\beta U^2 + \dots, \quad H = 1 + 2\gamma U + \dots, \quad U = \frac{M}{\rho},$$

we immediately obtain

$$\beta = 1 + \varepsilon_F, \qquad \gamma = 1.$$

Cassini tracking of the Shapiro time delay gives $(\gamma - 1) = (2.1 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-5}$ [1], so the GF ansatz with $\gamma = 1$ is fully consistent with these bounds at the 1PN level. Lunar Laser Ranging, combined with Cassini's γ, yields $(\beta - 1) = (1.2 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-4}$ [2], implying roughly

$$|\beta - 1| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-4}.$$

In terms of the GF deformation parameter this becomes

$$|\varepsilon_F| \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-4},$$

so the $1/\rho^2$ coefficient in g_{tt} must agree with its Schwarzschild value to within a few parts in 10^4 in the Solar–System regime.

8 Where GF Differs from GR

The analysis above shows that GF can be made phenomenologically acceptable in the weak–field regime by satisfying two conditions:

1. The slow–geometry action (4) governs the envelope, ensuring the Poisson equation (14).
2. The asymptotic GF metric has f_1, f_2, h_1 satisfying (28) with $\gamma \approx \beta \approx 1$.

Where GF genuinely departs from GR is in the strong–field region: the helicoid–catenoid associate family and the Geometry–Flow connection produce throat geometries that do not satisfy the Einstein field equations with the Levi–Civita connection and standard energy conditions. From the PPN point of view, this is acceptable as long as the exterior, asymptotic sector is tuned to match the GR values of γ and β.

9 Open Questions: Stability and Causality

Two important questions remain:

- **Stability of throats.** If GF admits wormhole–like throats without exotic stress–energy, one must show that these do not trigger vacuum instabilities or runaway creation of topology.
- **Causality and time machines.** In GR, traversable wormholes typically allow closed timelike curves. GF needs either (i) a geometric analogue of energy conditions that rule out such configurations, or (ii) a dynamical mechanism that renders them unstable.

These questions live beyond the PPN regime, but they are part of the overall observational and conceptual burden of any modified gravity theory.

10 Conclusion

By introducing a two–timescale geometry fluid with fields (ρ, S_1, S_2, S_3) and an effective slow–geometry action, Geometry–Flow acquires a standard Newtonian limit: the Poisson equation $\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G_{\text{eff}}\rho$ and the usual self–gravitating fluid equations emerge in the weak–field regime. Writing the GF exterior metric in isotropic coordinates and expanding it at large radius provides direct formulas for the PPN parameters γ and β in terms of the asymptotic coefficients f_2 and h_1. Solar–System data then constrain these coefficients at the 10^{-5}–10^{-4} level.

The strong–field throat and the helicoid–catenoid structure remain the distinctive signatures of GF, but they sit on a weak–field sector that can be made observationally acceptable. The next steps are to (i) compute f_2 and h_1 for a specific GF metric, (ii) analyze the stability and causal structure of the throat solutions, and (iii) confront binary–pulsar and gravitational–wave data.

References

[1] B. Bertotti, L. Iess and P. Tortora, "A test of general relativity using radio links with the Cassini spacecraft," *Nature* **425**, 374–376 (2003).

[2] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev and D. H. Boggs, "Progress in lunar laser ranging tests of relativistic gravity," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 261101 (2004).