Origin Datum: Hidden Structure From Weak Signals

Zhane Daye

October 2026

A research-program paper for reconstructing hidden systems from indirect, noisy, and partially occluded observations

Research lanes

- Dark Matter and Cosmic Structure
- EO-OBSCURA Ground Proof
- Neutrino Observatory Systems
- Weak Gravity / Deep Theory Notes
- Black Hole Information as Future Theory Lane

Abstract

Origin Datum (OD) is proposed as a research framework for reconstructing hidden structure from weak, indirect, or partially occluded signals. Its central claim is methodological: a reconstruction is credible only when it exposes its forward model, selection effects, priors, uncertainty, and independent validation path. The framework is developed across five lanes. Dark matter and cosmic structure provide the scientific spine; EO-OBSCURA supplies the first ground-proof implementation; neutrino observatory systems extend the method into particle physics; weak gravity becomes a theory-comparison lane; and black-hole information remains a future theory lane. OD does not claim to solve these problems or to introduce a new fundamental theory. It proposes a disciplined bridge from incomplete observation to falsifiable reconstruction, with Earth observation as the first environment in which the full loop can be tested end to end.

Scope and status. This is a research-program and position paper. Established physical results are used as constraints and examples; OD methods, product names, and theory hypotheses are proposals requiring implementation and validation. The paper therefore distinguishes evidence, reconstruction, and explanation rather than treating them as interchangeable.

1 Introduction: The Origin Datum Problem

Many of the most important scientific questions are difficult for the same structural reason: the thing of interest is not directly available to the instrument. A dark-matter halo is inferred from the motion and distortion of visible matter. A neutrino mass is inferred from a change in flavor

probability. A subsurface or agricultural condition is inferred from reflected radiation, temperature, moisture, topography, and time. The interior information content of a black hole is inferred through quantum fields, entropy, and radiation rather than through direct access to the interior.

These are not identical physical problems. They should not be collapsed into one theory. They are, however, instances of a common methodological form:

$$y = \mathcal{F}(x, \theta) + \varepsilon, \tag{1}$$

where x is a hidden state, y is an observed signal, $\mathcal{F}$ is a forward model, θ represents nuisance or calibration parameters, and ε contains measurement noise, environmental variation, and model discrepancy. The inverse problem is to infer x from y without treating the first plausible reconstruction as the truth.

Origin Datum is the name proposed for a research architecture organized around this inverse problem. The term "datum" is used in its measurement sense: a reference point, an observation, or a basis from which a system can be reconstructed. "Origin" emphasizes that the objective is not merely to classify outputs but to trace them back toward the hidden structure that generated them.

The framework is motivated by a practical question: can one build a useful, testable system for hidden-structure reconstruction before possessing a complete theory of the hidden object? In Earth observation, the answer can be tested directly. In cosmology and particle physics, the answer becomes a way to organize evidence, identify missing measurements, and prevent conceptual leaps from being mistaken for discoveries.

2 The OD Reconstruction Framework

OD separates three claims that are often mixed together: established evidence, a method for reconstructing a hidden state, and a theory explaining why that state exists. The first can constrain the second; neither automatically proves the third. This distinction is essential for dark matter, dark energy, neutrino masses, and black-hole information, where strong observations coexist with unresolved mechanisms.

The proposed OD loop has six stages:

1. Define the hidden state and the observable proxies.
2. Record the selection function: what could the instrument see, and what did it systematically miss?
3. Build a prior or baseline model, making its assumptions explicit.
4. Produce an uncertainty-aware reconstruction rather than a single asserted answer.
5. Withhold a measurement, reveal it only after the prediction is frozen, and score recovery.
6. Update the model, document the failure modes, and preserve the provenance of each revision.

The loop resists two opposite errors: refusing to reason about a hidden object because it is not directly visible, and treating an elegant reconstruction as proof that the chosen model is correct.

OD is therefore best understood as a synthesis of inverse-problem reasoning, uncertainty-aware data fusion, and blind validation, not as a new fundamental physical law.

2.1 A general probabilistic formulation

Let $D = \{y_i, \Sigma_i, s_i\}_{i=1}^{N}$ be a dataset, where y_i is an observation, Σ_i describes its uncertainty or covariance, and s_i is a selection descriptor. An OD reconstruction can be written as a posterior:

$$p(x, \theta \mid D) \propto p(D \mid x, \theta, s)\, p(x \mid \theta)\, p(\theta). \tag{2}$$

The practical objective is not necessarily to compute a closed-form posterior. It is to preserve the distinction between likelihood, prior, and selection. A reconstruction that ignores s_i may appear precise because it has silently assumed that the observed sample is representative.

For a withheld validation set D_{hold}, the method should be evaluated using predictive quantities such as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pred}} = \log p(D_{\text{hold}} \mid D_{\text{train}}), \tag{3}$$

calibration of credible intervals, spatial or temporal recovery error, and performance against a null model. A map that is accurate on average but systematically overconfident is not an acceptable OD output.

3 Dark Matter and Cosmic Structure

3.1 What is established

Dark matter is the name given to gravitating structure that behaves, at cosmological scales, as if there is more mass than can be accounted for by the visible baryonic matter and radiation alone. The evidence is distributed across several kinds of observation: galaxy rotation and dynamics, gravitational lensing, the growth of large-scale structure, and the cosmic microwave background (CMB). The final Planck mission results found that the spatially flat six-parameter ΛCDM model provides a good fit to CMB observations and inferred, within that model, $\Omega_m = 0.315 \pm 0.007$ and $\sigma_8 = 0.811 \pm 0.006$ [1].

The Bullet Cluster provides a particularly clear example of multi-component inference. In a merging cluster, much of the ordinary gas is shocked and concentrated in X-ray emission, while weak-lensing maps place much of the projected mass elsewhere. Clowe et al. interpreted this separation as direct empirical evidence for a collisionless mass component [2]. The observation does not identify the particle, but it constrains explanations in which all apparent missing mass is merely a rearrangement of luminous gas.

The phrase “dark matter” therefore has two levels of meaning. At the observational level, it denotes a successful gravitational component in models of structure formation. At the microscopic level, it refers to an unknown substance or sector whose particle identity, interactions, and production history remain unresolved. OD must keep these levels separate.

3.2 Dark energy is not dark matter

Dark energy is a name for whatever produces the observed late-time acceleration of cosmic expansion in the standard description. Type Ia supernova observations provided the early evidence for an accelerating universe and a positive cosmological-constant contribution [4, 5]. In the minimal ΛCDM model, dark energy is represented by a cosmological constant Λ with an equation-of-state parameter $w = -1$. This is a phenomenological description of the stress-energy content that drives acceleration, not a confirmed microscopic explanation.

Dark matter clumps and helps form structure; dark energy is smooth on the scales relevant to standard structure formation and changes the expansion history. The two labels answer different observational needs:

	Dark matter	**Dark energy**
Primary role	Adds gravitational attraction and structure growth	Produces late-time accelerated expansion
Typical evidence	Galaxy dynamics, lensing, CMB, clustering	Supernova distances, CMB geometry, large-scale expansion
Known identity	Unknown particle or sector	Unknown field, vacuum property, or modified-gravity effect
OD relevance	Reconstruct hidden mass from its gravitational fingerprints	Reconstruct expansion history and test whether one constant is sufficient

3.3 The Z-ZOA and cosmic reconstruction problem

The Zone of Avoidance (ZOA) is the region of the sky where the Milky Way's dust and stellar density obscure extragalactic observations. The obscuration is not an empty region; it is a measurement gap. Structures such as the Great Attractor region, the Vela supercluster, Laniakea, and Shapley are inferred through incomplete redshift surveys, peculiar velocities, X-ray emission, lensing, and other tracers.

The proposed Z-ZOA research lane is an OD-style blind reconstruction problem:

1. construct a three-dimensional large-scale-structure field using a declared subset of observations;
2. freeze the prediction before exposing the withheld radio or infrared observations;
3. reveal the withheld data and quantify recovery, false structure, and uncertainty coverage;
4. compare the blind reconstruction with a hybrid reconstruction that includes the withheld observations.

The key scientific output is not a prettier map. It is a measured answer to: which features are recoverable despite the ZOA, at what scales, under which selection assumptions, and with what uncertainty? A successful pipeline would provide a reusable testbed for hidden-structure inference rather than a one-time illustration.

3.4 OD questions for dark matter and dark energy

The most productive OD questions are operational:

- Which combination of kinematics, lensing, and galaxy-density tracers most strongly constrains a hidden mass field?
- How much apparent structure is produced by survey geometry, dust, and tracer incompleteness?
- Can the uncertainty in a reconstructed mass field be calibrated against withheld observations?
- Does a single ΛCDM expansion history explain the joint observations, or do residuals require a time-varying dark-energy model or modified gravity?

OD does not need to choose a dark-matter particle candidate in order to make progress. It can first improve the quality of the gravitational reconstruction and thereby sharpen the constraints that any candidate theory must satisfy.

4 EO-OBSCURA Ground Proof

4.1 Why Earth observation is the first practical test

EO-OBSCURA is proposed as the first ground-proof implementation of the OD framework. Unlike a black hole interior or a cosmological dark-matter particle, Earth-surface state can be checked with independent observations. A field team, sensor station, agricultural record, hydrological gauge, or later satellite pass can provide a validation datum. This makes EO-OBSCURA the appropriate place to test the discipline of hidden-structure reconstruction before using it as a metaphor for frontier physics.

The Copernicus programme provides a suitable public-data environment. Sentinel missions and associated services offer open Earth-observation data for land, climate, emergency management, agriculture, and related domains [12, 13]. The intended OD contribution is not merely another classifier. It is a provenance-aware system that states what is visible, what is occluded, what is predicted, and what evidence would prove the prediction wrong.

4.2 A ground-proof target

The first pilot should be flood extent and post-flood recovery in one selected corridor with reliable gauge, field, or administrative validation. Flooding is a strong ground-proof case because optical imagery can be blocked by cloud, radar can provide a complementary view, and the event produces a time-bounded prediction that can be checked. Agriculture, abandoned farmland, and wildfire response can follow as transfer tests. The selection rule is simple: choose the smallest region in which the hidden state, the missing observations, and the validation datum can all be documented.

4.3 Observation model

Let x_t denote the latent environmental state at time t, including variables such as vegetation condition, surface moisture, flood extent, access, or structural damage. Let the sensor streams be

$y_t^{(k)}$, where k indexes optical, synthetic-aperture radar, thermal, meteorological, topographic, or in-situ observations:

$$y_t^{(k)} = H_t^{(k)} x_t + b_t^{(k)} + \varepsilon_t^{(k)}, \tag{4}$$

where $H_t^{(k)}$ captures the sensor response and geometry, $b_t^{(k)}$ represents bias or domain shift, and $\varepsilon_t^{(k)}$ is noise. Cloud cover, revisit timing, seasonal change, and sensor failure should be modeled as missingness or selection, not silently imputed away.

A state-space representation is:

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t) + \eta_t, \tag{5}$$

$$y_t = h(x_t, m_t) + \varepsilon_t, \tag{6}$$

where u_t is an external forcing such as weather, m_t is the available modality mask, and f, h are transition and observation functions. The modality mask is itself part of the data-generating process.

4.4 Blind validation protocol

EO-OBSCURA should adopt the following minimum protocol:

1. Select a geographic region and a time interval with at least one independent validation source.
2. Partition the data by time and geography so that nearby pixels or adjacent dates do not leak into both training and testing.
3. Declare which modalities and dates are hidden from the reconstruction.
4. Generate a prediction with calibrated uncertainty intervals.
5. Reveal the withheld observations and score localization, extent, severity, lead time, and calibration.
6. Publish the failure map: locations where the system was uncertain, confidently wrong, or unable to observe.

For a binary event map, useful scores include intersection-over-union, precision-recall area, and spatially weighted error. For continuous variables, the system should report proper scoring rules such as the continuous ranked probability score, as well as coverage of nominal credible intervals. The central result is not a single accuracy number; it is the relationship between confidence and actual recovery.

4.5 The engineering product

The minimum EO-OBSCURA system can be organized into three stages:

1. **Observe:** ingest imagery, weather, topography, and field data while preserving metadata and an occlusion ledger.

2. **Reconstruct:** fuse modalities into a state estimate with uncertainty and a record of which observations support it.
3. **Validate and decide:** freeze predictions, reveal withheld data, score recovery, and produce ranked actions without erasing uncertainty.

This is where OD becomes concrete. The system should be able to answer, for every alert: which observations supported it, which observations were missing, how uncertain the estimate is, and what new measurement would reduce the uncertainty most.

5 Neutrino Observatory Systems

5.1 What neutrino oscillations tell us

Neutrinos are produced and detected in flavor states, such as ν_e, ν_μ, and ν_τ, but propagate as mixtures of mass eigenstates. The Super-Kamiokande atmospheric-neutrino result established a deficit and zenith-angle dependence consistent with neutrino oscillation [6]. Since oscillation probabilities depend on mass-squared differences, the observation demonstrates that not all neutrino masses are equal and that at least one neutrino mass is nonzero.

In the relativistic approximation, the vacuum transition probability can be written schematically as

$$P_{\alpha\to\beta}(L,E) = \left|\sum_i U_{\beta i} U^*_{\alpha i} \exp\left(-i\frac{\Delta m^2_{i1} L}{2E}\right)\right|^2, \tag{7}$$

where U is the lepton mixing matrix, L is baseline, E is energy, and Δm^2_{i1} are mass-squared differences. The oscillation measurement is therefore an indirect reconstruction: the hidden quantities are the mass splittings and mixing parameters, while the observable is a flavor-dependent event distribution.

5.2 Where neutrino masses may come from

The Standard Model, in its minimal form, contains no right-handed neutrino field and therefore no ordinary Dirac mass term for neutrinos. Several extensions are possible:

- **Dirac masses:** add right-handed neutrinos with very small Yukawa couplings.
- **Majorana masses:** allow a neutrino to be its own antiparticle and violate lepton number by two units.
- **Seesaw mechanisms:** introduce heavy states so that a small light-neutrino mass emerges from a large scale.
- **Radiative or effective mechanisms:** generate masses through loops or higher-dimensional operators.

Oscillation data do not uniquely select among these mechanisms. Absolute-mass probes, neutrinoless double-beta decay, cosmological structure constraints, and searches for heavy neutral leptons address complementary parts of the inference problem. The OD perspective is to treat the neutrino observatory as a network of partial views rather than as one decisive instrument.

5.3 Neutrino observatory systems as an OD stack

The proposed Neutrino Observatory Systems lane is not a claim to build a detector immediately. It is a systems-research programme for how detector, environment, reconstruction, and theory constraints should connect:

1. **Source layer:** reactor, solar, atmospheric, accelerator, supernova, and geophysical neutrino sources.
2. **Transport layer:** propagation through vacuum and matter, including energy loss, matter effects, and baseline uncertainty.
3. **Detector layer:** timing, energy reconstruction, particle identification, background rejection, and detector response.
4. **Inference layer:** oscillation parameters, absolute mass, ordering, CP phase, and non-standard interactions.
5. **Cross-domain layer:** comparison with cosmology, beta-decay endpoints, nuclear matrix elements, and astrophysical populations.

The OD contribution would be strongest in the interfaces. A system should preserve the provenance of an inferred parameter: which detector response, environmental assumption, nuclear model, or cosmological prior contributed to it. It should also make disagreement visible instead of averaging incompatible measurements into a deceptively precise result.

5.4 Near-term research questions

- How can heterogeneous neutrino datasets be combined without allowing one model family to dominate through hidden priors?
- Which future measurement would most reduce the uncertainty in the absolute mass scale?
- How should an observatory represent a null result whose sensitivity varies strongly over energy, time, or source distance?
- Can an uncertainty ledger make it easier to compare particle-physics and cosmology constraints without double-counting shared assumptions?

6 Weak Gravity / Deep Theory Notes

Gravity is not weak in every regime. The puzzle is that its effective coupling at ordinary particle-physics energies is extraordinarily small compared with the other interactions, while quantum-gravity effects are expected to become important near the Planck scale. A compact statement of the hierarchy is

$$\frac{v}{M_{\mathrm{Pl}}} \ll 1, \tag{8}$$

where $v \simeq 246\,\mathrm{GeV}$ is the Higgs vacuum expectation value. The disparity is not a contradiction; it is a naturalness and scale-separation problem. The gauge hierarchy question asks why the Higgs scale remains far below the Planck or ultraviolet scale under quantum corrections [8].

Candidate explanations include extra dimensions, compositeness, supersymmetry, asymptotic safety, emergent gravity, modified gravitational sectors, and selection principles. None is established as the answer. OD therefore treats weak gravity as a theory-comparison lane, not as a solved mechanism or an immediate experimental programme.

For each proposed explanation, the OD record should state:

- what new fields, dimensions, symmetries, or boundary conditions are introduced;
- how the mechanism stabilizes the weak scale under quantum corrections;
- what it predicts for collider observables, precision tests, gravitational waves, cosmology, or deviations from general relativity;
- whether the mechanism merely relocates the fine-tuning into a new parameter;
- which observation would make the model less plausible.

The immediate OD deliverable is an assumption-to-prediction matrix: what hidden degrees of freedom are introduced, what scale is stabilized, what observations change, and which result would weaken the model. The analogy to hidden-structure reconstruction is useful for organizing theory, but it is not evidence for any particular emergent-gravity or extra-dimensional model.

7 Black Hole Information as Future Theory Lane

In semiclassical gravity, a black hole is characterized externally by a small set of macroscopic parameters, while Hawking radiation appears approximately thermal. If a pure state collapses and the hole evaporates into exactly thermal radiation, the final state appears mixed, conflicting with ordinary unitary evolution [9, 10]. The Page curve sharpens the problem: radiation entropy should rise, peak, and then decrease if the full evolution is unitary. Recent quantum-extremal-surface calculations reproduce this behavior in controlled settings [11], but do not complete the empirical account of information in an astrophysical black hole.

OD treats this as a future theory lane. The word "information" must be separated into at least four questions:

1. Is the fundamental evolution unitary?
2. Where is the information encoded at different times in the evaporation process?
3. Which degrees of freedom carry the correlations required by the Page curve?
4. How does a smooth infalling experience coexist with the requirements of unitarity and entanglement monogamy?

These questions concern different descriptions and may not have one operational answer. The proposed OD deliverable is a structured literature and model-comparison ledger containing:

- a glossary that maps terms such as Page time, island, entanglement wedge, firewall, complementarity, and holography without treating them as synonyms;
- a derivation ledger recording which assumptions enter each entropy calculation;
- a model matrix comparing unitarity, locality, horizon smoothness, and semiclassical control;
- a signature register identifying which predictions are mathematical consistency conditions and which could, even in principle, affect observations.

The lane remains later in the OD sequence because its theory-to-measurement distance is high. Its authority should be earned through the more directly testable reconstruction work first.

8 Cross-Lane Architecture

The five lanes are related by method, not by a claim that dark matter, environmental sensing, neutrino mass, weak gravity, and black-hole information share one physical cause. Their relationship is the following:

Lane	**Hidden object**	**Primary signal**	**Validation mode**
Dark matter	Mass distribution / particle sector	Motion, lensing, CMB, clustering	Cross-survey and blind reconstruction
EO-OBSCURA	Environmental or agricultural state	Multi-sensor remote observations	Withheld imagery and field data
Neutrinos	Mass splittings and origin	Flavor-dependent event rates	Independent detector and source classes
Weak gravity	UV structure and scale separation	Precision, collider, cosmological residuals	Model-specific prediction tests
Black holes	Quantum information encoding	Entropy and radiation calculations	Internal consistency and eventual signatures

8.1 A shared data and reasoning layer

Across all five lanes, OD should preserve the same compact ledger: observable, latent state, selection function, prior, residual, validation datum, and revision history. This vocabulary does not make the domains physically commensurable; it makes the reasoning auditable.

8.2 Priority sequence

For a one-person origin-stage research effort, the recommended sequence is:

1. **EO-OBSCURA ground proof:** demonstrate the full OD loop on an Earth-observation problem with public data and independent validation.

2. **Dark matter and cosmic structure:** apply the blind-reconstruction logic to Z-ZOA and related large-scale-structure questions.
3. **Neutrino observatory systems:** build the conceptual architecture and a provenance-aware literature/data map.
4. **Weak gravity notes:** maintain an assumption-to-prediction matrix for competing explanations of the hierarchy and gravitational weakness.
5. **Black-hole information:** develop the future theory lane after the framework has demonstrated methodological discipline in testable settings.

The sequence is not a ranking of intellectual importance. It is a ranking of distance to independently checkable evidence and feasibility for a small team.

9 Falsifiability, Failure, and Governance

An OD system should be allowed to fail publicly. Three failure classes are especially important.

1. **Observational failure:** the relevant signal is below the instrument's sensitivity or is systematically missing.
2. **Model failure:** the forward model cannot reproduce the observations even after calibration and uncertainty are handled honestly.
3. **Decision failure:** the reconstruction is statistically reasonable but does not support a useful or safe action.

A mature output should therefore include negative evidence: regions without coverage, null results, failed predictions, posterior sensitivity to priors, and the cost of collecting the next measurement. This is not only good scientific practice. It is essential for any future EO-OBSCURA decision-support deployment where a confident false alarm or missed event could cause harm.

The research record should preserve versioned data manifests, code revisions, parameter files, random seeds where applicable, and a distinction between exploratory and confirmatory analysis. Every figure should be traceable to a data version and every claim should be tagged as observation, reconstruction, interpretation, or hypothesis.

10 Conclusion

Origin Datum begins with a simple observation: much of what matters cannot be seen directly. The response should not be either passive uncertainty or unjustified certainty. It should be a disciplined reconstruction process that makes the hidden object, the observation model, the missingness, the prior, the uncertainty, and the validation path explicit.

Dark matter and cosmic structure provide the scientific spine because gravitational structure is repeatedly inferred from its effects. EO-OBSCURA provides the first practical proof because Earth systems allow withheld observations and field validation. Neutrino observatory systems extend the framework into particle physics, where flavor is an indirect window onto mass. Weak gravity

becomes a theory lane for comparing possible ultraviolet structures behind a large scale separation. Black-hole information remains a future theory lane because it is conceptually central but farthest from direct empirical closure.

The proposed OD contribution is therefore not a single answer to five famous questions. It is an architecture for asking better questions of hidden systems, and for knowing when the evidence has earned the answer.

A Notation and Minimum Reproducibility Checklist

Symbol	Meaning
x	latent or hidden state
y	observed measurement
$\mathcal{F}$	forward model mapping state to observation
θ	nuisance, calibration, or model parameters
Σ	measurement covariance or uncertainty model
s	selection function or observation-availability descriptor
D_{hold}	withheld validation data
U	neutrino flavor-to-mass mixing matrix
Δm^2	neutrino mass-squared difference
Λ	cosmological-constant contribution in ΛCDM

Before an OD result is called reproducible, the record should include:

1. the exact data sources and processing levels;
2. the selection and occlusion rules;
3. the baseline and alternative models;
4. the uncertainty and calibration procedure;
5. the frozen prediction before withheld data are revealed;
6. the validation metric and null comparison;
7. the limitations and known failure modes;
8. the code, configuration, and version identifiers needed to repeat the run.

References

[1] Planck Collaboration, "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters," *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 641, A6 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833910.

[2] D. Clowe, M. Bradač, A. H. Gonzalez, M. Markevitch, S. W. Randall, C. Jones, and D. Zaritsky, "A direct empirical proof of the existence of dark matter," *The Astrophysical Journal* 648, L109–L113 (2006). https://doi.org/10.1086/508162.

[3] V. C. Rubin, W. K. Ford Jr., and N. Thonnard, "Rotational properties of 21 SC galaxies with a large range of luminosities and radii, from NGC 4605/R=4 pc to UGC 2885/R=122 kpc," *The Astrophysical Journal* 238, 471–487 (1980).

[4] A. G. Riess et al., "Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant," *The Astronomical Journal* 116, 1009–1038 (1998). https://doi.org/10.1086/300499.

[5] S. Perlmutter et al., "Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high-redshift supernovae," *The Astrophysical Journal* 517, 565–586 (1999). https://doi.org/10.1086/307221.

[6] Y. Fukuda et al. (Super-Kamiokande Collaboration), "Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos," *Physical Review Letters* 81, 1562–1567 (1998). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.1562.

[7] S. Weinberg, "A model of leptons," *Physical Review Letters* 19, 1264–1266 (1967). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.1264.

[8] N. Craig, "New solutions to the gauge hierarchy problem," *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* (2023). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-102422-080830.

[9] S. W. Hawking, "Breakdown of predictability in gravitational collapse," *Physical Review D* 14, 2460–2473 (1976). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.14.2460.

[10] D. N. Page, "Information in black hole radiation," *Physical Review Letters* 71, 3743–3746 (1993). https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.3743.

[11] A. Almheiri, N. Engelhardt, D. Marolf, and H. Maxfield, "The Page curve of Hawking radiation from semiclassical geometry," *Journal of High Energy Physics* 03, 149 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2020)149.

[12] European Commission and Copernicus, "Access data," online documentation, accessed October 2026. https://www.copernicus.eu/en/access-data.

[13] European Space Agency, "Sentinel-2 user handbook," online mission documentation. https://sentinels.copernicus.eu/documents/247904/685211/Sentinel-2_User_Handbook.