

Canonical Quantum Gravity, Constructive QFT and Renormalisation

T. Thiemann^{1*}

¹ Inst. for Quantum Gravity, FAU Erlangen – Nürnberg,
Staudtstr. 7, 91058 Erlangen, Germany

July 25, 2021

Abstract

The canonical approach to quantum gravity has been put on a firm mathematical foundation in the recent decades. Even the quantum dynamics can be rigorously defined, however, due to the tremendously non-polynomial character of the gravitational interaction, the corresponding Wheeler-DeWitt operator valued distribution suffers from quantisation ambiguities that need to be fixed.

In a very recent series of works we have employed methods from constructive quantum field theory in order to address those ambiguities. Constructive QFT trades quantum fields for random variables and measures thereby phrasing the theory in the language of quantum statistical physics. The connection to the canonical formulation is made via Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction. It is well known in quantum statistics that the corresponding ambiguities in measures can be fixed using renormalisation. The associated renormalisation flow can thus be used to define a canonical renormalisation programme.

The purpose of this article is to review and further develop these ideas and to put them into context with closely related earlier and parallel programmes.

1 Introduction

The canonical approach to quantum gravity has been initialised long time ago [1]. However, the mathematical foundations of the theory remained veiled due to the tremendous non-linearity of the gravitational interaction. This has much changed with the reformulation of General Relativity as a Yang-Mills type gauge theory in terms of connection rather than metric variables [2] and has culminated in a research programme now known as Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) (see e.g. [3] for monographs and recent reviews on the subject). The qualifier “loop” stems from the fact that for gauge theories of Yang-Mills type it has proved useful to formulate the theory in terms of holonomies of the connection along closed paths (loops) in order to maintain manifest gauge invariance. Such so-called (Wilson) loop variables are widely used for instance in (lattice) QCD [4].

LQG has succeeded in providing a rigorous mathematical framework: The representation theory of the canonical commutation relations and the $*$ relations has been studied and a unique representation has been singled out [5] that allows for a unitary representation of the spatial diffeomorphism group. Moreover, the generators of temporal diffeomorphisms, sometimes referred to as Wheeler-DWitt operators, could be rigorously quantised on the corresponding Hilbert space [6] and in contrast to the perturbative approach to quantum gravity [7], no ultraviolet divergences were found. It should be emphasised, that this was achieved 1. in the continuum, rather than on a lattice, i.e. there is no artificial cut-off left over, 2. for the physical Lorentzian signature rather than unphysical Euclidian one, and 3. non-perturbatively and background independently, that is, one does not perturb around a classical background metric and then quantises the fluctuations which thus manifestly preserves the diffeomorphism covariance of all constructions.

*thomas.thiemann@gravity.fau.de

However, the theory is not yet completed: Due to the tremendously non-polynomial nature of the gravitational interaction, the usual factor ordering ambiguity in the quantisation of operator valued distributions which are non-linear in the fields is much more severe. Thus, the operators defined in [6] suffer from those ambiguities. Moreover, the following problem arises: In the classical theory, the canonical generators of spacetime diffeomorphisms (that is, their Hamiltonian vector fields) form a Lie algebroid (that is, a Lie algebra except that the structure constants are replaced by structure functions on the phase space) known as the hypersurface algebroid [8]. The structure functions are themselves promoted to operator valued distributions upon quantisation, thus it becomes even harder to find a quantisation of those generators such that the algebroid is represented without anomalies than it would be for an honest Lie algebra. Specifically, the commutator between two temporal diffeomorphism generators is supposed to 1. be proportional to a linear combination of spatial diffeomorphism generators with operator valued distributions as coefficients and 2. in an ordering, such that the following holds: The image of any such commutator of a dense domain of vectors in the Hilbert space must be in the kernel of the space of spatially diffeomorphism invariant distributions on that domain. In [10] it was shown that both conditions 1. and 2. hold, however, the coefficients in that linear combination do not qualify as quantisations of their classical counterpart. Thus while the quantisation of the hypersurface algebroid closes, it does so with the wrong operator valued distributions as coefficients.

Thus, the status of LQG can be summarised as follows:

As compared to [1] it is now possible to ask and answer precise questions about the mathematical consistency of the whole framework. As compared to the perturbative approach [7] the framework does not suffer from ultraviolet divergences and one does not have to worry about the convergence of a perturbation series due to the manifestly non-perturbative definition of LQG. However, just as in the perturbative approach, one needs further input in order to draw predictions from the theory, although of a different kind: In the perturbative approach, there are an infinite number of counter terms necessary due to non-perturbative non-renormalisability all of which come with coefficients that have to be measured but one can argue that only a finite number of them is of interest for processes involving energies not exceeding a certain threshold (effective field theory point of view). In LQG there are in principle infinitely many quantisation ordering prescriptions possible, each of which comes with definite coefficients in order to yield the correct naive continuum limit but it is not clear which ordering to choose so that presently one resorts to the principle of least technical complexity.

Various proposals have been made in order to improve the situation. In [11] one exploits the fact that classically one can always trade a set of first class constraints by a single weighted sum of their squares (called the master constraint). Since a single constraint always closes with itself and the weights can be chosen such that the master constraint commutes with spatial diffeomorphisms, one can now focus on the quantisation ambiguities involved in the master constraint without having to worry about anomalies. In [12] the case of General Relativity coupled to perfect fluid matter was considered which allows to solve the constraints before quantisation so that the remaining quantisation ambiguity now only rests in the corresponding physical Hamiltonian that drives the time evolution of the physical (that is, spacetime diffeomorphism invariant) observables. In [13] the constraints are quantised on a suitable space of distributions with respect to a dense domain of the Hilbert space rather than the Hilbert space itself in order to find a representation of the the hypersurface algebroid directly on that space of distributions which would at least partially fix the afore mentioned ordering ambiguity.

It transpires that additional input is necessary in order to fix the quantisation ambiguity in the dynamics of LQG and thus to complete the definition of the theory. This would also put additional faith into applications of LQG for instance to quantum cosmology [14] (where the amount of ambiguity is drastically reduced) which are believed to be approximations of LQG by enabling to make the connection between LQG and those approximations precise including an error control, see [15] for recent progress in that respect. In the recent proposal [16] which we intend to review in this article, the authors were inspired by Wilson's observation [16] that renormalisation methods help to identify among the principally infinitely many interaction terms in Hamiltonians relevant for condensed matter physics the finitely many relevant ones that need to be measured. This insight implies that a theory maybe perturbatively non-renormalisable but non-perturbatively renormalisable, also known as asymptotically safe [17]. The asymptotic safety approach to quantum gravity for Euclidian [18] and Lorentzian signature [19] precisely rests on that idea and has received much attention recently. In fact, there is much in common between our proposal and asymptotically safe quantum gravity (especially for Lorentzian signature) and we will have the opportunity to spell out more precisely points of contact in the course of this article. Also, there is a large body of work on

renormalisation [20] in the so-called spin foam approach [23] and the related group field theory [21] and tensor model¹ [22] approach to quantum gravity. The spin foam approach is loosely connected to LQG in the following sense: The states of the Hilbert space underlying LQG are labelled by collections of loops, that is, 3D graphs. A spin foam is an operator that maps such states excited on a graph to states excited on another graph. The operator depends on a specific class of 4D cell complex (foam) such that its boundary 3D complex is dual to the union of the two graphs corresponding to the incoming and outgoing Hilbert spaces. The operator is supposed to form the rigging map [24] of LQG, i.e. a generalised projector onto the joint kernel of the Wheeler-Dewitt constraints. We say that the connection is loose because the rigging nature of current spin foams in 4D is not confirmed yet. In any case, a spin foam operator can be formulated as a state sum model and thus renormalisation ideas apply. For applications of renormalisation group ideas in the cosmological sector of LQG see [25].

Most of the work on renormalisation is either within classical statistical physics (e.g. [26]) or the Euclidian (also called constructive) approach to quantum field theory [27]. In the Euclidian approach, the quantum field, which is an operator valued distribution on Minkowski space, is replaced by a distribution valued random variable on Euclidian space. While the dynamics in the Minkowski theory is given by Heisenberg equations, in the Euclidian theory it is encoded in a measure on the space of random variables. We are then back in the realm of statistical physics because loosely speaking the measure can be considered as a Gibbs factor for a Hamiltonian (sometimes called Euclidian action) in 4 spatial dimensions. How then should one use renormalisation ideas for quantum gravity? Quantum gravity is not a quantum field theory on Minkowski space (unless one works in the perturbative regime, but then it is non renormalisable). Also, while the Minkowski and Euclidian signature of metrics are related by simple analytic rotation in time from the real to the imaginary axis, this does not even work for classical metrics with curvature, not to mention the quantum nature of the metric (in ordinary QFT, the metric is just a non-dynamic background structure). One can of course start with Euclidian signature GR and try to build a measure theoretic framework, but then the relation to the Lorentzian signature theory is unclear. Moreover, while as an Ansatz for the Euclidian signature measure we can take the exponential of the Euclidian Einstein-Hilbert action, that action is not bounded from below and thus the measure cannot be a probability measure which is one of the assumptions of constructive QFT. Finally, in contrast to constructive QFT, in quantum gravity expectation values (operator language) or means (measure language) of basic operators (or random variables) such as the metric tensor have no direct physical meaning because coordinate transformations are considered as gauge transformations, hence none of the basic fields correspond to observables.

In our approach [16] we will use the framework [12], that is, we do not consider vacuum GR but GR coupled to matter which acts as a dynamical reference field. This enables us 1. to solve the spatial diffeomorphism and Hamiltonian constraints classically, 2. to work directly on the physical Hilbert space (i.e. the generalised kernel of all constraints equipped with the inner product induced by the rigged Hilbert space structure), 3. to have at our disposal immediately the gauge invariant degrees of freedom such that the physical Hilbert space is the representation space of a $*$ representation of those observables and 4. to be equipped with a physical Hamiltonian that drives the physical time evolution of those observables. Concretely and out of mathematical convenience we use the perfect fluid matter suggested in [28] but for what follows these details are not important. Important is only that it is possible to rephrase GR coupled to matter as a conservative Hamiltonian system and that all the machinery that was developed for LQG can be imported. Now the quantisation ambiguity rests of course in the physical Hamiltonian and it is that object and its renormalisation on which we focus our attention.

As we just explained, we can bring GR coupled to matter somewhat closer to the usual setting of ordinary QFT or statistical physics but still we cannot apply the usual path integral renormalisation scheme because we work in the canonical (or Hamiltonian) framework. The idea is then to make use of Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener like ideas in order to generate a Wiener measure theoretic framework from the Hamiltonian setting and vice versa to use Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction to map the measure theoretic (or path integral) framework to the Hamiltonian one. This way we can map between the two frameworks and thus import path integral renormalisation techniques into the Hamiltonian framework which are strictly equivalent to those employed in path integral renormalisation.

¹In principle any field theory with a polynomial Lagrangian can be written as a (coloured) tensor model as follows: Pick any orthonormal basis wrt the measure appearing in the action, expand the field in that basis, call the expansion coefficients a coloured (by the spacetime or internal indices) tensor in an infinite dimensional ℓ_2 space and call the integral over polynomials in those basis functions that appear in the action upon expanding the fields interaction terms of those tensors. If the basis carries labels in \mathbb{N}^d we obtain a coloured tensor model with tensors of rank n .

In order that this works one needs to check of course that the Wiener measure constructed obeys at least a minimal subset [29] of Osterwalder-Schrader axioms [30] in order for the reconstruction to be applicable, most importantly reflection positivity.

This was one of the goals of [16], namely to define a renormalisation group flow directly within the Hamiltonian setting with strict equivalence to the path integral flow. Specifically the flow is a flow of Osterwalder-Schrader triples (\mathcal{H}, H, Ω) consisting of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} a self-adjoint Hamiltonian H thereon bounded from below and a vacuum vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ annihilated by H . While physically well motivated, of course, one does not need to do this. Indeed, renormalisation techniques for Hamiltonians and vacua directly within the Hamiltonian setting were invented before and we devote the next section for putting our framework into context with schemes closely related to ours. The fact that we have a precise relation between Hamiltonian and path integral renormalisation makes it possible to bring Hamiltonian formulations of Quantum Gravity such as LQG and path integral formulations such as asymptotically safe Quantum Gravity, into closer contact.

The architecture of this article is as follows:

In the second section we give an incomplete overview over and sketch Hamiltonian renormalisation frameworks closely related to ours and point out differences and similarities.

In the third section we review how classical General Relativity coupled to suitable matter can be brought into the form of a conservative Hamiltonian system as well as the LQG quantisation thereof. The necessity to remove quantisation ambiguities will be highlighted.

In the fourth section we recall some background material on constructive QFT, the Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener construction as well as Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction.

In the fifth section we derive the natural relation between families of cylindrically defined measures, coarse graining, renormalisation group flows and their fixed points. We then use Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction to map the flow into the Hamiltonian framework. This section contains new material as compared to [16] in the sense that we 1. develop some systematics in the choice of coarse graining maps that are motivated by naturally available structures in the classical theory, 2. clarify the importance of the choice of random variable or stochastic process when performing OS reconstruction and 3. improve the derivation of the Hamiltonian renormalisation flow by adding the uniqueness of the vacuum as an additional assumption (also made in the OS framework of Euclidian QFT [27]) as well as some machinery concerning degenerate contraction semigroups and associated Kato-Trotter formulae.

In the sixth section we mention concrete points of contact between the scheme developed here and others in the context of density matrix, entanglement and projective renormalisation.

In the seventh section we sketch a relation between Hamiltonian renormalisation via Osterwalder Schrader reconstruction and the functional renormalisation group which is the underlying technique of the asymptotic safety programme.

In the eighth section we summarise, spell out implications of the renormalisation programme for the anomaly free implementation of the hypersurface algebroid and outline the next steps when trying to apply the framework to interacting QFT and finally canonical quantum gravity such as LQG.

In appendix A we prove some properties for a coarse graining scheme appropriate for non Abelian gauge theories, in appendix B we prove a lemma on the existence of certain Abelian C^* -algebras needed for the construction of stochastic processes during OS reconstruction, in appendix C we collect some renormalisation terminology for readers more familiar with actions rather than measures, in appendix D we give a proof for the Kato-Trotter product formula for semi-groups and projections in the simple case that the semi-group has a bounded generator and in appendix E we prove a strong limit identity between projections needed in section 5.3.

2 Overview over related Hamiltonian renormalisation schemes

Purpose of this section is not to give a complete scan of the vast literature on the subject of Hamiltonian renormalisation but just to give an overview over those programmes that we believe are closest to ours. Also we leave out many finer details as we just want to sketch their relation to our framework in broad terms. In sections 6, 7 we will give a few more details on the connection of our approach with the density matrix and functional

renormalisation group.

The starting point are of course the seminal papers by Kadanoff [31] and Wilson [32]. Kadanoff introduced the concept of a block spin transformation in statistical physics, i.e. a coarse graining transformation in *real space* (namely on the location of the spin degrees of freedom on the lattice) rather than in some more abstract space (e.g. momentum space blocking/suppressing as used e.g. in the asymptotically safe quantum gravity approach). This kind of real space coarse graining map is widely used not only in statistical physics but also in the path integral approach to QFT as for instance in lattice QCD [33]. On the other hand, Wilson introduced the concept of *Hamiltonian diagonalisation* to solve the Kondo problem (the low temperature behaviour of the electrical resistance in metals with impurities). This defines a renormalisation group flow directly on the space of Hamiltonians and its lowest lying energy eigenstates. More precisely, one considers a family of Hamiltonians labelled by an integer valued cut-off on the momentum mode label of the electron annihilation and creation operators. The renormalisation group flow is defined by diagonalising the Hamiltonian given by a certain cut-off label, and to use the eigenstates so computed to construct the matrix elements of the Hamiltonian at the next cut-off label. To make this practical, Wilson considered a *truncation*, at each renormalisation step, of the full energy spectrum to the 10^3 *lowest lying energy levels* which was sufficient for the low temperature Kondo problem. This is in fact nothing but the concrete application of the Rayleigh-Ritz method. The concept of truncation plays an important role also in most other renormalisation schemes, as otherwise the calculations become unmanageable.

The next step was done by Wegner [34] as well as Glazek and Wilson [35] which can be considered as a generalisation of the Hamiltonian methods of [32]. It could be called *perturbative Hamiltonian block diagonalisation* and was applied in QFT already (e.g. [36] and references therein). Roughly speaking, one introduces a momentum cut-off on the modes of the annihilation and creation operators involved in the free part of the Hamiltonian, then perturbatively (with respect to the coupling constant) constructs unitarities which at least *block diagonalise* that Hamiltonian with respect to a basis defined by modes that lie below half the cut-off and those that lie between half and the full cut-off, and then projects the Hamiltonian onto the Hilbert space defined by the modes below half of the cut-off to define a new Hamiltonian at half the cut-off. This can be done for each value of the cut-off and thus defines a flow of Hamiltonians (and vacua defined as their ground states). Another branch of work closely related to this is the projective programme due to Kijowski [37]. Here a flow of Hamiltonians on Hilbert spaces for different resolutions is given by the partial traces of the corresponding density matrices given by minus their exponential (Gibbs factors - assuming that these are trace class). See also [38, 39, 40] for more recent work on renormalisation building on this programme.

In these developments the spectrum of the Hamiltonian was directly used to define the flow. Another proposal was made by White [41] who defined the *density matrix renormalisation group*. This is a real space renormalisation group flow which considers the reduced density matrix corresponding to the tensor product split of a vector (e.g. the ground state of a Hamiltonian) of the total Hilbert space into two factors corresponding to a block and the rest (or at least a much larger “superblock”). This density matrix is diagonalised and then the Hilbert space is *truncated* by keeping only a certain fixed number of *highest lying eigenvalues* of the reduced density matrix. Finally the Hamiltonian corresponding to the block is projected and then the resulting structure is considered as the new structure on the coarser lattice resulting from collapsing the blocks to new vertices (we are skipping here some finer details). This method thus makes use of entanglement ideas since the reduced density matrix defines the degree of entanglement via its von Neumann entropy.

A variant of this is the *tensor renormalisation group approach* due to Levin and Nave [42]. It is based on the fact that each vector in a finite tensor product of *finite dimensional Hilbert spaces* can be written as a *matrix product state*, i.e. the coefficients of the vector with respect to the tensor product base can be written as a trace of a product of matrices of which there are in general as many as the dimensionality of the Hilbert space. One now performs a real space renormalisation scheme directly in terms of those matrices which are considered to be located on a lattice with as many vertices as tensor product factors. Importantly, this work connects renormalisation to the powerful numerical machinery of tensor networks [43].

Finally, as observed by Vidal [44] and Evenbly and Vidal [45], one can improve [41, 42] by building in an additional unitary disentanglement step into the tensor network renormalisation scheme. This is quite natural because a tensor network can also be considered as a quantum circuit with the truncation steps involved considered as isometries but a quantum circuit in quantum computing [46] consists of a network of unitary gates some of

which have a disentangling nature depending on the state that they act upon. The resulting scheme is called multi-scale entanglement renormalisation ansatz (MERA).

As this brief and incomplete discussion reveals, there are numerous proposals in the literature for how to renormalise quantum systems. They crucially differ from each other in the choice of the coarse graining map. There are various aspects that discriminate between these maps, such as:

1. Real space versus other labels

The degrees of freedom to be coarse grained are labelled by points in spacetime or else (momentum, energy, ...).

2. Kinematic versus dynamical

Real space block spin transformations are an example of a kinematic coarse graining, i.e. the form of the action, a Hamiltonian, its vacuum vector, its associated reduced density matrix and the corresponding degree of entanglement do not play any role. By contrast, Hamiltonian block diagonalisation, density matrix and entanglement renormalisation take such dynamical information into account.

3. Truncated versus exact

In principle any renormalisation scheme can be performed exactly, e.g. in real space path integral renormalisation one can just integrate the excess degrees of freedom that live on the finer lattice but not on the coarser thus obtaining the measure (or effective action) on the coarser lattice from that of the finer one. The same is true e.g. for the procedure followed in asymptotically safe quantum gravity. However, in practice this may quickly become unmanageable and thus one resorts to approximation methods e.g. by truncation in the space of coupling constants, energy eigenstates or reduced density matrix eigenstates.

For the newcomer to the subject, this plethora of suggestions may appear confusing. Which choice of coarse graining is preferred? Do different choices lead to equivalent physics? What can be said about the convergence of various schemes and what is the meaning of the fixed point(s) if it (they) exist(s)? The physical intuition is that different schemes should give equivalent results if 1. the corresponding fixed point conditions capture necessary and sufficient properties that the theory should have in order to qualify as a continuum theory and 2. *when performed exactly*. The first condition is obvious, we start from what we believe to be an initial guess for how the theory looks at different resolutions and then formulate a coarse graining flow whose fixed points are such that they qualify to define a continuum theory. The second condition entails that the coarse graining maps just differ in the separation of the total set of degrees of freedom into subsets corresponding to coarse and fine resolution, hence corresponds to choices of coordinate systems which of course can be translated into each other. However, when truncations come into play, this equivalence is lost because different schemes truncate different sets of degrees of freedom which are generically no longer in bijection. It is conceivable therefore that dynamically driven truncation schemes perform better at identifying the correct fixed point structure of the theory in the sense that they may converge faster and are less vulnerable to truncation errors or automatically pick the truncation of *irrelevant* couplings. This seems to be confirmed in spin system examples but we are not aware of a general proof. Recently, the importance of the kinematic versus dynamic issue has also been emphasised for the LQG and spin foam approach [47].

In our work we currently are not concerned with issues of computability, that is, we consider an exact scheme. Next, as far as the coarse graining map is concerned, we currently favour a kinematic scheme. The reason for doing this is that kinematic schemes are *naturally suggested by measure theoretic questions*. Namely, measures on spaces of infinitely many degrees of freedom are never of the type of the exponential of some action times a normalisation constant times Lebesgue measure. Neither of these three ingredients is well defined. What is well defined are integrals of certain probe functions of the field with respect to that measure. These probe functions in turn are naturally chosen to depend on test functions that one integrates the field against. Thus these test functions provide a natural notion of resolution, discretisation and coarse graining. By integrating the measure against probe functions one obtains a family of measures labelled by the test functions involved. The relation between test functions at different resolution induces a corresponding relation between members of the family of measures which *must hold exactly* for a true measure of the continuum QFT. In turn, such consistency relations called *cylindrical consistency* can be used to *define* a measure on a space of infinitely many degrees of freedom [48], called a *projective limit*. The idea is then to formulate measure renormalisation in such a way that its fixed points solve the consistency relations. This approach has been advocated in [49] for Euclidian Yang-Mills theory and in [50] for spin foams. Note that spin foams strictly speaking do not construct measures but rather

are supposed to construct a rigging map so that Hamiltonian methods come also into play. Indeed, in [47] it was shown that the cylindrically consistent coarse graining of the rigging map and its underlying spacetime lattice, thought of as an anti-linear functional on the kinematical Hilbert space, induces a coarse graining of the spatial lattice on its boundary and thus the Hilbert space thereon, equipping it with a system of consistent embeddings, a structure similar to inductive limits of Hilbert spaces (an inductive structure requires in addition the injections to be isometric). That latter structure underlies the kinematical Hilbert space of LQG and a renormalisation procedure based on inductive limits was already proposed in [51] due to the similarity of LQG to lattice gauge theory.

Another reason for why picking real space coarse graining schemes as compared to say, momentum space based ones is their background independence which is especially important for quantum gravity. In our work, as we consider the version of LQG in which the constraints already have been solved, we will work with probability measures. As we will see, the connection between inductive limits of Hilbert spaces and projective limits of path integral measures can be made crystal clear in this case. The price we pay by using an exact, kinematical scheme is that the fixed point (or renormalised) Hamiltonian becomes spatially non-local at finite resolution. However, in the free QFT examples studied [16], which are spatially local in the continuum, by blocking the known fixed point theory from the continuum one can see that this is natural and *must happen* for such schemes, hence it is not a reason for concern but in fact physical reality. The degree of spatial non-locality in fact decreases as we increase the resolution scale.

When applying the framework to interacting QFT one will have to resort to some kind of approximation scheme and possibly tools from entanglement renormalisation combined with tensor network techniques may prove useful. However, note that QFT of bosonic fields (gravity is an example) deals with infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces even when the theory depends only on a finite number of degrees of freedom say by discretising it on a lattice and confining it to finite volume. Thus, to apply tensor network techniques which, to the best of our knowledge, require the factors in the tensor product to be finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, one would have to cut off the dimensions of those Hilbert spaces right from the beginning, i.e. one would have to work with *three* cut-offs rather than two (see e.g. [52] where quantum group representations are used in gauge theories rather than classical group representations and performs real space renormalisation or [53] where one combines both the UV and the dimension cut-off into one by turning the dimension of tensor spaces in tensor models into a finite coarse graining parameter and otherwise performs the asymptotic safety programme which is often formulated in the presence of a cut-off anyway).

Some sort of truncation or approximation has to be made in practice when treating complex systems numerically. The physical insight behind the tensor network and density matrix/entanglement renormalisation developments, namely that the dynamically interesting vectors in a Hilbert space appear to lie in a “tiny” subspace thereof is presumably a profound one and the truncation of the Hilbert space to the corresponding subspaces appears to be well motivated by the model (spin) systems studied so far. Still, what one would like to have is some sort of error control or convergence criteria on those truncations. We appreciate that this is a hard task for the future. For the time being we phrase our framework without incorporating a cut-off on the dimension of Hilbert spaces as we are not yet concerned with numerical investigations, however, we may have to use some of these ideas in the future.

3 Canonical Quantum Gravity coupled to reference matter

The physical idea is quite simple and goes back to [54]: General Relativity is a gauge theory, the gauge group being the spacetime diffeomorphism group. Thus the basic tensor and spinor fields in terms of which one writes the Einstein-Hilbert action and the action of the standard model coupled to the metric (or its tetrad) are not observable. However, the value of, say a scalar field Φ at that spacetime point X_y , at which four reference scalar fields ϕ^0, \dots, ϕ^3 take values y^0, \dots, y^3 , that is, $\Phi(X_y)$; $\phi^\mu(X_y) = y^\mu$ is spacetime diffeomorphism invariant. For this to work, the relation $\phi^\mu(X) = y^\mu$ must of course be invertible, in particular the reference scalar fields must not vanish anywhere or anytime. This seems to be a property of dark matter [55].

These kind of relational observables have been further developed by various authors, see in particular [56, 57]. When one couples General Relativity and such reference matter preserving general covariance, it becomes possible

to formulate the theory in a manifestly gauge invariant way. The form of that gauge invariant formulation of course strongly depends on the type of reference matter used and its Lagrangian. In what follows we use the concrete model [12] out of mathematical convenience, but we emphasise that the same technique works in a fairly general context. In the next subsection, that model will be introduced and the classical gauge invariant formulation will be derived. After that we quantise it using LQG methods which will be introduced in tandem.

3.1 Gaussian dust model

The Lagrangian of the theory takes the form

$$L = L_{EH} + L_{SM} + L_D \quad (3.1)$$

where L_{EH} is the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian, L_{SM} the standard model Lagrangian coupled to GR via the metric, its tetrad or its spin connection and L_D is the Gaussian dust Lagrangian [28]

$$L_D = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{|\det(g)|} \{g^{\mu\nu} [\rho (\nabla_\mu T) (\nabla_\nu T) + 2(\nabla_\mu T)(W_j \nabla_\nu S^j)] + \rho\} \quad (3.2)$$

where g is the Lorentzian signature metric tensor, ∇_μ its Levi-Civita covariant differential, $\phi^0 := T$, $\phi^j := S^j$; $j = 1, 2, 3$ are the reference scalar fields introduced above and ρ, W_j are additional four scalar fields. The latter four fields appear without derivatives and thus give rise to primary constraints in addition to those present even in vacuum GR. One easily show that the contribution of L_D to the energy momentum tensor is of perfect fluid type. Further physical properties and motivations are discussed in [28]. For what follows it suffices to know that the equations of motion for T, S^j say that $\nabla_\mu T$ is a timelike geodesic co-tangent and that S^j is constant along the geodesic spray. Thus, those geodesics can be interpreted as worldlines of dynamically coupled test observers.

The full constraint analysis of (3.1) is carried out in [12]. There are secondary constraints and the full set of constraints contains those of first and second class (see [57] for a modern treatment of Dirac's algorithm [58]). One has to introduce a Dirac bracket and solves the second class constraints in the course of which the variables ρ, W_j are eliminated. The remaining constraints are then of first class and read

$$C^{\text{tot}} = C + \frac{P - q^{ab} T_{,a} C_b}{\sqrt{1 + q^{ab} T_{,a} T_{,b}}}, \quad C_a^{\text{tot}} = C_a + P T_{,a} + P_j S^j_{,a} \quad (3.3)$$

Here C is the Wheeler-DeWitt constraint function (including standard matter), C_a , $a = 1, 2, 3$ are the spatial diffeomorphism functions (including standard matter). The Dirac bracket reduces to the Poisson bracket on all the variables involved in (3.3) and P, P_j are the momenta conjugate to T, S^j , e.g. $\{P(x), T(y)\} = \delta(x, y)$. Here $a = 1, 2, 3$ are tensorial indices on the spatial hypersurface σ of the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner foliation underlying the Hamiltonian formulation of GR [59] with intrinsic metric tensor q_{ab} . For the moment it is just necessary to know that C, C_a do not involve the variables T, P, S^j, P_j .

The constraints (3.3) encode the spacetime diffeomorphism gauge symmetry in Hamiltonian form, in particular they represent the hypersurface deformation algebra [8]. It is possible to solve these remaining constraints, to determine the complete set of gauge invariant (so called Dirac) observables and to determine the physical Hamiltonian H that drives their physical time evolution [12]. Equivalently, we may gauge fix (3.3). The above interpretation of T, S^j suggest to use the gauge conditions $G = T - t, G^a = \delta^a_j S^j - x^a$. The stabilisation of these gauge conditions fixes the Lagrange multipliers λ, λ^a in the gauge generator

$$K := C^{\text{tot}}(\lambda, \vec{\lambda}) := \int_\sigma d^3x [\lambda C^{\text{tot}} + \lambda^a C_a^{\text{tot}}] \quad (3.4)$$

namely

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{G}(t, x) &= \{K, G(x)\} + \partial_t G(t, x) = \frac{\lambda(x)}{\sqrt{1 + q^{ab} T_{,a} T_{,b}}} + \lambda^a T_{,a} - 1 = 0, \\ \dot{G}^a(t, x) &= \{K, G^a(x)\} + \partial_t G^a(t, x) = \lambda^b S^j_{,b} \delta^a_j = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

which when evaluated at $G = G^a = 0$ yields the unique solution $\lambda = 1, \lambda^a = 0$. Likewise, in this gauge the constraints can be uniquely solved for $P = -C$, $P_j = -\delta_j^a C_a$ while T, S^j are pure gauge. This shows that the physical degrees of freedom are those not involving T, P, S^j, P_j .

For any function F independent of these variables the reduced or physical Hamiltonian is that function on the phase space coordinatised by the physical degrees of freedom which generates the same time evolution as K when the constraints, gauge conditions and stabilising Lagrange multipliers are installed

$$\{H, F\} := \{K, F\}_{C^{\text{tot}}=\vec{C}^{\text{tot}}=G=\vec{G}=\lambda=1=\vec{\lambda}=0} = \left\{ \int_{\sigma} d^3x C, F \right\} \quad (3.6)$$

which shows that

$$H = \int_{\sigma} d^3x C \quad (3.7)$$

Thus the final picture is remarkably simple: The physical phase space is simply coordinatised by all metric and standard matter degrees of freedom (and their conjugate momenta) while the physical Hamiltonian is just the integral of the usual Wheeler-DeWitt constraint. The influence of the reference matter now only reveals itself in the fact that H is not constrained to vanish as it only involves the geometry and standard matter contribution C of C^{tot} and that the number of physical degrees of freedom has increased by four as compared to the system without reference matter. This phenomenon is of course well known from the electroweak interaction: One can solve the three isospin $SU(2)$ Gaus constraints for three of the four degrees of freedom sitting in the complex valued Higgs isodoublet, leaving a single scalar Higgs field and three massive rather than massless vector bosons. See [60] for further discussion.

We close this subsection with three remarks:

First, a complete discussion requires to show that the gauge cut $G = G^a = 0$ on the constraint surface of the phase space be reachable from anywhere on the constraint surface. As (3.5) shows, this requires that $S_{,a}^j$ be invertible. We thus impose this as an anholonomic constraint on the total phase space. One easily verifies from (3.5) that this condition is gauge invariant, i.e. compatible with the dynamics.

Second, the simplicity of the final picture is due to the particular choice of reference matter. Other reference matter most likely will increase the complexity, see e.g. [61] which produces a square root Hamiltonian! One may argue that the dust is a form of cold dark matter [55], but it is unclear whether this is physically viable. Nevertheless, the present model serves as a proof of principle, namely that GR coupled to standard matter and reference can be cast into the form of a conservative Hamiltonian system.

Third, it should be appreciated that the reference matter helps us to accomplish a huge step in the quantum gravity programme: It frees us from quantising and solving the constraints, construct the physical inner product, the gauge invariant observables and their physical time evolution. All of these steps are of tremendous technical difficulty [3]. All we are left to do is to quantise the physical degrees of freedom and the physical Hamiltonian.

3.2 Loop Quantum Gravity quantisation of the reduced physical system

In order to keep the technical complexity to a minimum, we consider just the contribution to H coming from the gravitational degrees of freedom, see [6, 3] for more details on standard matter coupling. The Hamiltonian directly written in terms of $SU(2)$ gauge theory variables reads (we drop some numerical coefficients that are not important for our discussion)

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_E + H_L \\ H_E &= \int_{\sigma} \text{Tr}(F \wedge \{V, A\}) \\ V &= \int_{\sigma} \sqrt{|\det(E)|} \\ H_L &= \int_{\sigma} \text{Tr}(\{\{H_E, V\}, A\} \wedge \{\{H_E, V\}, A\} \wedge \{V, A\}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Here A is an $SU(2)$ connection and E an $SU(2)$ non-Abelian electric field that one would encounter also in a $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory. However, the geometric interpretation of A, E is different: Namely, $e_j^a := E_j^a / \sqrt{|\det(E)|}$ is a

triad, that is, $q^{ab} = \delta^{jk} e_j^a e_k^b$ is the inverse spatial metric. Here, as before, $a, b, c, \dots = 1, 2, 3$ denote spatial tensor indices while now $j, k, l, \dots = 1, 2, 3$ denote $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Lie algebra indices. Further, let Γ_a^j be the spin connection of e_j^a . Then $K_{ab} := (A_a^j - \Gamma_a^j) e_b^k \delta_{jk}$ has the meaning of the extrinsic curvature of the ADM slices [59] on the kernel of the $\text{SU}(2)$ Gauss constraint

$$C_j := \partial_a E_j^a + \epsilon_{jkl} A_a^k E_m^a \delta_l^m \quad (3.9)$$

The important quantity V is recognised as the total volume of the hypersurface σ and H_E, H_L are known as the Euclidian and Lorentzian contributions to H . See [6] for further details. The Poisson brackets displayed are with respect to the standard symplectic structure

$$\{A_a^j(x), A_b^k(y)\} = \{E_j^a(x), E_k^b(y)\} = \{E_j^a(x), A_b^k(y)\} - \kappa \delta_b^a \delta_j^k \delta(x, y) = 0 \quad (3.10)$$

where $\hbar\kappa = \ell_P^2$ is the Planck area. The definition of the phase space is completed by the statement that the elementary fields A, E are real valued

$$[A_a^j(x)]^* - A_a^j(x) = [E_j^a(x)]^* - E_j^a(x) = 0 \quad (3.11)$$

The traces involved in 3.8 are carried out by introducing the Lie algebra valued 1-forms $A = A_a^j \tau_j dx^a$ where $2i\tau_j$ are the Pauli matrices and $F = 2(dA + A \wedge A)$ is the curvature of A . The non polynomiality of GR is hidden in the Poisson brackets that appear in (3.8). The reason for why we use these particular Poisson bracket structure will become clear only later.

To quantise the theory we start from functions on the phase space that are usually employed in lattice gauge theory, see e.g. [62], namely non-Abelian magnetic holonomy and electric flux variables

$$A(c) := \mathcal{P} \exp\left(\int_c A\right), \quad E_f(S) = \int_S \text{Tr}(f * E) \quad (3.12)$$

where \mathcal{P} denotes path ordering, c is a piecewise analytic real curve, S a piecewise real analytic surface, f an $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ valued function and $*E = \epsilon_{abc} E^a dx^b \wedge dx^c / 2$ the pseudo 2-form corresponding to the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ valued vector density E . Note that $A(c)$ is $\text{SU}(2)$ valued while $E_f(S)$ is $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ valued

$$A(c)^* = (A(c)^{-1})^T = A(c^{-1})^T, \quad E_f(S)^* = -E_f(S)^T \quad (3.13)$$

where c^{-1} is the same curve as c but with the opposite orientation. The simplest non-trivial Poisson brackets are

$$\{E_f(S), A(c)\} = \kappa A(c_1) f(c \cap S) A(c_2) \quad (3.14)$$

in case that $S \cap c$ is a single point in the interior of both c, S , see [5] for a complete discussion. The relations (3.13), (3.14) are the defining relations of a non-commutative abstract $*$ -algebra \mathfrak{A} generated by fluxes and complex valued smooth functions F of a finite number of holonomy variables [5]. It is the free algebra generated by them and divided by the two sided ideal generated by the canonical commutation relations $E_f(S)A(c) - A(c)E_f(S) = i\hbar\{E_f(S), F\}$ and the adjointness relations (3.13). See [5] for more details.

Interestingly, the physical Hamiltonian H has a large symmetry group. Namely, it is invariant under the group $\mathfrak{G} = \text{SU}(2)_{\text{loc}} \rtimes \text{Diff}(\sigma)$ where $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{loc}}$ denotes the group of local $\text{SU}(2)$ valued gauge transformations and $\text{Diff}(\sigma)$ denotes the group of (piecewise real analytic) diffeomorphisms of σ . An element of \mathfrak{G} is given by a pair $g = (g, \varphi)$ which acts on the basic variables as

$$\alpha_{(g, \varphi)}(A) = -dg g^{-1} + g[\varphi^* A]g^{-1}, \quad \alpha_{(g, \varphi)}(*E) = g[\varphi^* (*E)]g^{-1} \quad (3.15)$$

where φ^* denotes the pull-back action of diffeomorphisms on differential forms. This action lifts to the algebra \mathfrak{A} , specifically

$$\alpha_{(g, \varphi)}(A(c)) = g(b(c)) A(\varphi(c)) g(f(c))^{-1}, \quad \alpha_{(g, \varphi)}(E_f(S)) = E_{[g^{-1}fg] \circ \varphi^{-1}}(\varphi(S)) \quad (3.16)$$

where $b(c), f(c)$ denote beginning and final point of c and this simple covariant transformation behaviour was part of the reason why the particular “smearing” of A along curves involved in holonomies is used. Note also the

different character of the two groups: While we still have to find the gauge invariant observables with respect to the Gauss constraint the diffeomorphism constraint is already solved. The diffeomorphisms in \mathfrak{G} are thus to be considered as active diffeomorphisms rather than passive ones.

The mathematical problem in quantising the theory consists in constructing a $*$ representation of \mathfrak{A} , that is, a representation (π, \mathcal{H}) of elements $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ as operators $\pi(a)$ densely defined on a common, invariant domain \mathcal{D} of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} such that the $*$ relations are implemented as adjointness relations and such that the canonical commutation relations are implemented as commutators between them. Thus we want in particular that

$$\pi(a^*) = [\pi(a)]^\dagger, \pi(a + b) = \pi(a) + \pi(b), \pi(ab) = \pi(a)\pi(b), \pi(za) = z\pi(a), [\pi(a), \pi(b)] = \pi(c); \quad (3.17)$$

for all $a, b, c \in \mathfrak{A}$, $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ if $ab - ba = c$. In QFT this problem is known to typically have an uncountably infinite number of unitarily inequivalent solutions, there is no Stone-von Neumann uniqueness theorem when the number of degrees of freedom is infinite. Hence, to make progress, we must use additional physical input. That input can only come from the Hamiltonian. Thus, we require in addition that the representation supports H as a self-adjoint operator (H is real valued) also densely defined on \mathcal{D} and such that \mathcal{H} carries a unitary representation U of \mathfrak{G} (such that its generators are self-adjoint by Stone's theorem). Using the powerful machinery of the Gel'fand-Naimark-Segal construction [63], the representation property and the unitarity property can be granted if we find a positive linear and \mathfrak{G} invariant functional $\omega : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on \mathfrak{A} , that is

$$\omega \circ \alpha_g = \omega, \quad \omega(a^*a) \geq 0 \quad (3.18)$$

In [5] it was found that there is a *unique* ω satisfying (3.18). While the derivation is somewhat involved, the final result can be described in a compact form. The dense domain \mathcal{D} consists of functions of the form

$$\psi(A) = \psi_\gamma(\{A(c)\}_{c \in E(\gamma)}); \quad \psi_\gamma \in C^\infty(SU(2)^{|E(\gamma)|}, \mathbb{C}) \quad (3.19)$$

i.e. ψ_γ is a complex valued, smooth functions of a finite number of holonomy variables. The union of the curves of these holonomies forms a finite graph γ where $E(\gamma)$ denotes the set of its edges. Note that the elements of \mathfrak{A} that just depend on the connection are themselves of the form (3.19) and thus their action by multiplication

$$[\pi(f)\psi](A) := f(A) \psi(A) \quad (3.20)$$

is densely defined. The fluxes are densely defined when acting by derivation

$$[\pi(E_f(S))\psi](A) := i\hbar\{E_f(S), \psi(A)\} \quad (3.21)$$

which also solves the canonical commutation relations.

To see that the adjointness conditions hold we need the inner product. To define it, we note that graphs defined by finitely many piecewise analytic curves are partially ordered by set theoretic inclusion and they are directed in the sense that for any two graphs γ_1, γ_2 there exists γ_3 with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subset \gamma_3$, for instance $\gamma_3 = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$. Then we can decompose all edges of γ_1, γ_2 with respect to the edges of γ_3 , use the algebraic relations of the holonomy $A(c^{-1}) = A(c)^{-1}$, $A(c \circ c') = A(c)A(c')$ where $c \circ c'$ is the composition of curves $f(c) = b(c')$ in order to write ψ_1, ψ_2 excited over γ_1, γ_2 respectively as functions excited over γ_3 . Thus it is sufficient to know the inner product of functions excited over the same graph γ which is given by

$$\langle \psi, \psi' \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} := \int_{SU(2)^{|E(\gamma)|}} \prod_{k=1}^{|E(\gamma)|} d\mu_H(h_k) \overline{\psi(\{h_k\})} \psi'(\{h_k\}) \quad (3.22)$$

where μ_H is the Haar measure on $SU(2)$. One can check that the adjointness relations are indeed satisfied, in fact $\pi(E_f(S))$ is an unbounded but essentially self-adjoint operator (i.e. a symmetric operator with unique self-adjoint extension).

In fact (3.22) defines a cylindrical family of measures μ_γ , one for every graph γ . One has to check that (3.22) is well defined because a function excited on γ can be written also as a function excited over any finer graph γ' by extending it trivially to the additional edges. This is in fact the case [5]. Then the Kolmogorov type extension theorems grant that the family extends to an honest continuum measure μ on the quantum configuration space

$\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ of distributional connections. We will not go into the details here which can be found in [5] but just mention for the interested reader that this space coincides with the so-called Gel'fand spectrum of the Abelian C^* algebra that one obtains by completing the space of functions (3.19) in the sup norm. It follows that the Hilbert space is given by $\mathcal{H} = L_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, d\mu)$.

By construction, the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} carries a unitary representation U of \mathfrak{G} given by

$$(U(\mathfrak{g})\psi)(A) = \psi_\gamma(\{\alpha_{\mathfrak{g}}(A(c))\}_{c \in E(\gamma)}) \quad (3.23)$$

To check this, one uses the properties of the Haar measure (translation invariance) and the diffeomorphism invariance of (3.22) which does not care about the location and shape of the curves involved.

The Hilbert space comes equipped with an explicitly known orthonormal basis called spin network functions (SNWF). This makes use of harmonic analysis on compact groups G [64], in particular the Peter & Weyl theorem which states that the matrix element functions of the irreducible representations of G , which are all finite dimensional and unitary without loss of generality, are mutually orthogonal, unless equivalent, with respect to the inner product defined by the Haar measure on G , moreover, they span the whole Hilbert space. As the irreducible representations of $SU(2)$ are labelled by spin quantum numbers, the name SNWF comes at no surprise. More in detail a SNWF $T_{\gamma,j,\iota}$ is labelled by a graph γ , a tuple $j = \{j_c\}_{c \in E(\gamma)}$ of spin quantum numbers decorating the edges and a tuple $\iota = \{\iota_v\}_{v \in V(\gamma)}$ of intertwiners decorating the vertices v in the vertex set $V(\gamma)$ of γ . Here an intertwiner ι_v projects the tensor product of irreducible representations corresponding to the edges incident at v onto one of the irreducible representations appearing in its decomposition into irreducibles (Clebsch-Gordan theory). Besides providing an ONB convenient for concrete calculations, SNF make it easy to solve the Gauss constraint: A detailed analysis [3] shows that (3.9) can be quantised in the given representation and just imposes that the space of intertwiners be restricted to those projecting on the trivial (spin zero) representation. We call such intertwiners gauge invariant. Hence the joint kernel of the Gauss constraints is a closed subspace of \mathcal{H} which is explicitly known. We will abuse the notation and will not distinguish between that subspace and \mathcal{H} and henceforth consider the Gauss constraint as solved. All operators considered in what follows are manifestly gauge invariant and preserve that subspace.

As a historical remark, solutions of the Gauss constraint are excited on closed graphs since there is no non-trivial intertwiner between the trivial representation and a single irreducible one, hence open ends are forbidden. For closed graphs, one can alternatively label SNWF by homotopically independent closed paths (loops) with a common starting point (vertex) on that graph. Originally one used loops as labels, hence the name Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG).

One of the many unfamiliar features of \mathcal{H} is that it is not separable which easily follows from the uncountable cardinality of the set of graphs. This is a direct consequence of the diffeomorphism invariance of the inner product: Two graphs that are arbitrarily close but disjoint are simultaneously also arbitrarily far apart under the inner product. Thus if the measure clusters for far apart support of the smearing functions (here the graphs) then the orthogonality of the corresponding spin network functions comes at no surprise. A direct consequence of this is that the diffeomorphism operators $U(\varphi)$ do not act (strongly) continuously, hence a generator of infinitesimal diffeomorphisms generated by the integral curves of vector fields cannot exist. Yet another direct consequence is that the connection operator A itself does not exist, only its holonomies do.

The remaining task is to quantise the Hamiltonian and it is at this point where the afore mentioned quantisation ambiguities arise. The strategy followed in [6] is as follows: It turns out that the volume operator appearing in (3.8) can be quantised on \mathcal{H} as an essentially self-adjoint operator whose spectrum is pure point (discrete) [65]. It is densely defined on the span of the SNWF and it acts vertex wise, with no contribution from gauge (in)variant vertices that are not at least three (four) valent or from vertices whose incident edges have tangents in a common two dimensional or one dimensional space. Next the holonomy along an open curve c can be expanded as $A(c) = 1_2 + \int_c A + \dots$ and along a closed curve α as $A(\alpha) = 1_2 + \int_{S, \partial S = \alpha} F$ so that the functions A, F that appear in (3.8) can be approximated by suitable holonomies where the approximation is in terms of the "length" of the curves involved which are matched with the coordinate volume assigned by the Lebesgue measure d^3x appearing in (3.8) approximating the integral by a Riemann sum (this is a regularisation step). Suppose then that somehow a well defined operator H_E can be defined by replacing the classical functions by operators and the Poisson brackets by commutators times \hbar . Then the same argument can be applied to the Lorentzian piece. As

a final piece of information, one uses the observation that a spatially diffeomorphism invariant operator, densely defined on the span of SNWF cannot have non-trivial matrix elements between SNWF excited over different graphs [9]. This has the following consequence: Let \mathcal{H}_γ be the closed linear span of SNWF excited precisely over γ . Then, if H is supposed to preserve its classical diffeomorphism invariance upon quantisation we necessarily have

$$H = \oplus_\gamma H_\gamma, \quad \mathcal{H} = \oplus_\gamma \mathcal{H}_\gamma \quad (3.24)$$

where each H_γ is self-adjoint on \mathcal{H}_γ , in particular it preserves this space. Let now $P_\gamma : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\gamma$ be the orthogonal projection. Then the following concrete expression for H can be given [12] (again we drop some numerical coefficients and set $\hbar = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} H_{E,\gamma} &= P_\gamma H'_{E,\gamma} P_\gamma \\ H'_{E,\gamma} &= i \sum_{v \in V(\gamma)} \sum_{c_1, c_2, c_3 \in E(\gamma); c_1 \cap c_2 \cap c_3 = v} \epsilon^{IJK} \text{Tr}([A(\alpha_{\gamma, v, c_I, c_J}) - A(\alpha_{\gamma, v, c_I, c_J})^{-1}] A(c_K) [V, A(c_K)^{-1}]) + h.c. \\ H_{L,\gamma} &= P_\gamma H'_{L,\gamma} P_\gamma \\ H'_{L,\gamma} &= i \sum_{v \in V(\gamma)} \sum_{c_1, c_2, c_3 \in E(\gamma); c_1 \cap c_2 \cap c_3 = v} \epsilon^{IJK} \text{Tr}(A(c_I) [[H'_{E,\gamma}, V], A(c_I)^{-1}] A(c_J) [[H'_{E,\gamma}, V], A(c_J)^{-1}] A(c_K) [V, A(c_K)^{-1}]) + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

The sum is over vertices of γ and triples of edges incident at them (taken with outgoing orientation). For each vertex v and pairs of edges c, c' outgoing from v one defines $\alpha_{\gamma, v, c, c'}$ as that loop within γ starting at v along c and ending at v along $(c')^{-1}$ with the minimal number of elements of $E(\gamma)$ used (if that loop is not unique, we average over them). It has been shown, that the concrete expression (3.25) has the correct semiclassical limit in terms of expectation values with respect to semiclassical coherent states [66] on sufficiently fine graphs of cubic topology [67].

Remarkably, (3.25) defines an essentially self-adjoint, diffeomorphism invariant, continuum Hamiltonian operator for Lorentzian quantum gravity in four spacetime dimensions, densely defined on the physical continuum Hilbert space \mathcal{H} *which is manifestly free of ultraviolet divergences*. That is, while for each given graph γ the theory looks like a lattice gauge theory on γ , the theory is defined on all lattices simultaneously which makes it a continuum theory. Moreover, note that the vector $\Omega = 1$ has norm unity and that $H\Omega = 1$.

Yet, one cannot be satisfied with (3.25) for the following reasons:

1.

While it is true that one can give a better motivated derivation than we could sketch here for reasons of space, there are some ad hoc steps involved.

2.

There are several ordering ambiguities involved in (3.25): Not only could we have written the factors in different orders but instead of using the fundamental representation to approximate connections in terms of holonomies we could have used higher spin representations [68] or an average over several of them and in each case we would have different coefficients appearing in front of these terms.

3.

Of particular concern is definition of the minimal loop. While this gives good semiclassical results on sufficiently fine lattices, the theory lives on all lattices also those which are very coarse and on those the expression (3.25) is doubtful, because the Riemann approximation mentioned above would suggest to use a much finer loop. In fact, one is supposed to take the regulator (i.e. the coordinate volume ϵ of the Riemann approximants) away and in that limit the loop would shrink to zero. One can justify that this does not happen by using a sufficiently weak operator topology [6]. Namely, there exist diffeomorphism invariant distributions (linear functionals) l on the dense span of SNWF ψ [9] and we define an operator O_ϵ to converge to an operator O in that topology if $l([O_\epsilon - O]\psi) \rightarrow 0$ for all l, ψ . Now due to diffeomorphism invariance we can deform for any ϵ the small loop to any diffeomorphic one as long as we do not cross other edges of the graph, in particular we can deform it as close

as we want to the minimal one. Then the result mentioned above about the matrix elements of diffeomorphism invariant operators in fact forces us to choose that loop precisely, not only approximately. Of course, while the diffeomorphism symmetry of H makes the space of diffeomorphism invariant distributions a natural space to consider, it is still not perfectly justified to use it in order to define a topology.

4.

The naive dequantisation of (3.25) will perform poorly on very coarse graphs and will be far from the continuum expression (3.8) but one could argue that that vectors supported on coarse graphs simply do not qualify as good semiclassical states.

5.

Using the same argument as in 3. there is nothing sacred about the minimal loop and one could take again other loops and/or average of over them with certain weights. However, then the locality of (3.25) is lost.

6.

The block diagonal or superselection structure 3.24) which is forced on us by the non-separability of the Hilbert space and its spatial diffeomorphism covariance appears unphysical, one would expect that the Hamiltonian creates also new excitations.

It transpires that we must improve (3.25) and the discussion has indicated a possible solution: Blocking free QFT from the continuum (i.e. restricting the Hilbert space to vectors of finite spatial resolution) with respect to a kinematic real space coarse graining scheme exactly produces such a high degree of non-locality at finite resolution even if the continuum measure or the continuum Hamiltonian is local [16, 20, 33]. This bears the chance that what we see in (3.25) is nothing but a naive guess of a continuum Hamiltonian which is blocked from the continuum but whose off-block diagonal form we cannot determine with the technology used so far. Accordingly this calls for shifting our strategy which was already started in [67] in the sense that the block diagonal structure was dropped but only one infinite graph was kept:

We take the above speculation serious and consider the operators H_γ as projections onto the subspaces \mathcal{H}_γ of \mathcal{H} of a continuum Hamiltonian H but we will drop the unphysical block diagonal structure 3.24 which arises from the non-separability of \mathcal{H} . Rather the relation between the H_γ is to be imposed by a renormalisation scheme induced by the path integral renormalisation scheme adopted in quantum statistical physics. To do this, we must first derive a path integral measure μ_γ from the OS data $\mathcal{H}_\gamma, H_\gamma, \Omega_\gamma$ where Ω_γ is the vacuum of H_γ by the usual Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener formalism. Then we can compute the flow of the μ_γ in the usual way and then translate into a flow of OS data by OS reconstructing them from the measures. The fixed points of the flow will then define the possible continuum theories and these may be “phases” quite different from (3.25). The details of this programme will be the subject of the following sections.

4 Constructive QFT, Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener construction and Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction

The purpose of this section is to provide some background information on constructive QFT and related topics such as the Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener construction of measures (path integrals) from a Hamiltonian formulation (operator formulation) and vice versa the Osterwalder-Schrader reconstruction of a Hamiltonian framework from a measure. Our description will be minimal. The prime textbook references are [70, 27].

4.1 Measure theoretic glossary

Let S be a set. A collection B of so-called measurable subsets of S is called a σ -algebra if i. it is closed under taking complements with respect to S , ii. closed under taking countable unions and iii. B contains the empty set \emptyset . The pair (S, B) is called a measurable space. A measure space is a triple (S, B, μ) where (S, B) is a measure space and μ is a positive set function $\mu : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ $s \mapsto \mu(s)$ which is σ -additive, that is, for any pairwise disjoint $s_I \cap s_J = \emptyset, I \neq J; I, J \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\mu(\cup_I s_I) = \sum_I \mu(s_I) \quad (4.1)$$

The measure μ is called a probability measure if $\mu(S) = 1$. One uses the notation

$$\mu(s) = \int_S d\mu(p) = \int_S d\mu(p) \chi_s(p) \quad (4.2)$$

where $\chi_s(p) = 1$ if $p \in s$ and $\chi_s(p) = 0$ else is called the characteristic function of $s \in B$.

Consider now a second measurable space (\tilde{S}, \tilde{B}) . A function $X : S \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ is called measurable or a random variable if the pre-images $X^{-1}(\tilde{s}) = \{p \in S; f(p) \in \tilde{s}\}$ of measurable sets $\tilde{s} \subset \tilde{S}$ are measurable in S . Let \mathcal{F} be the set of random variables $X : S \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ then for $X \in \mathcal{F}$ the set function

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{s}) := \mu(X^{-1}(\tilde{s})), \quad \tilde{s} \in \tilde{B} \quad (4.3)$$

defines also a probability measure called the distribution of Φ . We consider real valued functions $f : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the simple form

$$f(\tilde{p}) = \sum_n z_n \chi_{\tilde{s}_n}(\tilde{p}); \quad z_n \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \tilde{s}_n \in \tilde{B} \quad (4.4)$$

where the sum is over at most finitely many terms and define their integral as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(f) &= \sum_n z_n \mu(s'_n) = \int_{\tilde{S}} d\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{p}) [\sum_n z_n \chi_{\tilde{s}_n}(\tilde{p})] = \int_{\tilde{S}} d\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{p}) f(\tilde{p}) \\ &= \sum_n z_n \mu(X^{-1}(\tilde{s}_n)) = \int_S d\mu(p) [\sum_n z_n \chi_{X^{-1}(\tilde{s}_n)}(p)] \\ &= \int_S d\mu(p) [\sum_n z_n \chi_{\tilde{s}_n}(X(p))] = \int_S d\mu(p) (f \circ X)(p) = \mu(f \circ X) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

One can show that this identity extends from simple functions to Borel functions i.e. measurable functions $f : \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where \mathbb{R} is equipped with the Borel σ -algebra (the smallest σ algebra containing all open intervals). We can then also extend it to those complex functions whose real and imaginary parts are Borel by linearity.

A stochastic process indexed by an index set \mathcal{I} is a family $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ of random variables $X_i : S \rightarrow \tilde{S}$. For any finite subset $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_N\} \subset \mathcal{I}$ we have the joint distribution

$$\tilde{\mu}_I(\tilde{s}_1 \times \dots \times \tilde{s}_N) := \mu(\cap_{k=1}^N X_{i_k}^{-1}(\tilde{s}_k)) \quad (4.6)$$

The probability measures μ'_I are called cylinder measures. For any complex valued Borel function $f : \tilde{S}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we have similarly as in (4.4)

$$\int_S d\mu(p) f(\{X_{i_k}(p)\}_{k=1}^N) = \int_{\tilde{S}^N} d\tilde{\mu}_I(\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_N) f(\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_N) \quad (4.7)$$

Functions on S of the form $f_I(p) = f(\{X_{i_k}(p)\}_{k=1}^N)$ are called cylinder functions.

In what follows we assume that for each $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a distinguished system \mathcal{W}_N of complex valued, bounded elementary functions W on N copies of \tilde{S} such that the corresponding cylinder functions enjoy the following properties:

1. They generate an Abelian $*$ algebra, that is, for all $I, I' \in \mathcal{I}$ the product $W_I W_{I'}$ is a finite, complex linear combination of suitable $W_{I''}$, $I'' \in \mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{W}'' \in \mathcal{W}_{|I''|}$ and also $\overline{W_I}$ is of that form.
2. \mathcal{W}_N contains the constant function.
3. For each $I \in \mathcal{I}$, the moments $\mu(W_I)$, $W \in \mathcal{W}_{|I|}$ determine $\tilde{\mu}_I$ uniquely.
4. These properties show that the W_I are $L_2(d\tilde{\mu}_I, \tilde{S}^{|I|})$ functions. We require their span to be dense.

We saw that a probability measure μ together with a stochastic process gives rise to a family of cylindrical probability measures $(\tilde{\mu}_I)_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ on $\tilde{S}^{|I|}$. The converse question is under which circumstances a cylindrical family of cylinder probability measures determines a measure μ . A necessary criterion is as follows: The set \mathcal{I} is partially ordered and directed by inclusion, that is, for each $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ we find $K \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I, J \subset K$ (for instance $K = I \cup J$). Suppose that $I \subset J$. Then

$$\mu(X_I^{-1}(\tilde{s}_I)) = \tilde{\mu}_I(\tilde{s}_I) = \mu(X_J^{-1}(\tilde{s}_I \times (\tilde{S})^{|J|-|I|})) = \tilde{\mu}_J(\tilde{s}_I \times (\tilde{S})^{|J|-|I|}) \quad (4.8)$$

where $X_I = \{X_i\}_{i \in I}$, $\tilde{s}_I \subset \tilde{B}^{|I|}$. Furthermore for any permutation π on $N = |I|$ elements set $\pi \cdot I = \{i_{\pi(1)}, \dots, i_{\pi(N)}\}$ and $\pi \cdot \tilde{s}_I = \{(\tilde{p}_{\pi(1)}, \dots, \tilde{p}_{\pi(N)}); (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_N) \in \tilde{s}_I\}$. Then

$$\mu(X_{\pi \cdot I}^{-1}(\pi \cdot \tilde{s}_I)) = \tilde{\mu}_{\pi \cdot I}(\pi \cdot \tilde{s}_I) = \mu(X_I^{-1}(\tilde{s}_I)) = \tilde{\mu}_I(\tilde{s}_I) \quad (4.9)$$

Even more generally, a partial order on the set \mathfrak{I} of finite subsets I of \mathcal{I} is a transitive, reflexive and antisymmetric relation, that is, $I < J \wedge J < K \Rightarrow I < K$ and $I < I$ and $I < J \wedge J < I \Rightarrow I = J$ for all $I, J, K \in \mathfrak{I}$. The set \mathfrak{I} is called directed with respect to $<$ provided that for all $I, J \in \mathfrak{I}$ we find $K \in \mathfrak{I}$ such that $I, J < K$. For $I < J$ we may have surjective maps $P_{JI} : \tilde{S}^{|J|} \rightarrow \tilde{S}^{|I|}$ such that $X_I(p) = P_{JI}(X_J(p))$ and such that for $I < J < K$ we have $P_{JI} \circ P_{KJ} = P_{KI}$. Then similar as in (4.8) we necessarily must have for $I < J$

$$\tilde{\mu}_I(\tilde{s}_I) = \tilde{\mu}_J(P_{JI}^{-1}(\tilde{s}_I)) \quad (4.10)$$

It turns out that these two conditions, either (4.8), (4.9) or (4.10) are also sufficient in fortunate cases (for instance if $\tilde{S} = \mathbb{R}$, which is the classical Kolmogorov theorem, see [48]). That is, we can then reconstruct the measure space (S, B, μ) and a stochastic process $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ such that the $\tilde{\mu}_I$ are the cylinder measures of μ . It follows that the $W_I \in \mathcal{W}_{|I|}$, $I \in \mathcal{I}$ lie dense in $L_2(S, d\mu)$.

Physical meaning:

We consider the elements $p \in S$ to be spacetime fields Φ or spatial fields ϕ respectively. The index set \mathcal{I} will have the meaning of a set of test functions or more generally distributions whose elements i label the random variables X_i . These map the fields smeared with test functions to a finite dimensional manifold (usually copies of \mathbb{R} or more generally of a Lie group). For instance for a scalar field Φ we may consider the random variable $X_F(\Phi) = \exp(i \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \sigma} d^4x F(x) \Phi(x))$ which takes values in $\tilde{S} = U(1)$. It is also customary to consider the field $p = \Phi$ itself as a random variable indexed by the same index set or to simply write $X_i(p) = p(i)$ as an abbreviation.

4.2 Constructive QFT

The application of interest of the previous subsection is a stochastic process indexed by either $\mathbb{R} \times L$ or just by L where the label set L is a certain set of distributions on the spatial manifold. We distinguish between random variables Φ indexed by a pair $(t, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times L$ and random variables ϕ indexed by $f \in L$. Some examples are:

1. Real quantum scalar fields with smooth smearing:

Consider $L = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the space of smooth test functions of rapid decrease and $\tilde{S} = \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the Borel σ -algebra. Then $\phi(f) = \langle f, \phi \rangle = \int_{\sigma} d^3x f(x) \phi(x)$ and $\Phi(t, f) = \langle f, \Phi(t, \cdot) \rangle$. Given $F := (f_1, \dots, f_N) \in L^N$ consider $\phi(F) = (\phi(f_1), \dots, \phi(f_N)) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The space \mathcal{W}_N of elementary functions on N copies of \mathbb{R} can be chosen to be generated by the exponentials

$$w_{r_1, \dots, r_N}(\phi(F)) = \exp(i \sum_{k=1}^N r_k \langle f_k, \phi \rangle) \quad (4.11)$$

with $r_1, \dots, r_N \in \mathbb{R}$ labelling the (necessarily one dimensional) unitary irreducible representations of $U(1)$.

In fact, since in this case the space L is a vector space, it is sufficient to consider the functions $w(\phi(f)) = \exp(i\phi(f))$, $f \in L$. Analogously the space of elementary functions for the time dependent fields can be chosen as $(w_k \in \mathcal{W}_{N_k})$

$$W(\Phi(t_1, F_1), \dots, \Phi(t_T, F_T)) = w_T(\Phi(t_T, F_T)) \cdot w_1(\Phi(t_1, F_1)) \quad (4.12)$$

which of course reduces to

$$\exp(i\Phi(t_T, f'_T)) \cdot \exp(i\Phi(t_1, f'_1)), \quad f'_k \in L \quad (4.13)$$

for certain $f'_k \in L$. Obviously the Abelian $*$ -algebra and boundedness conditions are satisfied. That these elementary functions suffice to determine the cylindrical measures requires a more involved argument (Bochner's theorem, [48]).

2. Real quantum scalar fields with distributional smearing:

Consider a subset $L \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of the tempered distributions and $\tilde{S} = U(1)$ equipped with the Borel σ -algebra. In applications to scalar fields coupled to General Relativity elements $f \in L$ are typically δ -distributions supported at a single point.

Then $\phi(f) := \exp(i \langle f, \phi \rangle)$ and $\Phi(t, f) = \exp(i \langle f, \Phi(t, \cdot) \rangle)$ where $\langle f, \phi \rangle$ is the evaluation of $f \in L$ on ϕ . Given $F := (f_1, \dots, f_N) \in L^N$ consider $\phi(F) = (\phi(f_1), \dots, \phi(f_N)) \in U(1)^N$. The space \mathcal{W}_N of elementary functions on N copies of $U(1)$ can be chosen to be generated by the exponentials

$$w_{r_1, \dots, r_N}(\phi(F)) = \exp(i \sum_{k=1}^N r_k \langle f_k, \phi \rangle) \quad (4.14)$$

with $r_1, \dots, r_N \in \mathbb{R}$ labelling the (necessarily one dimensional) unitary irreducible representations of $U(1)$. Analogously the space of elementary functions for the time dependent fields can be chosen as $(w_k \in \mathcal{W}_{N_k})$

$$W(\Phi(t_1, F_1), \dots, \Phi(t_T, F_T)) = w_T(\Phi(t_T, F_T)) \dots w_1(\Phi(t_1, F_1)) \quad (4.15)$$

In this case we could still equip L with the structure of a real vector space if we extend L to the finite real linear combinations \tilde{L} of its generating set L . Since this is no longer possible for the non-Abelian gauge theory example below, we will refrain from doing this, in order to highlight the structural similarity between the examples.

3. Non-Abelian gauge fields for compact gauge groups G :

A form factor is a distribution

$$f_c^a(x) = \int_c dy^a \delta^{(3)}(x, y) \quad (4.16)$$

where c is a one dimensional path in $i\sigma$. We take $\tilde{S} = G$ equipped with the natural Borel σ -algebra and

$$\phi(c) := \phi(f_c) := \mathcal{P} \exp(\int_c \phi) = \mathcal{P} \exp(\phi(f_c)); \quad \phi(f_c) = \int_\sigma d^3x f_c^a(x) \phi_a(x) \quad (4.17)$$

where we have identified ϕ as a G connection and \mathcal{P} denotes path ordering. Thus (4.17) is the direct analog of the scalar field construction (note that the Lie generators are anti-self adjoint since G is compact so that (4.17) is unitary) and $\phi(f_c)$ is simply the holonomy of ϕ along c . Likewise

$$\Phi(t, c) := \mathcal{P}(\exp(\int_c \Phi(t, \cdot))) \quad (4.18)$$

Note that the form factors do not form a vector space, in general they cannot be added (unless two curves share a boundary point) and they can never be multiplied by a non-integer real scalar (there is a certain groupoid structure behind this [3]). Accordingly, our space of generating set of elementary functions \mathcal{W}_N on N copies of G need to be more sophisticated. We consider the space L of form factors and for each $F = (f_{c_1}, \dots, f_{c_N}) \in L^N$ the pairing $\phi(F) = (\phi(c_1), \dots, \phi(c_N)) \in G^N$. Then a possible choice of generating set \mathcal{W}_N of elementary functions is

$$w_\delta(\phi(F)) = \prod_{k=1}^N \sqrt{d_{j_k}} [\pi_{j_k}(\phi(c_k))]_{m_k, n_k} \quad (4.19)$$

with $\delta := \{(j_1, m_1, n_1), \dots, (j_N, m_N, n_N)\}$. In fact it is sufficient to consider mutually disjoint (up to end points), piecewise real analytic curves c_k . Here j labels an irreducible representation π_j of G of dimension d_j and $[\pi_j(g)]_{m,n}$; $m, n = 1, \dots, d_j$ its matrix element functions. By the Peter & Weyl theorem these functions suffice to determine the cylindrical measures uniquely at least if they are absolutely continuous with respect to the product Haar measure. Likewise we consider the elementary functions

$$W_{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_T}(\Phi(t_1, F_1), \dots, \Phi(t_T, F_T)) = w_{\delta_N}(\Phi(t_T, F_T)) \dots w_{\delta_1}(\Phi(t_1, F_1)) \quad (4.20)$$

The fact that these functions satisfy all requirements is the statement of Clebsch-Gordan decomposition theory together with the properties of the holonomy to factorise along segments of a curve (note the piecewise analyticity

condition).

This ends our list of examples. We will denote the measure related to the stochastic process $\{\Phi(t, f)\}$ by μ and the measure related to the stochastic process $\{\phi(f)\}$ by ν . As the notation suggests, Φ is a field defined on spacetime $M = \mathbb{R} \times \sigma$ while ϕ is a field defined on space σ . Note that $M = \mathbb{R} \times \sigma$ with σ any 3D manifold is a consequence of the requirement of global hyperbolicity [71].

The measures μ underlying a relativistic QFT are not only probability measures. In addition, they need to satisfy a set of axioms [27, 30] called Osterwalder-Schrader axioms which, however, are tailored to $M = \mathbb{R}^4$, stochastic processes with L being a vector space and with an Euclidean background metric at one's disposal. In quantum gravity and more generally in non-Abelian gauge theories one typically must or may want to drop some of these structures. As a consequence we will only keep those axioms that can also be applied in this more general context.

Some of them generalise to stochastic processes not indexed by a vector space, some do not. Some generalise from the manifold \mathbb{R}^4 to the general spacetime manifold $\mathbb{R} \times \sigma$ allowed by global hyperbolicity, some do not. Fortunately, those that do generalise are sufficient for the reconstruction process [29]. We call them the minimal OS axioms and we call a probability measure that satisfy them an OS measure. They can be phrased as follows:

Let $\theta(t, x) := (-t, x)$ and $T_s(t, x) := (t + s, x)$ denote time reflection and time translation respectively. Let $w_k \in \mathcal{W}_{N_k}$, $k = 1, \dots, T$, $F_k \in L^{N_k}$, $t_k \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)} &:= w_T(\Phi(t_T, F_T)) \dots w_1(\Phi(t_1, F_1)) \\ R \cdot W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)} &= W_{(-t_1, F_1), \dots, (-t_T, F_T)}, \\ U(s) \cdot W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)} &= W_{(t_1+s, F_1), \dots, (t_T+s, F_T)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Then we have the following conditions on the generating functional

$$\mu(W(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)) \quad (4.22)$$

I. Time Reflection invariance:

$$\mu(W_{(-t_1, F_1), \dots, (-t_N, F_T)}) = \mu(W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)}) \quad (4.23)$$

II. Time translation invariance

$$\mu(W_{(t_1+s, F_1), \dots, (t_N+s, F_T)}) = \mu(W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_N, F_T)}) \quad (4.24)$$

III. Time translation continuity

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \mu([W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)}]^* W_{(t'_1+s, F'_1), \dots, (t'_T+s, F'_T)}) = \mu([W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)}]^* W_{(t'_1, F'_1), \dots, (t'_T, F'_T)}) \quad (4.25)$$

IV. Reflection positivity

Consider the vector space V of the complex span of functions of the form $W_{(t_1, F_1), \dots, (t_T, F_T)}$ with $t_1, \dots, t_T > 0$. Then for any $\Psi, \Psi' \in V$

$$\langle \Psi, \Psi' \rangle := \mu(\overline{\Psi} R \cdot \Psi'), \quad \langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle \geq 0 \quad (4.26)$$

Note that the stochastic process indexed by $\mathbb{R} \times L$ considers random variables $\Phi(t, f)$ at sharp points of time. It is often argued that this index set provides an insufficient “smearing” in the time direction and fails to cover interacting QFT at least in 3+1 spacetime dimensions (in 1+1 and 2+1 dimensions, there are examples for which this works [72]). However, this argument rests on perturbative results as on 3+1 dimensional Minkowski space so far no interacting QFT (obeying the Wightman axioms) has been rigorously constructed. It is still conceivable [73] that in a non-perturbative construction of the theory, for which constructive QFT is designed, one can deal with fields at sharp time. One could of course be more general and consider stochastic processes indexed by some L which now also includes smearing in the time direction and the formulation of reflection positivity will then constrain to elements of L with positive time support, however, then the Wiener measure construction sketched

below will not work. Our viewpoint is that this more general situation can be obtained from the sharp time construction because integrals of smearing functions with respect to time can be approximated by Riemann sums which in turn are nothing but integrals with respect to sharp time smearing functions.

At the moment it is rather unclear how and why μ, Φ define a relativistic QFT. This will become clear in the next subsection.

4.3 Osterwalder-Schrader (OS) Reconstruction

The following abstract argument is standard [27]. See [16] for a proof adapted to the notation in this article.

Due to reflection positivity (4.26) defines a positive semi-definite sesqui-linear form on V . We compute its null space N and complete the quotient of equivalence classes V/N in the inner product (4.24) to a Hilbert space. Given $\Psi \in V$ we denote its equivalence class $\Psi + N$ by $[\Psi]_\mu$ where we keep track of the measure dependence of the quotient construction. By construction the $D = [V]_\mu$ is dense in \mathcal{H} . Since the constant function $\Psi = 1 \in V$ we define a “vacuum” vector by $\Omega := [1]_\mu$. Finally we define for $s \geq 0$

$$K(s)[\Psi]_\mu := [U(s)\Psi]_\mu \quad (4.27)$$

The constraint $s \geq 0$ is due to the time support condition in the definition of V . One must show that this is well defined (independent of the representative) [27]. By virtue of their definition (4.21) the $U(s)$ form a one parameter Abelian group of operators $U(s)U(s') = U(s + s')$ on $L_2(S, d\mu)$. This implies that the $K(s)$ form a one parameter Abelian semi-group due to the constraint $s \geq 0$ (again one must show that the definition is well-defined). Time translation continuity (3.23) translates into weak continuity of the semi-group. Furthermore, by time translation invariance 4.24 the $U(s)$ define unitary, in particular bounded operators on $L_2(S, d\mu)$ which translates into the statement that the $K(s)$ form a contraction semi-group. Thus [27] there exists a positive self-adjoint operator H , called “Hamiltonian” on \mathcal{H} such that $K(s) = e^{-sH}$. Obviously $K(s)\Omega = \Omega$, thus Ω is a ground state for H which justifies the name “vacuum”.

This elegant argument is deceptively simple. To actually compute the *Osterwalder-Schrader triple* (\mathcal{H}, Ω, H) from μ and to relate it to the fields and Hamiltonian in terms of which one would construct the quantum theory using canonical quantisation is not clear yet. However, one can again use the following abstract argument [16]. Suppose that there is an Abelian C^* -algebra \mathfrak{B} of bounded operators on \mathcal{H} such that $\mathfrak{B}\Omega$ is dense (the C^* -norm is inherited from the uniform operator topology). It is not difficult to show that this is always the case when \mathcal{H} is separable which is the only case that we will consider in our application to renormalisation, but it also holds in many non-separable situations, see appendix B for a proof. Let $\Delta(\mathfrak{B})$ be its Gel'fand spectrum [74] (which is a compact space) i.e. the space of all $*$ homomorphisms $\phi : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Then by Gel'fand's theorem, \mathfrak{B} can be thought of as the space $C(\Delta(\mathfrak{B}))$ i.e. the continuous functions on the spectrum which is an Abelian C^* -algebra with respect to the sup-norm. The correspondence (Gel'fand isomorphism) is given by $\hat{b}(\phi) = \phi(b)$ for all $\phi \in \Delta(\mathfrak{B})$ and in fact this is an isometric isomorphism of C^* -algebras. Consider now the linear functional

$$\nu(\hat{b}) := \langle \Omega, b\Omega \rangle \quad (4.28)$$

which by construction is positive $\nu(|\hat{b}|^2) = \|b\Omega\|^2$. By the Riesz-Markov theorem [70] there exists a (regular Borel) probability measure on $S' := \Delta(\mathfrak{B})$ which by abuse of notation we also denote by ν such that

$$\nu(\hat{b}) = \int_{\Delta(\mathfrak{B})} d\nu(\phi) \hat{b}(\phi) \quad (4.29)$$

That is to say, the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} obtained from OS reconstruction can be thought of as $L_2(\Delta(\mathfrak{B}), d\nu)$ under the isomorphism $b\Omega \mapsto \hat{b}$, in particular Ω corresponds to the constant function equal to 1. We thus have managed to cast \mathcal{H} into the language of measure theory on the set $S' = \Delta(\mathfrak{B})$. The fields ϕ that come out of this construction are random variables indexed by some index set L' , that is, we have shown that we can always construct such a measure and a corresponding stochastic process. We think of the field ϕ as the spatial configuration fields

underlying a canonical quantisation approach. A priori, however, it is not clear what L' is although it must be related in some way to $\mathbb{R}^+ \times L$. In the case of free fields one can show that in fact one can choose \mathfrak{B} in such a way that $L' = L$ due to the quotient construction involved in \mathcal{H} but even then it is a priori not clear how $\Phi(t, f)$ and $\phi(f)$, $f \in L$ are related. Again in the case of free fields one shows that $\phi(f)$ can be thought of as $\Phi(0, f)$, the spacetime field at sharp time zero. However, in general the relation between the stochastic processes underlying Φ and ϕ may be more complex. In any case, the operator H translates in this language into the operator

$$\hat{H}\hat{b} := \widehat{Hb\Omega} \quad (4.30)$$

4.4 Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener (FKTW) construction

Given an OS triple (\mathcal{H}, Ω, H) we saw at the end of the previous subsection that without loss of generality we can assume that $\mathcal{H} = L_2(S', d\nu)$ where ν is a probability measure on S equipped with a Borel σ -algebra and that we are given a stochastic process $\phi(f)$, $f \in L$ indexed by some index set L , at least when \mathcal{H} is separable (which will be the case in our applications). Moreover, $\Omega = 1$ in this presentation of \mathcal{H} is cyclic for some C^* -algebra of functions on S' . We pick some set \mathcal{W}_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ of elementary functions $w \in \mathcal{W}_N$ subject to the conditions 1.-4. spelled out just after (4.7) and for $F = (f_1, \dots, f_N) \in L^N$ have $\phi(F) = (\phi(f_1), \dots, \phi(f_N)) \in (S')^N$ as well as

$$w_F(\phi) = w(\phi(F)) \quad (4.31)$$

Let now $T \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_T$ and $F_k \in L^{N_k}$, $w_k \in \mathcal{W}_{N_k}$. We consider the expectation value functional

$$< \Omega, w_{T, F_T} e^{-(t_T - t_{T-1})H} w_{T-1, F_{T-1}} e^{-(t_{T-1} - t_{T-2})H} \dots e^{-(t_2 - t_1)H} w_{1, F_1} \Omega > \quad (4.32)$$

Consider now a stochastic process $\Phi(s, f)$ indexed by $(s, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times L$ and the elementary functions

$$W_{(t_k, F_k)_{k=1}^T}(\Phi) = w_{T, F_T}(\Phi(t_N, \cdot)) \dots w_{1, F_1}(\Phi(t_1, \cdot)) \quad (4.33)$$

Then the Wiener measure μ , if it exists, evaluated on (4.33)

$$\mu(W_{(t_k, F_k)_{k=1}^T}) \quad (4.34)$$

is supposed to equal (4.31). The non-trivial question is why this should be the case, under which circumstances and how to construct μ . For this we consider the integral kernel K_β of the operator $e^{-\beta H}$, $\beta > 0$, that is,

$$[e^{-\beta H} \psi](\phi) =: \int_S d\nu(\phi') K_\beta(\phi, \phi') \psi(\phi') \quad (4.35)$$

Note the semigroup property

$$\int_{S'} d\nu(\phi) K_{\beta_1}(\phi_1, \phi) K_{\beta_2}(\phi, \phi_2) = K_{\beta_1 + \beta_2}(\phi_1, \phi_2) \quad (4.36)$$

Define $S := \prod_{t \in \mathbb{R}} S'$. For each $T \in \mathbb{N}_0$ consider $t_1 < \dots < t_T$ and measurable sets $s'_{t_k} \subset S'$ and define the set function

$$\mu([\times_{k=1}^T s'_{t_k}] \times [\times_{t \notin \{t_1, \dots, t_T\}} S']) := \int_{[S']^T} d\nu(\phi_1) \dots d\nu(\phi_T) \prod_{k=1}^T \chi_{s'_{t_k}}(\phi_k) \prod_{k=1}^{T-1} K_{t_{k+1} - t_k}(\phi_{k+1}, \phi_k) \quad (4.37)$$

It is not clear that this is a positive set function, but when it is, it is called the Wiener measure generated by the OS triple. For sufficient criteria for this property called Nelson-Symanzik positivity in the case of scalar fields, see [75]. Basically one needs to show that matrix elements of $e^{-\beta H}$ between positive functions is positive. Note that for $s'_k = S'$ for all k we get

$$\mu(S) = < \Omega, e^{-(s_T - s_1)H} \Omega > = 1 \quad (4.38)$$

This shows that μ is a probability measure on S . For quantum mechanical Schrödinger Hamiltonians one can use the Trotter product formula and the Wiener measure of the heat kernel to prove positivity [76] (Feynman-Kac formula).

One can now show the following [16]:

Theorem.

- i. Suppose that OS data (\mathcal{H}, H, Ω) are given and that the corresponding Wiener measure μ exists. Then μ is an OS measure and its OS reconstruction reproduce the given OS data up to unitary equivalence.
- ii. Suppose that an OS measure μ is given thus producing OS data (\mathcal{H}, Ω, H) . Then the corresponding Wiener measure exists and reproduces μ up to equivalence of measure spaces.

Here measure spaces (S_j, B_j, μ_j) ; $j = 1, 2$ are called equivalent if there exists a bijection $F : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ such that both F, F^{-1} are measurable and such that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 \circ F$. The reason for why we generically only reproduce an equivalent and not an identical starting point lies in the large freedom in the choice of the stochastic process ϕ when performing the OS reconstruction step.

5 Renormalisation

5.1 Motivation

Our motivation for renormalisation comes from the current state of affairs with respect to the definition of the quantum dynamics in LQG as outlined in section 3. In that case the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L_2(S', d\nu)$ is precisely of the form we envisage here. Moreover we have a vacuum Ω for a candidate Hamiltonian H that, however, we are not sure whether all steps of the quantisation process that led to H are justified. Namely we have defined H as H_γ on certain mutually orthogonal subspaces \mathcal{H}_γ preserving it using a choice of discretisation of the classical continuum expression which has naively the correct dequantisation if the graph γ fills the spatial manifold σ sufficiently densely. The definition of elementary functions in (4.19) precisely reproduces the SNWF and thus the spatial connection defines a stochastic process indexed by graphs.

As already mentioned at the emnd of section 3 we would like to take a fresh look at the problem. As usual in constructive QFT, if σ is not already compact, we replace it with a compact manifold σ_R where R is an infrared cut-off (IR) which we remove in the end $R \rightarrow \infty$ (thermodynamic limit). In order not to clutter the notation, the dependence on R of all considerations that follow will be suppressed. Next we do not consider all finite graphs γ (taking all finite graphs leads to a non-separable Hilbert space) but only a controllable countable family \mathcal{M} therein which however is such that the discretised classical variables (configuration and momentum fields) in terms of which we perform the quantisation separate the points of the classical phase space when all the graphs in \mathcal{M} are at our disposal. The set \mathcal{M} is supposed to be partially ordered and directed. The motivation for doing so stems from the spatial diffeomorphism invariance of the classical LQG Hamiltonian: The algebraic form of the Hamiltonian discretised on diffeomorphic graphs is identical. This is precisely the starting point of the algebraic quantum gravity proposal [67] where it was emphasised that one can quantise gravity in terms of abstract graphs which gain their physical meaning only after choosing an embedding supplied, for instance, by a semiclassical state.

To have some intuitive picture in mind consider $\sigma = \mathbb{R}^3$ with toroidal compactification $\sigma_R = T^3$ (where each direction has length R with respect to the Euclidian background metric on \mathbb{R}^3 and with periodic boundary conditions installed) and Γ the set of all finite graphs σ_R of cubic topology. This is still an uncountable set which we now restrict to a countable one as follows. Each element of Γ is uniquely labelled by $M \in \mathbb{N}$ where M^3 is the number of vertices of the graph (one could generalise this and have different numbers of vertices in each direction). We pick once and for all a coordinate system and locate the vertices of γ_M at the points

$$m \epsilon_M, m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^3, \mathbb{Z}_M = \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}, \epsilon_M = \frac{R}{M} \quad (5.1)$$

where the edges of the graph are straight lines into the coordinate directions between the vertices. We equip $\mathcal{M} := \mathbb{N}$ with the following partial order: $M < M'$ iff $\frac{M'}{M} \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this implies $\gamma_M \subset \gamma_{M'}$ since

$$m \epsilon_M = m \frac{M'}{M} \epsilon_{M'} =: m' \epsilon_{M'} \quad (5.2)$$

with $m' \in \mathbb{Z}_{M'}^3$ and because the edges of the graphs are straight lines into the coordinate directions. This is certainly not a linear order because not all natural numbers are in relation but still equips Γ with a direction:

Given M, M' take for instance $M'' = MM'$ then $M, M' < M''$ (more efficiently take M'' as the least common multiple). It is clear that for M sufficiently large discretised phase space variables obtained by integrating continuum variables over 0– or 1– dimensional subsets of γ_M (vertices or edges) or by integrating momentum variables over 3– or 2– dimensional subsets of the cell complex corresponding to γ_M (faces and cubes) will separate the points of the continuum phase space. Instead of γ_M one could also use the cubic cell complex γ_M^* dual to γ_M defined by saying that the barycentres of the cubes of γ_M^* coincide with the vertices of γ_M . However, in the spirit of economy we will not use the additional structure γ_M^* in what follows.

5.2 Discretisation of phase space

In canonical quantisation we start with a continuum phase space coordinatised by configuration fields ϕ^J and canonically conjugate momentum fields π_J in terms of which the classical continuum Hamiltonian H is formulated. Here the index J corresponds to an internal symmetry and is typically Lie algebra valued. We now would like to consider a discretisation of both the phase space and the Hamiltonian, one for each lattice M , while keeping track of how these fields ϕ_M^J, π_M^J are related to the continuum fields ϕ^J, π_J . The idea for how to do this stems from the observation that by construction of generally covariant field theories the fields ϕ^J, π_J are *dual* in the sense that there is a natural bilinear form $\langle \pi, \phi \rangle'_{I' \times K'} := \sum_J \langle \pi_J, \phi^J \rangle_{I \times K}$ on the phase space (usually a cotangent bundle T^*K') $I' \times K'$ of momentum and configuration fields respectively where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is spatially diffeomorphism invariant. Note that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle', \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ just differ by tracing over the internal directions in field space i.e. $I' = I^d, K' = K^d$ where d is the number of internal directions in field space.

For instance, the momentum of a scalar field is geometrically a scalar density of weight one, so that $\langle \pi, \phi \rangle' = \langle \pi, \phi \rangle := \int_\sigma d^3x \pi(x) \phi(x)$. The momentum of a G connection is geometrically a Lie algebra valued vector field density so that $\langle \pi, \phi \rangle' = \sum_J \int_\sigma d^3x \pi_J^a(x) \phi_a^J(x)$. This also holds for higher p –forms as they occur in some supergravity theories as well as for (standard model or Rarita-Schwinger) fermions. Note that the bilinear form is in general not invariant under the internal symmetry group but this will not be important for what follows. The fact that π, ϕ are conjugate is the statement that their canonical brackets are

$$\{\langle \pi, k' \rangle', \langle i', \phi \rangle'\} = \langle i', k' \rangle' \quad (5.3)$$

for all $(i', k') \in I' \times K'$.

The fact that the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is naturally at our disposal motivates a natural choice for the index set L, L^* of the stochastic process ϕ, π . Namely we choose L to be a certain distributional extension of I and likewise L^* as a certain distributional extension of K . These extensions should be such that $\langle i, k \rangle$ remains well defined for $i \in L, k \in L^*$. For instance, for a scalar field we may choose L as the set of δ distributions $f_p(x) = \delta_p(x)$ with support at single points $p \in \sigma$ and L^* as the set of characterisic functions $g^R(x) = \chi_R(x)$ of connected D –dimensional submanifolds R of σ . For a compact G –connection we can choose L as the set of form factors $f_c^a(x) := \int_c dy^a \delta(x, y)$ with support on (piecewise analytic) curves c . For L^* we would consider the set of dual form factors of the form $g_a^S(x) := 1/(D-1)! \int_S \epsilon_{ab_1 \dots b_{D-1}} dy^{b_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dy^{b_{D-1}} \delta(x, y)$ with support on (piecewise analytic) $D-1$ submanifolds S . We may also have opportunity to consider their Lie algebra valued versions $f_c^{aJ}(x) = \tau^J f_c^a(x) \in L', g_a^{SJ}(x) = \tau_J g_a^S(x) \in (L')^*$ were τ^J, τ_J are dual bases in the defining representation of the Lie algebra of G such that $\text{Tr}(\tau^J \tau_K) = \delta_K^J$. Note that we deliberately do not make use of the fact that these distributions are elements of vector spaces. This is because we would like to have a uniform description of both linear and non-linear theories. In the case of linear theories the description can be significantly simplified as we have done in [16].

The connection to section 4.2 is then as follows: For each $f \in L, \phi \in K$ we consider a map $(f, \phi) \mapsto \phi(f) \in \tilde{S}$. For linear theories one usually takes $\tilde{S} = U(1)$ and for a G gauge theory one takes $\tilde{S} = G$. The object $\phi(f)$ exploits the existence of the natural bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. For instance for a scalar field one considers $\phi(f_p) = \exp(i \langle f_p, \phi \rangle)$ while for a G connection we consider the holonomy $\phi(f_c) = \mathcal{P} \exp(\langle f_c, \phi^J \rangle \tau_J)$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider $F = (f_1, \dots, f_N) \in L^N$ and define $\phi(F) = (\phi(f_1), \dots, \phi(f_N)) \in \tilde{S}^N$. The space of elementary functions \mathcal{W}_N consists of maps $\tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ subject to the conditions listed at the beginning of section 4.2. We may generate \mathcal{W}_N from monomials labelled by matrix element functions of finite dimensional unitary representations of \tilde{S} , see (4.19).

For each $M \in \mathbb{N}$ let L_M be the space of discrete functions on the lattice consisting of M^D points with values in \mathbb{R}^t where t is tensorial number of configuration (or momentum) degrees of freedom per spatial point ($t = 1$ for scalar fields, $t = D$ for a G Yang-Mills theory in $D + 1$ spacetime dimensions etc). That is, an element $l_M \in L_M$ assigns to each point $m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D$ a vector in \mathbb{R}^t . The space L_M carries an auxiliary real Hilbert space structure (L_M is of course a finite dimensional vector space), e.g. for a G Yang-Mills theory

$$\langle l_M, \tilde{l}_M \rangle_{L_M} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D} \sum_{a=1}^t l_M(m, a) \tilde{l}_M(m, a) \quad (5.4)$$

for any $l_M, \tilde{l}_M \in L_M$ and we wrote $[l_M]^a(m) =: l_M(m, a)$.

Definition.

A discretisation of the continuum phase space $I \times K$ subordinate to $M \in \mathbb{N}$ is a pair of linear maps

$$I_M : L_M \rightarrow L; \quad K_M : L_M \rightarrow L^* \quad (5.5)$$

with the following properties:

i. For any $l_M, l'_M \in L_M$

$$\langle I_M l_M, K_M l'_M \rangle_{I \times K} = \langle l_M, l'_M \rangle_{L_M} \quad (5.6)$$

That is to say $I'_M K_M = K'_M I_M = \text{id}_{L_M}$ where $I'_M : I \rightarrow L_M$, $K'_M : K \rightarrow L_M$ are the dual maps defined by

$$\langle I_M l_M, \phi \rangle_{I \times K} = \langle l_M, I'_M \phi \rangle_{L_M}, \quad \langle \pi, K_M l_M \rangle_{I \times K} = \langle K'_M \pi, l_M \rangle_{L_M}, \quad (5.7)$$

ii. For any $M < M'$ define the injection maps

$$I_{MM'} := K'_{M'} I_M; \quad K_{MM'} := I'_{M'} K_M : L_M \rightarrow L_{M'} \quad (5.8)$$

Then we require

$$I_{M'} I_{MM'} = I_M, \quad K_{M'} K_{MM'} = K_M \quad (5.9)$$

To see how this gives rise to discretised configuration and momentum variables let $\delta_M^{m,a}, \delta_{m,a}^M \in L_M$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D$, $a = 1, \dots, t$ be the Kronecker functions $[\delta_M^{m,a}]_b(\tilde{m}) := \delta_b^a \delta_{m,\tilde{m}}$ and $[\delta_{m,a}^M]^b(\tilde{m}) := \delta_a^b \delta_{m,\tilde{m}}$. Then the following functions on the continuum phase space

$$(\pi_M)_J^a(m) := \langle \pi_J, K_M \delta_M^{m,a} \rangle_{I \times K}, \quad (\phi_M)_a^J(m) := \langle I_M \delta_M^{m,a}, \phi^J \rangle_{I \times K} \quad (5.10)$$

enjoy canonical brackets

$$\{(\pi_M)_J^a(m), (\phi_M)_b^K(\tilde{m})\} = \delta_b^a \delta_J^K \delta_{m,\tilde{m}} \quad (5.11)$$

where the first condition (5.6) was used. Thus, (5.6) makes sure that the discretisations (5.10) enjoy canonical brackets, so we call (5.6) the *symplectomorphism property*. The motivation for the second condition (5.9) will become clear only later, however we note that it implies that for all $M < M' < M''$

$$I_{M'M''} I_{MM'} = K'_{M''} [I_{M'} I_{MM'}] = I_{MM'} \quad (5.12)$$

which we thus call *cylindrical consistency property*. Likewise $K_{M'M''} K_{MM'} = K_{MM''}$. It says that injecting a function into the continuum is independent from which resolution scale M this is done.

Finally we will impose a further restriction on the maps I_M, K_M which amounts to a convenient choice of normalisation and thus is called *normalisation property*. Namely we require that for all $M < M'$ the map $I_{MM'} : L_M \rightarrow L_{M'}$ restricts to $B_M \rightarrow B_{M'}$ where B_M is the set of functions on \mathbb{Z}_M^D with values in the bit space $\{0, 1\}^t$. This condition is only necessary in the non Abelian case and there avoids overcounting.

We note that (5.9) defines elements $\pi_M = K'_{M'} \pi$, $\phi_M = I'_{M'} \phi$ of L_M^{dt} that we can now use to try to define a discretisation $H_M = H_M[\{(\pi_M)_J^a(m), (\phi_M)_a^J(m)\}_{a,j,m}]$ of the Hamiltonian $H = H[\pi, \phi]$. For instance, if

the Hamiltonian depends only quadratically on the fields then one may try (including discretisations of spatial derivatives and some spatial averages)

$$H_M := H[\pi = I_M \pi_M, \phi = K_M \phi_M] \quad (5.13)$$

For interacting Hamiltonians, more sophisticated approximations must be used. Certainly the expression for H_M is in general plagued by a large amount of discretisation ambiguity beyond the choice of discretised variables. On the other hand, the fact that $\pi_M = K'_M \pi$, $\phi_M = I'_M \phi$ are conjugate will be convenient when constructing H_M and it is efficient to construct them motivated by the naturally available bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'$ on the phase space.

To see that there are non-trivial examples for such maps, consider a scalar field in D spatial dimensions compactified on a torus with Euclidian coordinate length R in all directions. Then (recall $\epsilon_M = R/M$)

$$(I_M l_M)(x) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D} l_M(m) \delta_{m \epsilon_M}(x), \quad (K_M l_M)(x) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D} l_M(m) \chi_{m \epsilon_M}(x) \quad (5.14)$$

where

$$\chi_{m \epsilon_M}(x) = \prod_{a=1}^D \chi_{[m^a \epsilon_M, (m^a+1) \epsilon_M)}(x) \quad (5.15)$$

where the latter denotes the characteristic functions of left closed – right open intervals. This clopen interval structure is very important in order that (5.6) and (5.9) are satisfied [16]. Similar constructions work for gauge fields, see appendix A. Note that we changed here the notation as compared to [16]: The maps I_M, E_M used there are called here K_M, I'_M respectively. The motivation for this change of notation is to make it manifest how much of the structure is in fact already canonically provided by the structure of the classical theory.

Given the lattice in D spatial dimensions labelled by $M \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider in general $N = M^D t$ degrees of freedom $\phi(I_M l_M) =: \phi_M(l_M) := \{\phi(I_M l_M^{m,a})\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D, a=1,\dots,t} \in \tilde{S}^N$ where $l_M^{m,a} = l_M \delta_M^{m,a}$ and l_M is restricted to the subset $B_M \subset L_M$ of functions $\mathbb{Z}_M^D \rightarrow F_2^t$ where $F_2 = \{0, 1\}$ is the field in two elements (*bit space*). Thus $l_M(m, a) \in \{0, 1\}$ is restricted to the information whether the degree of freedom $\phi(I_M l_M^{m,a})$ is excited or not. This is justified because 1. the missing information about the strength of the excitation is encoded in the representation label, see below and 2. because the maps $I_{MM'}$ restrict to maps $B_M \rightarrow B_{M'}$ by assumption.

The space of elementary functions \mathcal{W}_M on the lattice labelled by M is then generated by

$$w_{j,n,\tilde{n}}^M(\phi_M(l_M)) = w_{j,n,\tilde{n}}^M(\phi(I_M l_M)) = \prod_{m,a} [\pi_{j_{m,a}}(\phi(I_M l_M^{m,a}))]_{n_{m,a}, \tilde{n}_{m,a}} \quad (5.16)$$

Here $j_{m,a}$ labels an irreducible representation $\pi_{j_{m,a}}$ of G (one from each equivalence class), $d_{j_{m,a}}$ is its dimension, and $[\pi_{j_{m,a}}(\cdot)]_{n_{m,a}, \tilde{n}_{m,a}}$ denote its matrix elements with $n_{m,a}, \tilde{n}_{m,a} \in \{1, \dots, d_{j_{m,a}}\}$.

To see how (5.16) interacts with the map $I_{MM'}$ in the case of non-Abelian gauge theory we note that the cylindrical consistency property of $I_{MM'}$ implies

$$w_{j,n,\tilde{n}}^M(\phi_M(l_M)) = w_{j,n,\tilde{n}}^M(\phi(I_M l_M)) = \sum_{\alpha} w_{j',n',\tilde{n}'}^{M'}(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) \quad (5.17)$$

where the notation is as follows (see appendix A): $j'_{m',a} = [I_{MM'} l_M](m', a)$ $j_{[m'/M']a}$ where $[\cdot]$ denotes the Gauss bracket, $n'_{m',a} = n_{m,a}$ if $m' = M'/M m$, $\tilde{n}'_{m',a} = \tilde{n}_{m,a}$ if $m'^a + 1 = M'/M(m^a + 1)$, $m'^b = M'/M m^b$; $b \neq a$, and otherwise the sum over α denotes the sum over all $\tilde{n}'_{m',a} = n'_{m'+\delta_a,a} \in \{1, \dots, d_{j'_{m',a}}\}$ with $[\delta_a]^b := \delta_a^b$ that arise by writing the holonomy along the edge labelled by $m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D, a = 1, \dots, D$ as products of holonomies along edges labelled by $m' \in \mathbb{Z}_{M'}^D$.

In general therefore we see that for any generating function $w^M \in \mathcal{W}_M$ we have for all $M < M'$

$$w^M(\phi_M(l_M)) = \sum_{\alpha} z_{\alpha} w_{\alpha}^{M'}(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) \quad (5.18)$$

where the sum over α involves a finite, unique set of generating functions $w^{M'} \in \mathcal{W}_{M'}$ and z_α are certain, definite complex numbers. Similar statements then of course hold for the stochastic process labelled by $\mathbb{R} \times L$ and for the functions

$$W^M(\Phi_M(t^{(1)}, l_M^{(1)}), \dots, \Phi_M(t^{(T)}, l_M^{(T)})) = w_T^M(\Phi_M(t^{(T)}, l_M^{(T)})) \dots w_1^M(\Phi_M(t^{(1)}, l_M^{(1)})) \quad (5.19)$$

5.3 Hamiltonian Renormalisation

Abstracting from the concrete lattice implementation and field content above we are in the following situation: There is a partially ordered and directed label set \mathcal{M} and for each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have a map $I_M : B_M \rightarrow L^{N(M)}$ where L is the index set of the stochastic process ϕ , $N(M) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of elements of L in the image of I_M and $B_M = \{0, 1\}^{N(M)}$. Then $\phi_M(l_M) := \phi(I_M l_M) \in \tilde{S}^{N(M)} =: \tilde{S}_M$ and we have a generating set of elementary functions $w^M : \tilde{S}^{N(M)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

Suppose that for each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have discretised the system somehow as sketched above and picked some OS triple $(\mathcal{H}_M^{(0)}, \Omega_M^{(0)}, H_M^{(0)})$ with $\mathcal{H}_M^{(0)} = L_2(d\nu_M^{(0)}, \tilde{S}_M)$. That is to say, we have a stochastic process $\{\phi_M(l_M)\}_{M \in \mathcal{M}}$ indexed by B_M and probability measures $\nu_M^{(0)}$ on \tilde{S}_M . The Hamiltonian $H_M^{(0)}$ preserves $\mathcal{H}_M^{(0)}$ and annihilates the unit vector $\Omega_M^{(0)} \in \mathcal{H}_M^{(0)}$ which is cyclic. We consider a space of elementary functions \mathcal{W}_M such that in particular the $w^M(\phi_M(l_M))\Omega_M^{(0)}$; $w^M \in \mathcal{W}_M, l_M \in B_M$ lie dense in $\mathcal{H}_M^{(0)}$.

Using the Feynman-Kac-Trotter-Wiener (FKTW) construction, we obtain a family of OS measures $\mu_M^{(0)}$ on $S_M = \prod_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \tilde{S}_M$ which can be probed using a stochastic process $\Phi_M(t, l_M)$ labelled by $\mathbb{R} \times B_M$. This measure family $\{\mu_M^{(0)}\}_{M \in \mathcal{M}}$ will generically not be cylindrically consistent, and therefore does not define a continuum measure μ because of the discretisation ambiguities involved in the construction of the $H_M^{(0)}$ which determines $\mu_M^{(0)}$. If it was then we would have for $w_1, \dots, w_T \in \mathcal{W}_M$

$$\mu(w_T(\Phi(t_T, I_M l_M^T)) \dots w_1(\Phi(t_1, I_M l_M^1))) = \mu_M(w_T(\Phi_M(t_T, l_M^T)) \dots w_1(\Phi_M(t_1, l_M^1))) \quad (5.20)$$

Using $I_M = I_{M'} I_{MM'}$ for $M < M'$ we would find the identity

$$\mu_M(w_T(\Phi_M(t_T, l_M^T)) \dots w_1(\Phi(t_1, l_M^1))) = \mu_{M'}(w_T(\Phi_{M'}(t_T, I_{MM'} l_M^T)) \dots w_1(\Phi_{M'}(t_1, I_{MM'} l_M^1))) \quad (5.21)$$

called the condition of cylindrical consistency.

As reviewed in section 3, condition (5.21) grants the existence of μ under rather generic conditions. The strategy (see also [50]) is therefore to construct an iterative sequence of measure families $\mathbb{N}_0 \ni n \mapsto \{\mu_M^{(n)}\}_{M \in \mathcal{M}}$ called *renormalisation (group) flow* with initial family as above such that the fixed point family satisfies (5.21). We refer to section C for the reader interested in more notions of the renormalisation group in the language of measure theory.

The scheme that we will employ in fact does not make use of (5.21) for all $M < M'$ but only $M' = p^n M$ where p is a prime. The simplest choice is $p = 2$ but we have tested the formalism also for $p = 3, 5$ [16] and mixtures thereof in the case of free scalar QFT. This in fact does cover all possible M because any natural number can be written as kp^l ; k, p relative prime but the fixed point family could depend on k . Of course one assumes that the fixed point family is independent of the choices of p, k as an expression of universality as confirmed again for simple systems [16]. Thus we define as renormalisation flow

$$\mu_M^{(n+1)}(w_T(\Phi_M(t_T, l_M^N)) \dots w_1(\Phi(t_1, l_M^1))) = \mu_{M'}^{(n)}(w_T(\Phi_{M'}(t_T, I_{MM'} l_M^N)) \dots w_1(\Phi_{M'}(t_1, I_{MM'} l_M^1))) \quad (5.22)$$

for $M' := 2M$.

Having then obtained μ^* from cylindrically consistent projections μ_M^* we want to construct the OS triple $(\mathcal{H}^*, \Omega^*, H^*)$ using OS reconstruction. However, while we are sure that $\mu_M^{(0)}$ is an OS measure for each M by theorem 4.4, we are a priori not granted that $\mu_M^{(n)}$ is an OS measure, i.e. that the flow preserves the OS measure class. This in fact shown in [16].

Theorem.

The renormalisation flow (5.22) preserves the OS measure class and its fixed points define OS measures μ^ .*

Responsible for this result is the fact that the time operations that define an OS measure commute with the spatial coarse graining operation.

Thus in principle we can perform renormalisation in the measure (or path integral) language and then carry out OS reconstruction in order to find the continuum Hamiltonian theory that we are interested in. On the other hand, the fact that FKTW construction and OS reconstruction are inverses of each other (theorem 4.4) allows for the possibility to map the renormalisation flow of measures directly into a renormalisation flow of OS triples. In detail:

Step 1: *Identifying the stochastic processes*

We need to work out the null space of the reflection positive sesquilinear form determined by the measure $\mu_M^{(n)}$ from the vector space V_M of finite linear combinations of vectors of the form

$$w_T^M(\Phi_M(t_T, l_M^T)) \dots w_1^M(\Phi_M(t_1, l_M^T)) \quad (5.23)$$

with $t_T > t_{T-1} > \dots > t_1 > 0$ for $w_K^M \in \mathcal{W}_M$ (for coinciding points of time we can reduce the number of time steps by decomposing the products of elementary functions into linear combinations of those).

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_M^{(n)}$ is then the completion of the span of equivalence classes $[\psi_M]_{\mu_M^{(n)}}$, $\psi_M \in V_M$, in particular the vacuum is $\Omega_M^{(n)} = [1]_{\mu_M^{(n)}}$. However, the abstract description in terms of equivalence classes is not very useful in practice, rather we would like to describe them concretely in terms of stochastic processes and measures $\nu_M^{(n)}$ as outlined in section 4.3. As the Hilbert spaces we deal with are separable, this is always possible, see appendix B, however, that construction does not directly refer to the spacetime stochastic process Φ we started from. The reason for why this happens is because of the appearing equivalence classes: To perform concrete calculations one will work with representatives which makes the construction non-canonical because the choice of such representatives is largely a matter of taste. In our setting, if $\mu_M^{(n)}$ is obtained by the FKTW construction from OS data, then of course $\Phi_M(0, \cdot) =: \phi_M(\cdot)$ is a possible choice. However, in the renormalisation step, we are to deduce the OS data at resolution M from the measure $\mu_M^{(n+1)}$ which was renormalised from $\mu_{M'}^{(n)}$, $M < M'$ via (5.22) and thus it is not a priori clear how the stochastic process ϕ_M can be chosen, in particular, it is not clear whether it can be chosen as $\phi_M(\cdot) = \Phi_{M'}(0, I_{MM'} \cdot)$ which appears to be a natural choice.

However, we are in a better situation than in the generic case because it is clear that $\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}$ can be formulated in terms of the fields $\phi_M(t, l_M) = \Phi_{M'}(t, I_{MM'} l_M)$ for a minimal number of distinguished times $t \in \tau$ where the set τ is determined by the quotienting process, see [16] for an example. Alternatively one can view the fields $\phi_M(t, l_M), t \in \tau$ as fields at time zero $\tilde{\phi}_M(\tilde{l}_M)$ but in a larger space of fields, i.e. a stochastic process $\tilde{\phi}_M$ with a larger index set $\tilde{B}_M = \tau \times B_M$ that still lives on the lattice labelled by M [16]. It follows that without further input, which will be provided below, $\phi_M(\cdot) = \Phi_{M'}(0, I_{MM'} \cdot)$ is in general a *compound field*, i.e. a *collective degree of freedom* composed out of the $\tilde{\phi}_M$ which together with its momentum π_M is insufficient to define the Hamiltonian $H_M^{(n+1)}$ which will generically depend on the larger set of variables $\tilde{\phi}_M$ and its conjugate momentum $\tilde{\pi}_M$.

Step 2: *Working out the flow of OS triples*

Using the correspondence between the Wiener measures $\mu^{(n)}$ and the corresponding operator expressions we

have for $t_T > \dots > t_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu_M^{(n+1)}(w_T^M(\Phi_M(t_T, l_M^T)) \dots w_1^M(\Phi_M(t_1, l_1^M))) \\
&= \langle \Omega_M^{(n+1)}, w_T^M(\phi_M(l_M^T)) e^{-(t_T-t_{T-1})H_M^{(n+1)}} w_{T-1}^M(\phi_M(l_M^{T-1})) e^{-(t_{T-1}-t_{T-2})H_M^{(n+1)}} \dots \\
&\quad e^{-(t_2-t_1)H_M^{(n+1)}} w_1^M(\phi_M(l_M^1)) \Omega_M^{(n+1)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} \\
&= \mu_{M'}^{(n)}(w_T^M(\Phi_{M'}(t_T, I_{MM'}l_M^T)) \dots w_1^M(\Phi_{M'}(t_1, I_{MM'}l_1^M))) \\
&= \langle \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}, w_T^M(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M^T)) e^{-(t_T-t_{T-1})H_{M'}^{(n)}} w_{T-1}^M(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M^{T-1})) e^{-(t_{T-1}-t_{T-2})H_{M'}^{(n)}} \dots \\
&\quad e^{-(t_2-t_1)H_{M'}^{(n)}} w_1^M(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M^1)) \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} \tag{5.24}
\end{aligned}$$

for all choices of $M \in \mathcal{M}$; $T \in \mathbb{N}_0$; $t_T > \dots > t_1$; l_M^1, \dots, l_M^T (in practice e.g. $M' = 2M$ is fixed).

We consider (5.24) as the *master equation* from which everything must be deduced. To avoid the compound field phenomenon mentioned above we use that (5.24) i. is supposed to hold for an arbitrary number of time steps and ii. we add as further input one more OS axiom namely *uniqueness of the vacuum* which is in fact a standard axiom to impose in QFT on Minkowski space [27]. In terms of measures it can be stated as *ergodicity of time translations*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T ds U(s) \Psi =_{\mu \text{ a.e.}} \mu(\Psi) \cdot 1, \quad \Psi \in L_2(S, d\mu) \tag{5.25}$$

We separate this axiom from the minimal ones because it enters in a crucial way only at this last stage of the renormalisation process. The subsequent discussion considerably extends the arguments of [16].

First of all, going back to (5.24) and picking $T = 1$ we find

$$\langle \Omega_M^{(n+1)}, w_T^M(\phi_M(l_M)) \Omega_M^{(n+1)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} = \langle \Omega_{M'}^{(n+1)}, w^M(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M)) \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} \tag{5.26}$$

Using the fact that the $w_M \in \mathcal{M}$ form a $*$ -algebra, we can formulate (5.26) as follows: Assuming by induction that up to renormalisation step n the vectors $w^M(\phi_M(l_M)) \Omega_M^{(n)}$, $w^M \in \mathcal{W}_M$ span a dense subspace of $\mathcal{H}_M^{(n)}$, consider the closed linear span $\widehat{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}}$ of vectors of the form

$$w^M(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M)) \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} \tag{5.27}$$

which is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$. Then (5.26) is the statement that the map

$$J_{MM'}^{(n)} : \mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}}; w^M(\phi_M(l_M)) \Omega_M^{(n+1)} \mapsto w^M(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M)) \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} \tag{5.28}$$

is an *isometry*, that is,

$$[J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger J_{MM'}^{(n)} = 1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} \tag{5.29}$$

which implies that

$$P_{MM'}^{(n)} := J_{MM'}^{(n)} [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger : \mathcal{H}_M^{(n)} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} \tag{5.30}$$

is a projection.

Next for $T = 2, t_2 - t_1 = \beta$ we find from (5.24)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \Omega_M^{(n+1)}, w(\phi_M(l_M)) e^{-\beta H_M^{(n+1)}} w'(\phi_M(l'_M)) \Omega_M^{(n+1)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} \\
&= \langle \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}, w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l_M)) e^{-\beta H_{M'}^{(n)}} w'(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'}l'_M)) \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} \tag{5.31}
\end{aligned}$$

and using again the $*$ -property of the algebra \mathcal{W}_M and taking formally the first derivative of (5.31) at $\beta = 0$ we conclude

$$H_M^{(n+1)} = [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger H_{M'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)} \tag{5.32}$$

Note that (choose $w = 1$ in (5.28))

$$H_M^{(n+1)} \Omega_M^{(n+1)} = [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger H_{M'}^{(n)} \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} = 0 \quad (5.33)$$

hence the new vacuum is automatically annihilated by the new Hamiltonian.

We notice that for finite β (5.31) is not implied by (5.32) unless $[H_{M'}^{(n)}, P_{MM'}^{(n)}] = 0$ and it is here where we use the condition that the correspondence (5.24) is to hold for an arbitrary number and choices of time as well as the uniqueness of the vacuum. Using the projection $P_{MM'}^{(n)}$ onto the closed linear span of the $w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}$ we see that the operators $w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M))$ on $\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$ are block diagonal with respect to the decomposition

$$\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)} = P_{MM'}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)} \oplus [P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\perp \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)} \quad (5.34)$$

since they together with their adjoints leave $P_{MM'}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$ invariant (the $w \in \mathcal{W}_M$ generate a $*$ -algebra). Thus $P_{MM'}^{(n)} w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) [P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\perp = [P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\perp w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) P_{MM'}^{(n)} = 0$ but in general $[P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\perp w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) [P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\perp \neq 0$. Thus, it is not sufficient to insert w operators an arbitrary number of times and at arbitrary places into the the correspondence (5.24) in order to deduce (5.32) from (5.24).

Let $b_{M'I}^{(n)}$ be an orthonormal basis of $P_{MM'}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$. Then, since $\Omega_{M'}^{(n)}$ is cyclic for the algebra $\mathcal{W}_{MM'}^{(n)}$ generated by the $w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M))$ with respect to $P_{MM'}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$ we find $w_I' \in \mathcal{W}_{MM'}^{(n)}$ such that $b_{M'I}^{(n)} = w_I' \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}$ (or can be made at least arbitrarily close). Next, assume that $\Omega_{M'}^{(n)}$ is the unique ground state for $H_{M'}^{(n)}$ then

$$e^{-\beta H_{M'}^{(n)}} \rightarrow \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} < \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}, \cdot >_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} \quad (5.35)$$

becomes the projection on the ground state for $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. It follows in the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$

$$P_{MM'}^{(n)} = \sum_I b_{M'I}^{(n)} < b_{M'I}^{(n)}, \cdot >_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} = \sum_I w_I' \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} < w_I' \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}, \cdot >_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} \rightarrow \sum_I w_I' e^{-\beta H_{M'}^{(n)}} (w_I')^\dagger \quad (5.36)$$

Let w_I be the element in the algebra generated by the $w(\phi_M(l_M))$ such that $J_{MM'}^{(n)} w_I \Omega_M^{(n+1)} = w_I' \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}$ (which exists because $P_{MM'}^{(n)} \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$ is the closure of the image of $J_{MM'}^{(n)}$). Then due to isometry $[J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger J_{MM'}^{(n)} = 1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}}$ (5.29) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_I w_I \Omega_M^{(n+1)} < w_I \Omega_M^{(n+1)}, \cdot >_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} &= [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger \sum_I w_I' \Omega_{M'}^{(n)} < w_I' \Omega_{M'}^{(n)}, \cdot >_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}} J_{MM'}^{(n)} \\ &= [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger P_{MM'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)} = 1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

On the other hand, if $\Omega_M^{(n+1)}$ is the unique ground state for $H_M^{(n+1)}$ we have by the same argument as in (5.35), (5.36) in the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$

$$1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}} \rightarrow \sum_I w_I e^{-\beta H_M^{(n+1)}} w_I^\dagger \quad (5.38)$$

Since the identity operator $1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}}$ can be inserted an arbitrary number of times and at arbitrary places on the left hand side of (5.24) and since it can be written as (5.38) which under the correspondence (5.24) translates into (5.36) the correspondence (5.24) is to hold also when we insert $P_{MM'}^{(n)}$ an arbitrary number of times and at arbitrary places on the right hand side of (5.24). In particular this means that we must replace on the right hand side of (5.24) the operator $e^{-\beta H_{M'}^{(n)}}$ by

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_{MM'}^{(n)} (e^{-\frac{\beta}{N} H_{M'}^{(n)}} P_{MM'}^{(n)})^N \quad (5.39)$$

To see this, we write in (5.24) for each $k = 2, \dots, T$ and for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ on the lhs $e^{-(t_k - t_{k-1}) H_M^{(n+1)}} = (e^{-(t_k - t_{k-1}) H_M^{(n)}/N} 1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}})^N$ and replace $1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}}$ by the approximants (5.38) or more precisely the $P(n, k, \beta)$

of appendix E for $P = 1_{\mathcal{H}_M^{(n+1)}}$. Using multi-linearity of (5.24) we can rewrite the resulting expression in terms of (5.24) again, just that now we have not T insertions of w operators but $T' = 2N$ insertions at times $t'_1 < \dots < t'_{T'}$ such that

$$t'_{2kN+2l} - t'_{kN+2l-1} = \frac{t_k - t_{k-1}}{N}, \quad t'_{2kN+2l-1} - t'_{kN+2l-2} = \beta, \quad (5.40)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, T-1; l = 1, \dots, N$. By the correspondence (5.24) this translates into the corresponding expressions on the rhs with approximants (5.36) or more precisely the $P(n, k, \beta)$ of appendix E for $P = P_{MM'}^{(n)}$. Then one takes strong limits in the appropriate order, see appendix E, in particular $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, keeping $t_k - t_{k-1}$ fixed. As this is to hold for all N , we take $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Formula (5.39) is known in the mathematics literature [80] as a degenerate case of a Kato-Trotter product [79] of which there are many versions. One of them states that for contraction semigroups generated by self-adjoint operators A, B such that $A + B$ is essentially self-adjoint on the dense domain $D(A) \cap D(B)$ we have strong convergence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [e^{-A/N} e^{-B/N}]^N = e^{-(A+B)} \quad (5.41)$$

In our case the second contraction semigroup $s \mapsto e^{-sB}$ is replaced by the degenerate one $K(s) = K(0) = P_{MM'}^{(n)}$. In [80] sufficient criteria for the existence of a degenerate semigroup $K(\beta)$, $K(0)$ an invariant projection, rather than the identity are studied, such that in, say the strong operator topology $K(\beta) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (e^{-\beta/N A} P)^N$. Assuming that existence $K(\beta)$ of the limit (5.39) is secured, we deduce

$$H_M^{(n+1)} := -[J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger \left[\frac{d}{d\beta} K(\beta) \right]_{\beta=0} J_{MM'}^{(n)}, \quad K(\beta) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_{MM'}^{(n)} [e^{-\frac{\beta}{N} H_M^{(n)}} P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^N \quad (5.42)$$

In particular, if the solution of (5.42) is given by

$$K(\beta) = P_{MM'}^{(n)} e^{-\beta P_{MM'}^{(n)} H_M^{(n)} P_{MM'}^{(n)}} \quad (5.43)$$

we recover (5.32) since $P_{MM'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)} = J_{MM'}^{(N)}$. In appendix D we prove (5.43) for the case that $H_{MM'}^{(n)}$ is bounded, that is, (5.43) is strictly true when replacing $H_{MM'}^{(n)}$ by its bounded spectral projections $E_{M'}^{(n)}(B)$, B Borel.

In what follows we will assume this to hold also when $e^{-\beta H_M^{(n)}}$ is a general contraction semi-group. In [80] we find proofs for existence of a resulting degenerate semi-group under special circumstances but no concrete formulae in terms of the original projection and semi-group are given. Thus for the time being we will use (5.32) as a plausible solution of the *exact relation* (5.42) but keep in mind that (5.42) may contain more information.

To conclude this step, under the assumption that uniqueness of the vacuum is preserved under the renormalisation flow and that the degenerate Kato-Trotter product formula applies to general contraction semi-groups, we can strictly derive (5.29) and (5.32) as equivalent to (5.24). Unfortunately, it is not possible to show that the uniqueness property is automatically preserved under the flow for suppose that $H_{M'}^{(n)}$ has unique vacuum $\Omega_{M'}^{(n)}$ and that $H_M^{(n+1)} v_M = [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger H_{M'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)} v_M = 0$ then we can just conclude that $H_{M'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)} v_M \in [P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\perp \mathcal{H}_{M'}^{(n)}$. Hence without further input, the uniqueness property must be checked self-consistently.

Step 3: Constructing the continuum theory from the fixed point data

Once we found a fixed point family $J_{MM'}; (\mathcal{H}_M, \Omega_M, H_M)$ with $M < M'$, $M, M' \in \mathcal{M}$ we have an inductive limit structure $(J_{MM'}, \mathcal{H}_M)$ of Hilbert spaces since $J_{M'M''} J_{MM'} = J_{MM''}$ is inherited from $I_{M'M''} I_{MM'} = I_{MM''}$ for $M < M' < M''$ and therefore can define the continuum Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as its inductive limit which always exists [63]. Thus, there exist isometries $J_M : \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $J_{M'} J_M = J_M$, $M < M'$. Moreover, there exists a consistently defined quadratic form H (not necessarily an operator) such that $H_M = J_M^\dagger H J_M$. Note that we can compute matrix elements of H between the subspaces $J_M \mathcal{H}_M, J_{M'} \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ of \mathcal{H} for any M, M' without actually knowing H , just its known finite resolution projections are needed, by using any $M, M' < M''$

$$\langle J_M \psi_M, H J_{M'} \psi_{M'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle J_{M''} J_{MM''} \psi_M, H J_{M''} J_{M'M''} \psi_{M'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle J_{MM''} \psi_M, H_{M''} J_{M'M''} \psi_{M'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{M''}} \quad (5.44)$$

We stress that H is *not* the inductive limit of the H_M since that would require $H_{M'}J_{MM'} = J_{MM'}H_M$. This inductive limit condition is much stronger than the quadratic form condition $H_M = J_{MM'}^\dagger H_{M'} J_{MM'}$ which can be seen by multiplying the inductive limit condition from the left with $J_{MM'}^\dagger$ and using isometry. It is not possible to derive the inductive limit condition from the quadratic form condition because $J_{MM'}^\dagger$ has no left inverse.

We emphasise that this Hamiltonian renormalisation scheme can be seen as an *independent, real space, kinematical* renormalization flow different from the OS measure (or path integral) scheme even if the assumptions that were made during its derivation from the measure theoretic one are violated. Note that both schemes are *exact*, i.e. make no truncation error. This is possible because we do not need to compute the spectra of the Hamiltonians (which is practically impossible to do analytically without error even at finite resolution) but only matrix elements which is computationally much easier and can often be performed analytically, even if the Hilbert spaces involved are *infinite dimensional* as is the case in bosonic QFT even at finite resolution.

As a final remark, recall that the reduction of (5.24) to (5.29) and (5.29) rests crucially on the assumption that the vacuum vectors $\Omega_M^{(n)}$ remain the unique ground states of the Hamiltonians $H_M^{(n)}$ in the course of the renormalisation, a condition which is difficult to keep track of in practice and which in fact contains dynamical information. Is it possible that the OS measure flow and the Hamiltonian flow (5.29) and (5.32) nevertheless deliver the same continuum theory, even if we drop the vacuum uniqueness assumption? In that respect, note that one arrives at (5.29), (5.32) from (5.24) by deleting by hand the off-block diagonal terms in $H_{M'}^{(n)}$ with respect to the decomposition (5.34). When deleting those terms by hand then (5.24) indeed becomes equivalent to (5.29) and (5.32). This is reminiscent of the Raleigh-Ritz procedure of diagonalising a self-adjoint operator [79]: There the statement is that for any self-adjoint operator H bounded from below (which is precisely our situation) and any finite dimensional projection P the $\dim(P)$ eigenvalues of PHP ordered by size are upper bounds of the $\dim(P)$ eigenvalues, ordered by size, in the discrete part of the spectrum (i.e. isolated eigenvalues of finite multiplicity) of H . Here we deal with an infinite projection instead of a finite one, but the general setting is the same. The idea is that as we increase M we approach the continuum Hamiltonian for which eventually there are no off-diagonal elements.

6 Connection with density matrix and entanglement renormalisation

In this brief section we display natural points of contact between density matrix renormalisation [32, 41], entanglement renormalisation [44, 45] and projective renormalisation [37, 38, 39, 40]. In particular the notions of ascending and descending superoperators, isometries and disentanglers from the multi scale entanglement renormalisation Ansatz (MERA) can be applied.

Recall that our Hamiltonian renormalisation scheme produced the following structures: At each resolution M we are given an OS triple $(\mathcal{H}_M, \Omega_M, H_M)$ and in addition we have the C^* -algebra \mathfrak{A}_M of bounded operators acting on \mathcal{H}_M . The $w(\phi_M(l_M))$ form a commutative subalgebra \mathfrak{B}_M of \mathfrak{A}_M for which Ω_M is cyclic and separating. The full algebra \mathfrak{A}_M contains in addition operators that depend on the momenta π_M conjugate to ϕ_M . Furthermore, the renormalisation scheme has naturally produced an inductive system of isometric injections $J_{MM'} : \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ for $M < M'$ such that $J_{MM'} w(\phi_M(l_M)) \Omega_M = w(\phi_{M'}(I_{MM'} l_M)) \Omega_{M'}$ and such that $J_{M'M''} J_{MM'} = J_{MM''}$ for $M < M' < M''$. Isometry $J_{MM'}^\dagger J_{MM'} = 1_{\mathcal{H}_M}$ implies that $P_{MM'} = J_{MM'} J_{MM'}^\dagger$ is an orthogonal projection in $\mathcal{H}_{M'}$.

In section 5 we established that the Hamiltonian renormalisation derived from OS reconstruction, under the assumption of vacuum uniqueness at each resolution, has given rise to a flow of *contraction semigroups*

$$e^{-\beta H_M^{(n+1)}} = [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger \left\{ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [e^{-\beta H_{M'}^{(n)}} P_{MM'}^{(n)}]^N \right\} J_{MM'}^{(n)} \quad (6.1)$$

using the master equation (5.24) consequently. Suppose we actually use the weaker condition (5.31) which can be stated as

$$e^{-\beta H_M^{(n+1)}} = [J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger e^{-\beta H_{M'}^{(n)}} J_{MM'}^{(n)} \quad (6.2)$$

and which appeared as an intermediate step. This flow condition on *Gibbs operators* cannot hold for all β hence we fix it for the rest of this section. Note that $\Omega_M^{(n+1)}$ keeps being an eigenvector of the Gibbs operator with eigenvalue unity during the flow since $\Omega_{M'}^{(n)} = J_{MM'}^{(n)} \Omega_M^{(n+1)}$.

Consider now the linear embedding of algebras

$$\alpha_{MM'} : \mathfrak{A}_M \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{M'}; \quad a_M \mapsto J_{MM'} a_M J_{MM'}^\dagger \quad (6.3)$$

sometimes called an *ascending superoperator*. This is a $*$ -homomorphism

$$[\alpha_{MM'}(a_M)]^\dagger = \alpha_{MM'}(a_M^\dagger), \quad \alpha_{MM'}(a_M b_M) = \alpha_{MM'}(a_M) \alpha_{MM'}(b_M) \quad (6.4)$$

by virtue of isometry of the injections. However, $\alpha_{MM'}$ is not unital

$$\alpha_{MM'}(1_{\mathcal{H}_M}) = P_{MM'} \neq 1_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}} \quad (6.5)$$

Nevertheless it is consistently defined

$$\alpha_{M'M''} \circ \alpha_{MM'} = \alpha_{MM''} \quad (6.6)$$

by virtue of the inductive properties of the injections.

We may want to twist $\alpha_{MM'}$ by unitary operators $U_M, U_{M'}$ in $\mathcal{H}_M, \mathcal{H}_{M'}$ respectively, sometimes called *disentangled* to obtain $\tilde{\alpha}_{MM'}(\cdot) = U_{M'} \alpha_{MM'} U_M^\dagger$ which preserves all properties and amounts to the substitution of cylindrically consistent isometries $J_{MM'} \rightarrow \tilde{J}_{MM'} = U_{M'} J_{MM'} U_M$ with no conditions on the U_M . For the injections into the continuum this amounts to $\tilde{J}_M = U J_M U_M^\dagger$ for some unitary U on \mathcal{H} .

We may use these to define a density matrix (positive trace class operators of unit trace) renormalisation scheme as follows: Given an initial system of density matrices $\rho_M^{(0)}$ for each resolution scale M we set for $M < M'$ (in practice $M' = 2M$)

$$\rho_M^{(n+1)} := \frac{[J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger \rho_{M'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_M}[[J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger \rho_{M'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)}]} = \frac{[J_{MM'}^{(n)}]^\dagger \rho_{M'}^{(n)} J_{MM'}^{(n)}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}}[\rho_{M'}^{(n)} P_{MM'}^{(n)}]} := D_{MM'}[\rho_{M'}^{(n)}] \quad (6.7)$$

which is sometimes called a *descending (non-linear) superoperator*. The lhs of (6.7) may be considered as the *reduced density matrix* of the density matrix on the rhs.

A fixed point of (6.7) defines a consistently defined system of density matrices since for $M < M' < M''$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_M &= \frac{J_{MM'}^\dagger \rho_{M'} J_{MM'}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}}[\rho_{M'} P_{MM'}]} \\ &= \frac{J_{MM'}^\dagger \left\{ \frac{J_{M'M''}^\dagger \rho_{M''} J_{M'M''}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M''}}[\rho_{M''} P_{M'M''}]} \right\} J_{MM'}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}} \left[\left\{ \frac{J_{M'M''}^\dagger \rho_{M''} J_{M'M''}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M''}}[\rho_{M''} P_{M'M''}]} \right\} P_{MM'} \right]} \\ &= \frac{[J_{M'M''} J_{MM'}]^\dagger \rho_{M''} [J_{M'M''} J_{MM'}]}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}}[J_{M'M''}^\dagger \rho_{M''} J_{M'M''} P_{MM'}]} \\ &= \frac{J_{MM''}^\dagger \rho_{M''} J_{MM''}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M''}}[\rho_{M''} J_{M'M''} P_{MM'} J_{M'M''}^\dagger]} \\ &= \frac{J_{MM''}^\dagger \rho_{M''} J_{MM''}}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M''}}[\rho_{M''} P_{MM''}]} \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

If one wants to have a linear descending superoperator one needs to extend the homomorphism to a unital one or work with trace class operators of non-unit norm because one can always normalise afterwards. This is possible because the *partition functions*

$$Z_M(\beta) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_M}[e^{-\beta H_M}] \quad (6.9)$$

enjoy the *invariance property* [32]

$$Z_M(\beta) := \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{M'}}[e^{-\beta H_{M'}} P_{MM'}] \quad (6.10)$$

for all $M < M'$

The relation (6.8) says that there exists a density matrix ρ on the inductive limit \mathcal{H} such that

$$\rho_M = \frac{J_M^\dagger \rho J_M}{\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\rho P_M]} \quad (6.11)$$

where the isometries $J_M : \mathcal{H}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ satisfy $J_{M'} J_{MM'} = J_M$ and $P_M = J_M J_M^\dagger$ is a projection. One may explicitly check that (6.11) solves (6.8).

Density matrices explore the folium of the algebraic vacuum state $\omega_0(\cdot) = \langle \Omega, \cdot \Omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e. we obtain algebraic states on the continuum algebra \mathfrak{A} and the one at finite resolution respectively

$$\omega_\rho(\cdot) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\rho \cdot], \quad \omega_{\rho_M}(\cdot) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_M}[\rho_M \cdot], \quad (6.12)$$

for which we have the identity

$$\omega_\rho(\alpha_M(a_M)) = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\rho P_M] \omega_{\rho_M}(a_M) \quad (6.13)$$

with $\alpha_M(a_M) = J_M a_M J_M^\dagger$.

Examples for unital homomorphisms are for example available if the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_M have the following, non-trivial additional structure [39]: For all $M < M'$ we have $\mathcal{H}_{M'} = \mathcal{H}_M \otimes \mathcal{H}_{M'|M}$ (or at least there is a unitary map between them) with additional consistency conditions between these factorisations, see [39] for details. Then for instance

$$\alpha_{MM'}(a_M) = a_M \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}_{M'|M}} \quad (6.14)$$

and density matrix renormalisation amounts to taking partial traces with respect to the factor $\mathcal{H}_{M'|M}$ [32]. The map (6.14) can be described in terms of isometric embeddings $J_{MM'}^I \psi = \psi \otimes b_I$ with $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_M$, b_I an ONB of $\mathcal{H}_{M'|M}$ so that $\alpha_{MM'}(a_M) = \sum_I J_{MM'}^I a_M [J_{MM'}^I]^\dagger$ which explains why just one isometry is not sufficient to make $\alpha_{MM'}$ unital. Such a tensor product situation is available if we consider as label set the mutually commuting modes of a Fock representation. The latter can be obtained by smearing creation and annihilation operators with respect an orthonormal basis of the 1-particle Hilbert space and if the corresponding smearing is supposed to be smooth and spatially local as one would like for a real space coarse graining scheme then one can use a (e.g. Meyer) wavelet basis [83]. However in view of Haag's theorem [73] it is unclear whether Fock space techniques can be applied in the interacting case, which is why the scheme adopted in this paper keeps track of the interacting rather than free vacuum during the flow. Even for free theories note that in case one is dealing with an infinite number of degrees of freedom (continuum limit) a Fock representation must be carefully adapted to the Hamiltonian as otherwise it is not even densely defined.

For completeness we mention that a unitalisation of $\alpha_{MM'}(\cdot) = J_{MM'}(\cdot) J_{MM'}^\dagger$ can be provided if the system $(\mathfrak{A}_M, \alpha_{MM'})_{M < M'}$ admits a consistently defined system of *weights*, that is, unital *-homomorphisms $w_M : \mathfrak{A}_M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $w_{M'} \circ \alpha_{MM'} = w_M$. Then it is not difficult to check that

$$\beta_{MM'}(a_M) = \alpha_{MM'}(a_M) + w_M(a_M) P_{MM'}^\perp \quad (6.15)$$

is unital, has all the properties of $\alpha_{MM'}$ and extends $\alpha_{MM'}$ in the sense that $\beta_{MM'}(a_M) \Omega_{M'} = \alpha_{MM'}(a_M) \Omega_{M'} = J_{MM'} a_M \Omega_M$.

Thus our Hamiltonian renormalisation scheme also suggests as a variant an independent density matrix renormalisation scheme corresponding to the Gibbs operator at fixed temperature that simultaneously keeps track of the vacuum. Various combinations and generalisations of these ideas are conceivable. For instance, one could use as density matrices the Gibbs operator corresponding to a Hamiltonian $\rho_M^{(n)} = e^{-\beta H_M^{(n)}}$ and any *fixed* inductive limit Hilbert space with inductive structure $J_{MM'}$ or a fixed consistent system of unital homomorphisms and then use the flow defined by the scheme considered in this section to derive a flow of Hamiltonians as an independent technique, see also [32, 39, 40]. This will likely give rise to a (finite) temperature state rather than a vacuum state as a fixed point of the renormalisation flow. Or one could keep the density matrices independent of

the Hamiltonians and study the time evolution of the reduced density matrices $\rho_M^{(n+1)}(t) := \alpha'_{MM'}(\gamma_{M',t}^{(n)}(\rho_{M'}^{(n)}))$ where $(\alpha'_{MM'}\rho_{M'})[a_M] := \rho_{M'}[\alpha_{MM'}(a_M)]$ (here the density matrices are understood as tracial states) with $\gamma_{M',t}^{(n)} = e^{itH_{M'}^{(n)}}(\cdot)e^{-itH_{M'}^{(n)}}$ whose infinitesimal form gives rise to a Lindblad equation [78] in the unital case (with trivial non-linear corrections in the non-unital case that can be computed from the linear flow that one obtains by dropping the normalisation by the partition function). Its non-dissipative component can be used to define a flow of Hamiltonians. Yet more generally we could in fact consider a system of quadruples $(\omega_M, \mathfrak{A}_M, H_M, \alpha_{MM'})$ where the Gibbs states have been replaced by general algebraic states ω_M and we could study their analogous flow.

7 Connections with the functional renormalisation group

The functional renormalisation group (FRG) (see the first two references in [18]) is the technique underlying the asymptotic safety approach to quantum gravity. We will sketch it here in measure theoretic terms to display the rather obvious point of contact with the Hamiltonian renormalisation programme which arises from OS reconstruction. We will restrict to scalar field theories for simplicity. The discussion will rely on several assumptions which we spell out in some detail and will be only qualitative in nature.

Suppose that μ is a probability measure with stochastic process Φ labelled by smearing functions F and that $\mathbb{R}^+ \ni k \mapsto \mu_k$ is a one parameter family of such probability measures defined in terms of its generating functional as

$$\mu_k(w[F]) := \frac{\mu(\rho_k w[F])}{\mu(\rho_k)}; \quad w[F](\Phi) := e^{i \int d^D x F(x) \Phi(x)} \quad (7.1)$$

Here ρ_k is a μ measurable, positive $L_1(d\mu)$ function with positive μ measure. This means that $d\mu_k = \frac{\rho_k}{\mu(\rho_k)}d\mu$, i.e. the measures μ_k are mutually absolutely continuous and ρ_k is essentially the Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ_k with respect to μ [70].

The family of measures enjoy the obvious *cylindrical consistency* identity

$$\mu_k(w[F]) = \frac{\mu_{k'}(\frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{k'}} w[F])}{\mu_{k'}(\frac{\rho_k}{\rho_{k'}})} \quad (7.2)$$

Suppose now that in fact the continuum measure μ is not known but that we guess a family of measures μ_k and use (7.2) to define a renormalisation group flow where the ρ_k are fixed and supposed to be measurable functions for all the μ_k in the process of the flow. This is, in most general terms, the idea of the FRG, that is, the rhs of (7.2) is the renormalisation of $\mu_{k'}$ and serves as the new definition of μ_k . If we take the derivative of the rhs of (7.2) with respect to k at $k' = k$ we obtain what is known in the literature as the *Polchinsky equation*. If we take the Legendre transformation with respect to F of

$$i\varphi[F] - \ln(\mu(\rho_k w[F])) + \ln(\rho_k(k)[\varphi]) \quad (7.3)$$

one obtains the *effective average action* $\Gamma_k[\varphi]$. One finds a closed equation for Γ_k for the case that $\ln(\rho_k)(\varphi) = -\frac{1}{2} < \varphi, R_k \varphi >$ is quadratic in φ known as the *Wetterich equation*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial k} \Gamma_k[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}([\partial_k R_k] [R_k + \Gamma_k^{(2)}[\varphi]]^{-1}) \quad (7.4)$$

where $R_k = R_k(x, y)$ and the second functional derivative $\Gamma_k^{(2)}(x, y)$ are symmetric integral kernels. As (7.4) is a consequence of having a consistent family of measures derived from μ , it can be used as a flow equation as well which is strictly equivalent to the Polchinsky equation.

To translate (7.2) into Hamiltonian renormalisation we must be more specific on the choice of ρ_k which we take to be of the form cited above in order that it yields the Wetterich equation together with the assumptions usually made: We consider a translation invariant kernel R_k whose Fourier transform $\hat{R}_k(p)$ enjoys the following properties: 1. $\hat{R}_k(p) \geq 0$, 2. $\hat{R}_k(p)$ is monotonously growing in k at fixed p and 3. $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \hat{R}_k(p) = 0$. One usually adds 4. $\hat{R}_{k=0}(p) = 0$, $\hat{R}_k(p=0) > 0$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \Lambda} \hat{R}_k(p) = \infty$ (where Λ is a cut-off which for a continuum

theory can be taken to ∞). We will only need 1.-3. in what follows. They imply that R_k is an *infrared cut-off* i.e. momentum modes p lower than k (with respect to the Euclidian metric) are suppressed, high momentum modes are unaffected. Thus as we increase k we suppress more and more modes, hence the number of degrees of freedom becomes smaller. Accordingly, the coarse graining here happens by *increasing* k rather than lowering, i.e. the flow is towards the UV rather than towards the IR in contrast to real space block spin transformations from fine to coarse lattices.

Accordingly, we update a measure at k from a measure at $k' < k$. Let us further assume that the measure $\mu_{k'}(\cdot)$ and $\mu_{k'}(\rho_k/\rho_{k'})/\mu_{k'}(\rho_k/\rho_{k'})$ are in fact Wiener measures with respect to the same stochastic process ϕ and Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{k'}$ but with underlying Hamiltonians and vacua given by $H_{k'}$, $\Omega_{k'}$ and $H'_k := H_{k'} + h_k - h_{k'}$, $\Omega_{kk'}$ respectively. This puts some restriction on R_k as far as the dependence on the time component of the momentum is concerned if we wish h_k to be an at most quadratic expression in the momenta π conjugate to ϕ . Thus we consider e.g. $\hat{R}_k(p) = [(p^0)^2 \kappa_k(|\vec{p}|) + \sigma_k(|\vec{p}|)]$ where κ_k, σ_k enjoy the properties 1.-3. above but only with respect to the spatial momenta and $\lambda > 0$. Similar restrictions have been made in [19] which is concerned with making contact to Lorentzian signature GR. This way temporal momentum is not suppressed which is in accordance with our Hamiltonian renormalisation scheme which does not renormalise in the time direction.

Then the rhs of (7.2) can be written for $F(t, \vec{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^T \delta(t, t_k) f_k(\vec{x})$

$$< \Omega_{kk'}, e^{i\phi[f_1]} e^{-[t_T - t_{T-1}]H'_k} \dots e^{-[t_2 - t_1]H'_k} e^{i\phi[f_1]} \Omega_{kk'} > \quad (7.5)$$

To get rid of the dependence on k in $\Omega_{kk'}$ we use as usually that

$$\Omega_{kk'} = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-\beta H'_k \Omega_{k'}}}{||e^{-\beta H'_k \Omega_{k'}}||} \quad (7.6)$$

assuming that the strong limit exists and thus the rhs of (7.2) can be written

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{< \Omega_{k'}, e^{-[\beta - t_T]H'_k} e^{i\phi[f_1]} e^{-[t_T - t_{T-1}]H'_k} \dots e^{-[t_2 - t_1]H'_k} e^{i\phi[f_1]} e^{-[t_1 + \beta]H'_k} \Omega_{k'} >}{< \Omega_{k'}, e^{-2\beta H'_k} \Omega_{k'} >} \quad (7.7)$$

Using the Trotter product formula we can replace every exponential of the form $e^{-sH'_k}$ by $[e^{-sH_{k'}/N} e^{-s(h_k - h_{k'})/N}]^N$ as N turns to ∞ . By construction $h_k - h_{k'}$ is non-vanishing for momentum modes $k' \leq |\vec{p}| \leq k$ and thus its Gibbs exponential suppresses those. As emphasised in the first two references of [18] one obtains an actual coarse graining renormalisation group only when $R_k(p)$ takes the more special form $Z(\vec{p})[(p_0)^2 + \vec{p}^2]I_k(\vec{p})^2/[1 - I_k(\vec{p})^2]$ where i. $I_k(\vec{p})I_{k'}(\vec{p}) = I_{\tilde{k}(k, k')}(\vec{p})$ for some $\tilde{k}(k, k')$ which ensures the group property and moreover ii. $I_k(\vec{p})$ approaches a step function $\theta(k^2 - \vec{p}^2)$. In this limit $e^{-s(h_k - h_{k'})/N} \rightarrow P_{kk'}$ becomes a projection operator which projects on a subspace $\mathcal{H}_k = P_{kk'}\mathcal{H}_{k'}$ independent of the excess modes $k' < |\vec{p}| < k$. To see this note that the form of $R_k - R_{k'}$ allows us to write $h_k - h_{k'}$ in terms of suitable annihilation and creation operators on a suitable Fock space which we assume to be unitarily related to $\mathcal{H}_{k'}$ (this will be the case in presence of both IR and UV cut-offs). On that Fock space in the step function limit the above *is* a projector onto the subspace with no excitations from the excess modes and a unitary transformation does not change the projection property. Accordingly the Trotter product becomes a degenerate one and $e^{-sH'_k}$ becomes $P_{kk'}e^{-sP_{kk'}H_{k'}P_{kk'}}$ see appendix D. Taking $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ in (7.7) the rhs of (7.2) can be written

$$< \Omega_k, e^{i\phi[f_1]} e^{-[t_T - t_{T-1}]H_k} \dots e^{-[t_2 - t_1]H_k} e^{i\phi[f_1]} \Omega_k > \quad (7.8)$$

with the vacuum Ω_k of H_k

$$H_k = P_{kk'}H_{k'}P_{kk'}, \quad \Omega_k = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-\beta H_k P_{kk'} \Omega_{k'}}}{||e^{-\beta H_k P_{kk'} \Omega_{k'}}||} \quad (7.9)$$

If we now compare to the end of section 5 we find qualitatively an *exact match*, just that the projections now involve momentum modes with respect to a Fock representation determined by R_k .

8 Conclusion

In this contribution we have reviewed, extended and clarified the proposal [16]. The extension consisted in i. an improved derivation of the renormalisation scheme (5.29), (5.32) from OS reconstruction using an extended minimal set of OS axioms that also includes the uniqueness of the vacuum (which is in fact always assumed in QFT on Minkowski space) as well as ii. a much more systematic approach to the choice of coarse graining maps for a general QFT which are motivated by structures naturally provided already by the classical theory. The clarification consisted in separating off the null space quotienting process imposed by OS reconstruction as an independent part of the renormalisation flow whose formulation naturally uses the language of stochastic processes.

We also had the opportunity to make several points of contact with other renormalisation programmes that are currently being further developed. For instance, the reduced density matrix approach on which entanglement renormalisation schemes rest occurs naturally in our scheme as well when looking at the flow of the vacuum and Hilbert space. Next, since we consider a real space renormalisation scheme, when translated in terms of the flow of Wiener measures that we obtain from the flow of OS data we are rather close to the asymptotic safety programme because our spatial lattices can of course be translated into momentum lattices by Fourier transformation that are used in the asymptotically safe quantum gravity programme. Finally, our proposal is obviously very close in language and methods to all other Hamiltonian renormalisation schemes and while we currently focus on a kinematical coarse graining scheme our approach also contains dynamical components such as the flow of the vacuum.

In [16] and [81] we have successfully applied our scheme to free QFT (scalar fields and Abelian gauge theories) exploiting their linear structure. Obviously one should construct further solvable examples of interacting theories, e.g. interacting 2D scalar QFT [72] or free Abelian gauge theories but artificially discretised in terms of non-linear holonomies in order to simulate the situation in Loop Quantum Gravity, see [81] for further remarks.

Of course the ultimate goal is to use Hamiltonian renormalisation to find a continuum theory for canonical Quantum Gravity. Here we can use the LQG candidate as a starting point because it is rather far developed, but of course the flow scheme developed can be applied to any other canonical programme. However, using LQG and the concrete scheme that employs a fixed subset of graphs γ_M labelled by $M \in \mathbb{M}$ of cubical topology is, at each resolution M , precisely the AQG version of LQG [67]. Hence we can already speculate on what can be expected from the renormalisation flow:

The Hamiltonian $H_M^{(0)}$ defined on the corresponding $\mathcal{H}_M^{(0)} = L_2(SU(2)^{3M^3}, d^{3M^3} \mu_H)$ (μ_H being the $SU(2)$ Haar measure) could be, but not needs to be, ordered in such a way as to annihilate the vacuum $\Omega_M^{(0)} = 1$ of a discretised volume operator $V_M^{(0)}$ as it is standard in current regularisations of the Hamiltonian constraint. In fact it may be desirable to choose the vacuum of $H_M^{(0)}$ not to coincide with that of $V_M^{(0)}$ in order to imprint its algebraic structure. The operator $H_M^{(0)}$ preserves $\mathcal{H}_M^{(0)}$ but not each subspace defined by sublattices of γ_M and is thus not super local in contrast to the definition [6], for instance it will use volume operators local to a vertex and holonomies along plaquettes incident at that vertex (next neighbour interaction). When running the renormalisation scheme, next to next neighbour interactions will be switched on (this is exactly what happens in the examples [16], [81]) etc. and upon reaching the fixed point the Hamiltonian H_M will involve all possible interactions *with precise coefficients* and thus be spatially non local but hopefully quasi local (i.e. the interactions die off exponentially with the distance between vertices defined by the 3D taxi driver metric on the graph (each edge counting one unit)). Note that this quasi locality at finite resolution can be straightforwardly computed in the examples [16], [81] by using the spatially local continuum Hamiltonian and projecting it with J_M, J_M^\dagger (blocking from the continuum) and is thus *physically correct*. In other words spatial locality in the continuum is not in conflict with spatial non locality at finite resolution. In fact we even *expect* a high degree of spatial non-locality for very small M for which the naive dequantisation of $H_M^{(0)}$ at any phase space point p will be far off the classical value $H(p)$ which matches with the remarks made at the end of section 3.

Several questions arise from this picture should the flow display any fixed points:

First, for compact σ and if indeed we use a countable set of lattices γ_M as above, the resulting inductive limit

Hilbert space could be separable (since there is a countable basis defined by vectors at finite resolution), thus would not be the standard LQG representation space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{LQG}} = L_2(\overline{\mathcal{A}}, d\mu_{\text{AL}})$ of square integrable functions with respect to the Ashtekar-Lewandowski measure μ_{AL} on a space $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ of distributional connections². In view of the uniqueness theorem [5] one of its assumptions will then be violated. The most likely possibility is that the corresponding vacuum expectation value functional is not spatially diffeomorphism invariant since the diffeomorphism symmetry was explicitly broken in the renormalisation process. If the continuum Hamiltonian is still spatially diffeomorphism invariant we would be in the situation of spontaneous symmetry breakdown and could view this as a phase transition from the symmetric \mathcal{H}_{LQG} phase to this broken phase. Note that in our gauge fixed situation the diffeomorphism group is considered as a continuous symmetry group and not as a gauge group.

Next, precisely due to this separability the resulting theory may not suffer from the discontinuity of holonomy operators which otherwise gives rise to what has been called the “staircase problem” in the literature [82]: The cubical graphs γ_M contain paths only along the coordinate axes. Since all $M \in \mathcal{M}$ are allowed, these paths separate the points of the classical configuration space but not of the distributional space $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular, any path that is not a “staircase” path cannot be accommodated at any finite resolution. Yet, the continuum Hamiltonian in the example [81] does not care about the fact that it was defined as a fixed point of a flow of its finite resolution projections of cubical lattices only, it also knows how to act on states which are excited on non-“staircase” paths. The reason for why this happens is as follows: Consider any path c and some staircase approximant \tilde{c} with the same end points as c which has zero winding number with respect to c so that $c \circ \tilde{c}^{-1} = \partial S$ bounds a surface. Then for an Abelian connection A we have $\int_c A - \int_{\tilde{c}} A = \int_S dA$ and in the classical theory the surface integral converges to zero. In the quantum theory a similar calculation can be made because the Hilbert space measure is supported on a different kind of distributional connections than $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$.

Finally, although the scheme strictly speaking was derived for theories with gauge fixed spacetime diffeomorphism constraints and a true physical Hamiltonian bounded from below, we may of course “abuse” it and also consider constraint operators $C(f)$ as Hamiltonians, define their finite resolution expressions $C(f)_M^{(0)}$ and let them flow (here f is a test function on the spatial manifold σ)³. This will involve as a new ingredient also a discretisation of the smearing function f which could be done using the maps I_M, K_M for scalar fields, see [81]. Suppose then that for all f fixed point families $\{C(f)_M\}_{M \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ can be obtained. Should we expect that the $C(f)_M$ represent a finite resolution version of the classical continuum constraint (hypersurface deformation) algebra $\{C(f), C(g)\} = C(h(f, g))$ where $h(f, g)$ is another (in general phase space dependent) smearing function? The answer is in the negative! Namely, what we want is that the continuum operators obey $[C(f), C(g)] = iC(h(f, g))$ (with appropriate orderings of $C, h(f, g)$ in place). But if $C(f)_M = J_M^\dagger C(f) J_M$ then

$$[C(f)_M, C(g)_M] = J_M^\dagger [C(f) P_M C(g) - C(g) P_M C(f)] J_M = C(h(f, g))_M + J_M^\dagger [C(f) [P_M, C(g)]] J_M \quad (8.1)$$

Thus, even if the continuum algebra closes, one *does not see this at any finite resolution* unless $[C(f), P_M] = 0$ for all f, M . This will generically not hold because not even $C(f)_{M'}$ preserves $J_{MM'} \mathcal{H}_M$, $M < M'$ unless $J_{MM'} C(f)_M = C(f)_{M'} J_{MM'}$ i.e. the $C(f)$ form an inductive family which is not expected. Of course the correction term in (8.1) is expected to become “small” in the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$ in which $P_M \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{H}}$ and thus an appropriate criterion for closure of the continuum algebra using only finite resolution projections can be formulated (see [16] for the simpler case of rotational invariance). Note that the quantisation performed for spatially diffeomorphism invariant Hamiltonian operators on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{LQG} displayed in section 3 was *forced* to have the unphysical property $[H, P_M] = 0$, see the statement just before (3.24). But the underlying theorem exploits in a crucial way the non-separability of \mathcal{H}_{LQG} and thus fortunately does not hold on separable Hilbert spaces.

Before closing, note that even if this approach of taking the UV limit can be completed and unless the manifold σ is compact, we still must take the thermodynamic or infrared limit and remove the IR cut-off R (compactification scale). As is well known from statistical quantum field theory [63] interesting phenomena related to phase transitions can happen here. Moreover, constructible examples of low dimensional interacting QFT show that the thermodynamic limit requires techniques that go beyond what was displayed here [72]. However, we consider

²In the non-compact case one may need to take the infinite tensor product extension [69] which is also non-separable but in a different sense and there one regains separability by passing to irreducible representations of the observable algebra.

³In fact, the physical Hamiltonian of section 3 is not manifestly bounded from below, hence we to abuse the formalism in the sense that we assumed the semi-boundedness.

this momentarily as a “higher order” problem and reserve it for future research.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Thorsten Lang for in depth discussions about reduced density matrices, decoherence and the Lindblad equation in the context of renormalisation, Klaus Liegener for clarifying conversations about renormalisation of constraints and Alexander Stottmeister for very fruitful exchanges about renormalisation in terms of algebraic states.

A Label structures for gauge field theories

We consider first the case of a $U(1)$ gauge theory so that L_M is the space of functions on \mathbb{Z}_M^D with values in \mathbb{R}^D .

Denote by $a = 1, \dots, D$ a direction on the lattice and by $m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D$ a vertex in it. Let (recall $\epsilon_M = R/M$)

$$\begin{aligned} [f_{a,m}^M]^b(x) &:= \delta_a^b \left[\prod_{c \neq a} \delta(x^c, m^c \epsilon_M) \right] \int_{[m^a \epsilon_M, (m^a+1) \epsilon_M)} dy \delta(x^a, y) \\ &= \delta_a^b \left[\prod_{c \neq a} \delta(x^c, m^c \epsilon_M) \right] \chi_{[m^a \epsilon_M, (m^a+1) \epsilon_M)}(x^a) \\ [F_{M'}^{a,m}]_b(x) &:= \delta_b^a \delta(x^a, m^a \epsilon_M) \left[\prod_{c \neq a} \int_{[m^c \epsilon_M, (m^c+1) \epsilon_M)} dy^c \delta(x^c, y^c) \right] \\ &= \delta_b^a \delta(x^a, m^a \epsilon_M) \left[\prod_{c \neq a} \chi_{[m^c \epsilon_M, (m^c+1) \epsilon_M)}(x^c) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Note the clopen structure of these distributions. We have for $M < M' \Leftrightarrow n := \frac{M'}{M} \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\langle f_{b,m}^M, F_{M'}^{a,m'} \rangle := \int d^3x [F_{M'}^{a,m'}]_c(x) [f_{b,m}^M]^c(x) = \delta_b^a \chi_{[m^a \epsilon_M, (m^a+1) \epsilon_M)}(m'^a \epsilon_{M'}) \prod_{c \neq a} \chi_{[m'^c \epsilon_{M'}, (m'^c+1) \epsilon_{M'})}(m^c \epsilon_M) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which is non vanishing and then equals unity iff $a = b$ and

$$nm^a \leq m'^a < n(m^a + 1), \quad m'^b \leq nm^b < m'^b + 1; b \neq a \quad (\text{A.3})$$

This implies $m = m'$ for $M = M'$ ($n = 1$).

Given $l_M \in L_M$ we obtain maps (we use the notation $l_M(m, a) := [l_M]^a(m)$)

$$\begin{aligned} I_M : L_M &\rightarrow L; (I_M l_M)^a(x) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D, b \in \{1, \dots, D\}} l_M(m, b) f_{m,b}^a(x) \\ K_M : L_M &\rightarrow L^*; (K_M l_M)_a(x) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_M^D, b \in \{1, \dots, D\}} l_M(m, b) F_a^{m,b}(x) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

For $M < M'$ (i.e. $M'/M \in \mathbb{N}$) we have for any $l'_{M'} \in L_{M'}$, $l_M \in L_M$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle l'_{M'}, I_{MM'} l_M \rangle_{L_{M'}} &:= \langle K_{M'} l'_{M'}, I_M l_M \rangle_{K \times I} = \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{Z}_{M'}^D, a} l'_{M'}(m', a) (I_{MM'} l_M)(m', a) \\ &= \sum_{m', m, a} l_{M'}(m', a) l_M(m, a) \chi_{[nm^a, n(m^a+1))}(m'^a) \prod_{b \neq a} \chi_{[m'^b, m'^b)}(nm^b) \\ &= \sum_{m', a} l_{M'}(m', a) \left[\prod_{b \neq a} \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_M}(m'^b/n) \right] l_M(m^a = [m'^a/n], m^b = m'^b/n; b \neq a) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

from which we read off

$$(I_{MM'}l_M)(m', a) = [\prod_{b \neq a} \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_M}(m'^b/n)] l_M(m^a = [m'^a/n], m^b = m'^b/n; b \neq a) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $[\cdot]$ denotes the Gauss bracket and $n = M'/M$. It follows for $M < M' < M''$ with $n = M'/M$, $n' = M''/M'$, $n'' = M''/M = nn'$

$$\begin{aligned} (I_{M'M'}I_{MM'}l_M)(a, m'') &= [\prod_{b \neq a} \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_{M'}}(m''^b/n')] (I_{MM'}l_M)([m''^a/n'], m''^b/n'; b \neq a) \\ &= [\prod_{b \neq a} \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_{M'}}(m''^b/n')] [\prod_{b \neq a} \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_M}((m''^b/n')/n)] l_M([m''^a/n']/n, (m''^b/n')/n; b \neq a) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which is non vanishing iff for all $b \neq a$ we have $m''^b/n' \in \mathbb{Z}_{M'}$ and $m''^b/(n'n) \in \mathbb{Z}_M$. Since the latter condition implies the first, the first factor in the last line of (A.7) can be dropped. Next let $m''^a = n'm'^a + k'$ with $m'^a \in \mathbb{Z}_{M'}$, $k' = 0, \dots, n' - 1$ and $m'^a = nm^a + k$ with $m^a \in \mathbb{Z}_M$, $k = 0, \dots, n - 1$. Then $m''^a = n'nm^a + (n'k + k') \leq n'nm^a + n'n - 1$ whence

$$[[m''/n']/n] = [m'^a/n] = m^a = [m''^a/n''] \quad (\text{A.8})$$

so that indeed

$$I_{M'M''}I_{MM'} = I_{MM''} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We note that $I_{MM'}$ restricts to a map $I_{MM'} B_M \rightarrow B_{M'}$ where B_M is the set of *bit valued maps* $\mathbb{Z}_M^D \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^D$. The idea is that the bit valued function l_M captures the information which edges of the lattice are *excited*, i.e. $l_M(m, a) = 1$ means that the edge with starting point $m \in \mathbb{Z}_M$ that extends one lattice unit into direction a is excited, otherwise not. The reason why this information is sufficient is that the information about the strength of the excitation sits in the group representation label of the corresponding holonomy. For Abelian groups we could take group representations labelled by \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{R} and thus absorb the representation label into l_M which then becomes \mathbb{Z}^D or \mathbb{R}^D valued and which has the structure of a module over the ring \mathbb{Z} or a vector space over the field \mathbb{R} . That absorption of the representation label into l_M is no longer possible for non-Abelian gauge groups. Thus, in order to develop a unified language for all physical theories we use the bit valued space B_M in the main text. Note that in the bit valued case, B_M is formally a vector space over the field $F_2^D = \{0, 1\}^D$. However, these module or vector space structures are irrelevant for the purposes of renormalisation.

B Cyclic Abelian C^* -algebras

Recall that a (unital) C^* algebra \mathfrak{A} is a $*$ -algebra with a norm topology with respect to which it is complete (i.e. \mathfrak{A} is a (unital) Banach algebra) such that $\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}$. One of the best known examples is the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Given a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and some sub- C^* algebra $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ a vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ is called cyclic for \mathfrak{B} if $\mathfrak{B}\Omega$ is dense in \mathcal{H} . It is called separating if $b\Omega = 0$ implies $b = 0$ for all $b \in \mathfrak{B}$.

In the OS reconstruction algorithm we construct \mathcal{H}, Ω in terms of equivalence classes of the vector space V of vectors which are linear combinations of vectors of the form $\Psi[\Phi] = w_T(\Phi(t_T, l_T)) \dots w_1(\Phi(t_1, l_1))$ where Φ is a stochastic process labelled by $\mathbb{R} \times L$ for the measure μ with $t_T > t_{T-1} > \dots > t_1$ and the reflection positive inner product is $\langle \psi, \psi' \rangle = \mu(\psi^* R \psi')$ where R denotes the time reflection. Here the w_k belong to some space of bounded functions \mathcal{W} on the range of the $\Phi(t, l), l \in L$ which form an Abelian $*$ -algebra with respect to point wise operations. The equivalence class $[\psi] = \psi + \mathcal{N}$ is with respect to the null space \mathcal{N} of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, \mathcal{H} is the completion of V/\mathcal{N} and $\Omega = [1]$. Consider the operators $[Q(w, l)], w \in \mathcal{W}, l \in L$ defined by $[Q(w, l)][\Psi] := [Q(w, l)\Psi]$, $(Q(w, l)\Psi)[\Phi] = w(\Phi(0, l))\Psi[\Phi]$. It is important that $Q(w, l)$ only depends on the time zero field in order for this definition to be well defined (independent of the representative) since for $\Psi \in \mathcal{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q(w, l)\Psi\|^2 &= \mu((Q(w, l)\Psi)^* R Q(w, l) \Psi) = \mu((\Psi)^* R Q(W, l)^* Q(w, l) \Psi) \\ &= | \langle \Psi, Q(W, l)^* Q(w, l) \Psi \rangle | \leq \|\Psi\| \|Q(W, l)^* Q(w, l) \Psi\| = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $Q(w, l)^* R = RQ(w, l)^*$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality was used. Consequently it is not clear that Ω is cyclic for the $Q(w, l)$ and in general this will not be the case.

Nevertheless, in the main text, we quoted the following result:

Theorem.

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space and $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ a unit vector. Then there exists an Abelian, unital sub- C^* -algebra $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on \mathcal{H} such that Ω is cyclic for \mathfrak{B} .

We could not find a proof of this statement in the literature, hence we supply an elementary one below.

Proof. Since \mathcal{H} is separable, it has a countable orthonormal basis b_I , $I \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and we may assume $b_0 = \Omega$ using the Gram-Schmidt algorithm. The idea is to construct inductively a basis e_I , $I \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $e_0 = b_0 = \Omega$, $\langle \Omega, e_I \rangle = 0$ for all $I \geq 1$ and $\langle e_I, e_J \rangle = \delta_{IJ}$ for all $I, J \geq 0$. Then the bounded operators given by the self-adjoint projections $P_0 = 1_{\mathcal{H}}$, $P_I := e_I \langle e_I, \cdot \rangle$ generate the searched for unital Abelian C^* -algebra since $P_0 P_I = P_I P_0 = P_I$, $P_I P_J = \delta_{IJ} P_J$, $I, J \geq 0$ and $P_I^* = P_I$, $I \geq 0$ and $P_I \Omega = \langle e_I, \Omega \rangle e_I$, $I \geq 0$ thus the finite linear combinations of the P_I applied to Ω have dense range.

We pick $e_1 = (b_0 + b_1)/\sqrt{2}$ so that $\langle e_1, \Omega \rangle = \langle e_1, b_1 \rangle = 1/\sqrt{2} > 0$ and assume that we have constructed e_1, \dots, e_I such that i. e_J , $1 \leq J \leq I$ is spanned by b_0, \dots, b_J with real coefficients, ii. $\langle e_J, e_K \rangle = \delta_{JK}$, $1 \leq J, K \leq I$, iii. $\langle b_J, e_J \rangle > 0$, $1 \leq J \leq I$ and iv. $\langle e_J, \Omega \rangle > 0$, $1 \leq J \leq I$. Consider the Ansatz

$$e_{I+1} = ab_{I+1} + bb_I + ce_I \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for real coefficients a, b, c to be determined. Note that e_{I+1} is spanned by b_0, \dots, b_{I+1} so that i. is satisfied. Clearly $\langle e_J, e_{I+1} \rangle = 0$ for $1 \leq J \leq I-1$ because $\langle e_J, e_I \rangle = 0$ by construction and $\langle e_J, b_I \rangle = \langle e_J, b_{I+1} \rangle = 0$ since e_J is spanned by b_0, \dots, b_J , $J < I$ which are orthonormal. We have

$$\langle e_I, e_{I+1} \rangle = b \langle e_I, b_I \rangle + c = 0 \Rightarrow c = -b \langle e_I, b_I \rangle \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and normalisation gives

$$\|e_{I+1}\|^2 = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + 2bc \langle b_I, e_I \rangle = a^2 + b^2 - c^2 = a^2 + b^2(1 - \langle e_I, b_I \rangle^2) = 1 \quad (\text{B.4})$$

and a convenient choice is

$$a = -b = [2 - \langle e_I, b_I \rangle^2]^{-1/2} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

so that orthonormalisation ii. is satisfied. Note that (B.5) is finite as $0 < |\langle e_I, b_I \rangle| \leq 1$. Since $a > 0$ we have $\langle b_{I+1}, e_{I+1} \rangle > 0$ satisfying iii. and since $b < 0$ we have $\langle \Omega, e_{I+1} \rangle = c < \langle \Omega, e_I \rangle = -b \langle \Omega, e_I \rangle < \langle b_I, e_I \rangle > 0$ satisfying iv.

With this choice we may in fact solve the recursion since

$$c_{I+1} := \langle b_{I+1}, e_{I+1} \rangle^2 = a^2 = (2 - [\langle b_I, e_I \rangle]^2)^{-1} = (2 - c_I)^{-1} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

which with $c_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ is solved by $c_I = \frac{I}{I+1}$. Thus the explicit solution is $e_0 = \Omega$, $e_1 = (\Omega + b_1)/\sqrt{2}$ and for $I \geq 1$

$$e_{I+1} = (b_{I+1} - b_I + \sqrt{\frac{I}{I+1}} e_I) \sqrt{\frac{I+1}{I+2}} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

It follows for $I \geq 1$

$$\langle \Omega, e_{I+1} \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{I}{I+2}} \langle \Omega, e_I \rangle = \sqrt{2 \frac{I!}{(I+2)!}} \langle \Omega, e_1 \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{I!}{(I+2)!}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(I+1)(I+2)}} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

which extends also to $I = 0$.

To see that the span of the e_I is dense suppose that $\langle \psi, e_I \rangle = 0$ for all $I \geq 0$. This means $\langle \psi, b_0 \rangle = 0$ and thus because e_I is in the span of the b_0, \dots, b_I successively $\langle \psi, b_I \rangle = 0$ for all b_I , $I \geq 0$ whence $\psi = 0$ as

the b_I provide an orthonormal basis. It is instructive to see that even the e_I , $I > 0$ already lie dense which is demonstrated by showing that Bessel's inequality is saturated for Ω . Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Omega - \sum_{I>0} \langle \Omega, e_I \rangle e_I\|^2 &= \|\Omega\|^2 - \sum_{I>0} |\langle \Omega, e_I \rangle|^2 = 1 - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{1}{I(I+1)} \\ &= 1 - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{I=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{I} - \frac{1}{I+1} \right] = 1 - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[1 - \frac{1}{N+1} \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

□

In the non-separable case a non-constructive argument can be provided.

Theorem.

Suppose that \mathcal{H} is not separable but that its dimension has the cardinality of \mathbb{R} . Let $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|\Omega\| = 1$. Then there exists an Abelian, unital sub- C^ -algebra $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on \mathcal{H} such that Ω is cyclic for \mathfrak{B} .*

Proof. Let b_I be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} with $b_0 = \Omega$ (this needs the axiom of choice) and consider the Abelian one-parameter group of unitary operators densely defined by $U_s b_I = b_{I+s}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $U_s^* = U_{-s}$ these generate an unital, Abelian C^* -algebra \mathfrak{B} of bounded operators and obviously Ω is cyclic for \mathfrak{B} as $U_I \Omega = b_I$. □

In the case of LQG we may label the basis b_I by spin net work functions. These have discrete labels (adjacency matrix (which edge connects which vertices), irreducible representations on the edges and intertwiners at the vertices) and continuous labels (germs of piecewise analytic edges). These data have the cardinality of finite unions of \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{R} respectively and thus have the cardinality of \mathbb{R} again [77] (even the space of real valued sequences $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has the same cardinality as \mathbb{R}), hence the above construction can be applied to LQG in principle.

In the separable case we may alternatively consider the index set \mathbb{Z} and the unitary one parameter group $U_s b_I = b_{I+s}$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ to apply the same construction. As elucidated by the proofs, the algebra \mathfrak{B} while always existent under the assumptions made has in general not a very direct relation to the operators that have an immediate physical interpretation.

C Brief Account of Renormalisation Group Terminology

The purpose of this brief appendix is to relate notions of the path integral renormalisation group usually formulated in terms of actions [33] now in terms of measures.

Recall from the main text that condition (5.21) grants the existence of μ under rather generic conditions and that the strategy is therefore to construct an iterative sequence of measure families $\mathbb{N}_0 \ni n \mapsto \{\mu_M^{(n)}\}_{M \in \mathcal{M}}$ called *renormalisation (group) flow* with initial family as above such that either i. it converges or ii. a subsequence of it converges or iii. it has a fixed point. The limit or the fixed point family then satisfy (5.21). As there is no natural choice for such a sequence, there are many possibilities which are guided mostly by the principle of least technical complexity. In that sense, case ii. is really case i. because we might have simply defined the sequence by passing to the subsequence right from the beginning. On the other hand, a fixed point maybe unstable (i.e. it has non-convergent directions) so that iii. is qualitatively different from i. In practice, one is generically confronted with case iii. and what one finds is the following: After performing a sufficient number n of iterations, one observes that the flow stabilises in the sense that the family member $\mu_M^{(n)}$ can be parametrised in terms of vertex functions $v_{M,k}^{(n)}(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ on $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ copies of the vertex set of γ_M which are updated at each renormalisation step $n \mapsto n+1$ (in general k can take all M^3 values). Such functions can be written as linear combinations of products of Kronecker- δ functions on two copies of the vertex set, hence, the flow can be stated in terms of the coefficients c of those. At the fixed point in general not all those coefficients take fixed numerical values, rather there are fewer functional relations between them than their number. Pick some of

them $\lambda_M^1, \lambda_M^2, \dots$ as independent ones and solve those relations for the rest which then become fixed functions of the $\lambda_M^1, \lambda_M^2, \dots$. Due to the fixed point condition, the λ_M^j can be written as functions of the $\lambda_{M'}^j$, for all $M < M'$. Obviously the theory is predictive iff the number of the λ_M^j as $M \rightarrow \infty$ is finite. The continuum measure μ^* is then determined through the cylindrically consistent family $\{\mu_M^*\}_{M \in \mathcal{M}}$ and depends on those M -independent parameters which we denote by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$

The vertex functions alluded to above can be considered as contributions to some discretised action $S_M^{(n)}$ and their coefficients in front of the algebraically independent terms can be called coupling constants g . It is customary to choose them dimensionfree by multiplying by suitable powers of the cutoff (here $\epsilon_M = R/M$). This way there are more coupling constants g that flow than coefficients c that flow in our scheme. In particular, if the decay of the two point function is determined by a mass parameter λ , the dimensionful correlation length is λ^{-1} and the dimensionless correlation length is $\xi_M = (\lambda \epsilon_M)^{-1}$ which diverges in the continuum limit $M \rightarrow \infty$. Under a renormalisation step (e.g. $\xi_M^{(n+1)} = \xi_{M'}^{(n)} = M'/M \xi_M^{(n)}$, $M < M'$ in the real space schemes considered in the main text, mostly $M' = 2M$ is used) the dimensionfree correlation length increases. The fixed point in this usual jargon maybe characterised by the number of a. stable, b. unstable c. and other directions of the flow in the parameter space of coupling constants. This distinction is done by linearisation of the flow equation $g^{(n+1)} = F(g^{(n)})$ around the fixed point solutions $g^* = F(g^*)$, a subset of which is relations among the coefficients c of our scheme and the others correspond to the additional flow parameters just mentioned. The negative, positive and zero eigenvalues (critical exponents) of the $\beta^* = \beta(g^*)$ matrix associated to the β function $\beta(g) = [\nabla F](g)$ defines those stable=irrelevant, unstable=relevant and other=marginal directions as the corresponding eigenvectors. If the integral curves of the irrelevant directions through the fixed point are integrable (surface forming) then they are tangent to that integral manifold called the critical surface through the fixed point which is of finite co-dimension for a predictive theory because the stable couplings run into the fixed point no matter what their initial values were (at least in the attraction neighbourhood of that fixed point). This is the phenomenon of universality (for the fixed point under consideration – there maybe several in which case one speaks of universality classes). Note however, that the fixed point in this language is in a space of couplings g that is higher dimensional than in our scheme. The relation between them is as follows: Consider the renormalisation group flow starting from a point g close to the critical surface then the trajectory will miss the point g^* but comes close and then diverges into the relevant directions. We now tune the starting point $g^{(0)}(n)$ in such a way that $g^{(n)}(n)$ is independent of n which means that in particular the starting value of the relevant couplings is closer and closer to the fixed point value and the critical surface. In particular since $\xi_M^{(n)} = 2^n \xi_M^{(0)}$ we pick $\xi_M^{(0)}(n) = \xi_M 2^{-n}$. This means that in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ we end up at a point g which depends on the fine tuned values (such as $\lambda = \epsilon_M / \xi_M$) and these correspond precisely to the values λ_j in our scheme. Such fine tuned trajectories that depend on the fine tuning parameters λ are called renormalised trajectories which formally run inside the critical surface into the fixed point and then end up off it. If one wishes to describe the theories defined by such renormalised trajectories at finite resolution M in terms of actions S_M^* rather than measures μ_M^* , then these actions are termed *perfect* [33].

D Trotter-Kato formula for bounded degenerate semi-groups

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, P a projection operator in \mathcal{H} and $\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$; $s \mapsto T(s)$ be a strongly continuous contraction semi-group (i.e. $\|T(s)\| \leq 1$). One would like to show that the degenerate Kato-Trotter product

$$K(s) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [T(\frac{s}{N}) P]^N \quad (\text{D.1})$$

strongly converges to a strongly continuous degenerate contraction semi-group, that is, $K(0) = Q \leq P$ is a subprojection, $Q\mathcal{H}$ is an invariant subspace of $K(s)$ and $K(s)(1 - Q) = 0$. A general proof of this result generalising the usual case that P in (D.1) is replaced by another contraction semigroup $S(s)$ appears not be available yet in the literature.

In what follows we consider therefore the simpler case that $T(s) = e^{-sA}$ has a bounded generator A .

Theorem.

Let $T(s), P$ be as above with $T(s) = e^{-sA}$, $\|A\| < \infty$ bounded. Then

$$K(s) = P e^{-s PAP} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

that is $Q = P$ and $K(s)$ is a strongly continuous semigroup with generator PAP on $P\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Consider the identity (no domain questions arise)

$$\begin{aligned} B_N(s) &:= [T(\frac{s}{N}) P]^N - K(s) = [T(\frac{s}{N}) P]^N - K(\frac{s}{N})^N = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} [T(\frac{s}{N}) P]^k [T(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})] K(\frac{s}{N})^{N-1-k} \\ &= [T(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})] K(\frac{s}{N})^{N-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} [T(\frac{s}{N}) P]^k [PT(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})] K(\frac{s}{N})^{N-1-k} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Using $\|P\| \leq 1$ and the sub-multiplicativity of the operator norm we estimate

$$\|B_N(s)\| \leq \{ \|T(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})\| + (N-1) \|PT(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})\| \} e^{2|s| \|A\|} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Since A, PAP are bounded, the Taylor expansions converge in norm and we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})\| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|s|^n}{N^n n!} \| [A^n - (PAP)^n] P \| \leq \frac{2}{N} e^{|s| \|A\|} \\ \|PT(\frac{s}{N}) P - K(\frac{s}{N})\| &\leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{|s|^n}{N^n n!} \| P[A^n - (PAP)^n] P \| \leq \frac{2}{N^2} e^{|s| \|A\|} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

whence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|B_N(s)\| = 0 \quad (\text{D.6})$$

hence the convergence is even uniform in this case. \square

Note that the sign of s played no role in the proof, but it will in the unbounded case.

E Projections and Limits

In the main text we need the following result:

Theorem. Let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space with projection P . Let Ω be cyclic for a C^* -subalgebra $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose that a self-adjoint operator H has spectrum bounded from below by zero and that zero is an isolated eigenvalue with eigenvector Ω . Then there exist elements $w_{I,k} \in \mathfrak{B}$; $I, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$s - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} P(n, k, \beta)]] = P, \quad P(n, k, \beta) = \sum_{I=1}^n w_{I,k} e^{-\beta H} w_{I,k}^\dagger \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Proof. : Let b_I , $I \in \mathbb{N}$ be an ONB of $P\mathcal{H}$. Then by cyclicity we find for each I a sequence $w_{I,k} \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $s - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} w_{I,k} \Omega = b_I$. Next, let E_H be the projection valued measure of H , then by the spectral theorem and $H\Omega = 0$

$$\|e^{-\beta H} \psi - \Omega \langle \Omega, \psi \rangle\|^2 = \langle \psi, e^{-2\beta H} \psi \rangle - |\langle \Omega, \psi \rangle|^2 = \int_{\sigma(H)} d\langle \psi, E_H(\lambda) \psi \rangle e^{-2\lambda\beta} - |\langle \Omega, \psi \rangle|^2 \quad (\text{E.2})$$

where $\sigma(H) \subset \mathbb{R}_0^+$ denotes the spectrum of H . By assumption $E_H(\lambda) \Omega \langle \Omega, \cdot \rangle + E'_H(\lambda)$ where $E'_H(\lambda) = 0$ for $\lambda \in [0, \epsilon)$ and some $\epsilon > 0$. It follows

$$\|e^{-\beta H} \psi - \Omega \langle \Omega, \psi \rangle\|^2 \leq \int_{\sigma(H) \cap [\epsilon, \infty)} d\langle \psi, E_H(\lambda) \psi \rangle e^{-2\lambda\beta} \leq e^{-2\beta\epsilon} \|\psi\|^2 \quad (\text{E.3})$$

thus $s - \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\beta H} \psi = \Omega < \Omega, \psi >$. Finally, $P\mathcal{H}$ is the closure of the finite linear span of the b_I , thus $s - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n \psi = P\psi$ where $P_n \psi = \sum_{I=1}^n b_I < b_I, \psi >$

It remains to write $P(n, k, \beta) - P$ as a telescopic sum

$$(P - P(n, k, \beta))\psi = (P - P_n)\psi + \sum_{I=1}^n [b_I < b_I, \psi > - w_{I,k} \Omega < w_{I,k} \Omega, \psi >] + \sum_{I=1}^n w_{I,k} [\Omega < \Omega, w_{I,k}^\dagger \psi > - e^{-\beta H} w_{I,k}^\dagger \psi] \quad (\text{E.4})$$

and to take the strong limits in the indicated order, i.e. first $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ at finite n, k removes the third term, then $k \rightarrow \infty$ at finite n removes the second term and finally $n \rightarrow \infty$ removes the first term. \square

References

- [1] P.A.M Dirac, Phys. Rev. **73** (1948) 1092; Rev. Mod. Phys. **21** (1949) 392
J. A. Wheeler, "Geometrodynamics", Academic Press, New York, 1962
B. S. DeWitt, Phys. Rev. **160** (1967) 1113; Phys. Rev. **162** (1967) 1195; Phys. Rev. **162** (1967) 1239
A. Komar, "General Relativistic Observables via Hamilton Jacobi Functionals", Phys. Rev. **D4** (1971) 923-927; "Commutator Algebra of General Relativistic Observables", Phys. Rev. **D9** (1974) 885-888; "Generalized Constraint Structure for Gravitation Theory", Phys. Rev. **D27** (1983) 2277-2281; "Consistent Factor Ordering of General Relativistic Constraints", Phys. Rev. **D20** (1979) 830-833
P. G. Bergmann, A. Komar, "The Coordinate Group Symmetries of General Relativity", Int. J. Theor. Phys. **5** (1972) 15; "The Phase Space Formulation of General Relativity and Approaches Towards its Canonical Quantization", Gen. Rel. Grav., **1** (1981) 227-254
K. Kuchař, in : "Quantum Gravity II : A second Oxford Symposium", C.J. Isham, R. Penrose, D. W. Sciama (eds.), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981
C.J. Isham, K. Kuchař, Ann. Phys. **164** (1985) 288; Ann. Phys. **164** (1985) 316
- [2] A. Ashtekar, "New Variables for Classical and Quantum Gravity" Phys. Rev. Lett. **57** (1986) 2244-2247
J. F. G. Barbero, "A real polynomial formulation of general relativity in terms of connections", Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 6935-6938
- [3] C. Rovelli, "Quantum Gravity", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
T. Thiemann, "Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007
J. Pullin, R. Gambini, "A first course in Loop Quantum Gravity", Oxford University Press, New York, 2011
C. Rovelli, F. Vidotto, "Covariant Loop Quantum Gravity", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015
K. Giesel, H. Sahlmann, "From Classical To Quantum Gravity: Introduction to Loop Quantum Gravity", PoS QGQGS2011 (2011) 002, [arXiv:1203.2733]
- [4] M. Creutz, "Quarks, Gluons and Lattices", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983
- [5] A. Ashtekar, C.J. Isham, "Representations of the Holonomy Algebras of Gravity and Non-Abelian Gauge Theories", Class. Quantum Grav. **9** (1992) 1433, [hep-th/9202053]
A. Ashtekar, J. Lewandowski, "Representation theory of analytic Holonomy C^* algebras", in "Knots and Quantum Gravity", J. Baez (ed.), Oxford University Press, Oxford 1994
A. Ashtekar, J. Lewandowski, "Projective Techniques and Functional Integration for Gauge Theories", J. Math. Phys. **36**, 2170 (1995), [gr-qc/9411046]
C. Fleischhack, "Representations of the Weyl algebra in quantum geometry", Commun. Math. Phys. **285** (2009) 67-140, [math-ph/0407006]
J. Lewandowski, A. Okolow, H. Sahlmann, T. Thiemann, "Uniqueness of diffeomorphism invariant states on holonomy-flux algebras" Commun. Math. Phys. **267** (2006) 703-733, [gr-qc/0504147]
- [6] T. Thiemann, "Anomaly-free Formulation of non-perturbative, four-dimensional Lorentzian Quantum Gravity", Physics Letters **B380** (1996) 257-264, [gr-qc/9606088]
T. Thiemann, "Quantum Spin Dynamics (QSD)", Class. Quantum Grav. **15** (1998) 839-73, [gr-qc/9606089]; "Quantum Spin Dynamics (QSD) : II. The Kernel of the Wheeler-DeWitt Constraint Operator", Class. Quantum Grav. **15** (1998) 875-905, [gr-qc/9606090]; "Quantum Spin Dynamics (QSD) : IV. 2+1 Euclidean Quantum Gravity as a model to test 3+1 Lorentzian Quantum Gravity", Class. Quantum Grav. **15** (1998)

- 1249-1280, [gr-qc/9705018]; “Quantum Spin Dynamics (QSD) : V. Quantum Gravity as the Natural Regulator of the Hamiltonian Constraint of Matter Quantum Field Theories”, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15** (1998) 1281-1314, [gr-qc/9705019];
- [7] M.H. Goroff, A. Sagnotti, *Phys. Lett.* **B160** (1985) 81; *Nucl. Phys.* **B266** (1986) 709
- [8] S. A. Hojman, K. Kuchar, C. Teitelboim, “Geometrodynamics Regained”, *Annals Phys.* **96** (1976) 88-135
- [9] A. Ashtekar, J. Lewandowski, D. Marolf, J. Mourão, T. Thiemann, “Quantization for diffeomorphism invariant theories of connections with local degrees of freedom”, *Journ. Math. Phys.* **36** (1995) 6456-6493, [gr-qc/9504018]
- [10] T. Thiemann, “Quantum Spin Dynamics (QSD) : III. Quantum Constraint Algebra and Physical Scalar Product in Quantum General Relativity”, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15** (1998) 1207-1247, [gr-qc/9705017]
- [11] T. Thiemann, “Quantum spin dynamics. VIII. The Master constraint”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 2249-2266, [gr-qc/0510011]
- [12] K. Giesel, T. Thiemann, “Scalar Material Reference Systems and Loop Quantum Gravity”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32** (2015) 135015, [arXiv:1206.3807]
- [13] A. Laddha, M. Varadarajan, “The Diffeomorphism Constraint Operator in Loop Quantum Gravity”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28** (2011) 195010, [arXiv:1105.0636]
C. Tomlin, M. Varadarajan, “Towards an Anomaly-Free Quantum Dynamics for a Weak Coupling Limit of Euclidean Gravity” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 044039, [arXiv:1210.6869]; “Towards an Anomaly-Free Quantum Dynamics for a Weak Coupling Limit of Euclidean Gravity: Diffeomorphism Covariance” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 044040 [arXiv:1210.6877]
- [14] A. Ashtekar, P. Singh, “Loop Quantum Cosmology: A Status Report”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28** (2011) 213001, [arXiv:1108.0893]
I. Agullo, P. Singh, “Loop Quantum Cosmology”, [arXiv:1612.01236]
B. Elizaga Navascues, M. Martn-Benito, G. A. Mena Marugan, “Hybrid models in loop quantum cosmology”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25** (2016), [arXiv:1608.05947]
L. Castello Gomar, G. A. Mena Marugan, D. Martin De Blas, J. Olmedo, “Hybrid loop quantum cosmology and predictions for the cosmic microwave background”, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 103528, [arXiv:1702.06036]
- [15] M. Han, H. Liu, “Effective Dynamics from Coherent State Path Integral of Full Loop Quantum Gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 046003, [arXiv:1910.03763]; “Improved ($\bar{\mu}$ -Scheme) Effective Dynamics of Full Loop Quantum Gravity”, [arXiv:1912.08668]
A. Dapor, K. Liegener, “Cosmological Effective Hamiltonian from full Loop Quantum Gravity Dynamics” *Phys. Lett. B* **785** (2018) 506-510, [arXiv:1706.09833]; “Cosmological coherent state expectation values in loop quantum gravity I. Isotropic kinematics”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 135011, [arXiv:1710.04015]; J. Engle, I. Vilenky “Uniqueness of minimal loop quantum cosmology dynamics”, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 121901, [arXiv:1902.01386]; “Deriving loop quantum cosmology dynamics from diffeomorphism invariance” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 023505, [arXiv:1802.01543]
C. Fleischhack, “Continuity of States on Non-Unital Differential Algebras in Loop Quantum Cosmology” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **370** (2019) 531-538 [arXiv:1803.08944]
- [16] T. Lang, K. Liegener, T. Thiemann, “Hamiltonian Renormalisation I. Derivation from Osterwalder-Schrader Reconstruction”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 245011, [arXiv:1711.05685]; “Hamiltonian Renormalisation II. Renormalisation Flow of 1+1 dimensional free, scalar fields: Derivation”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 245012, [arXiv:1711.06727]; “Hamiltonian Renormalisation III. Renormalisation Flow of 1+1 dimensional free, scalar fields: Properties”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 245013, [arXiv:1711.05688]; “Hamiltonian Renormalisation IV. Renormalisation Flow of D+1 dimensional free scalar fields and Rotation Invariance”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 245014, [arXiv:1711.05695]
- [17] S. Weinberg, “Ultraviolet divergences in quantum theories of gravitation”, in “General Relativity: An Einstein centenary survey”, ed. S. W. Hawking and W. Israel, 790-831, Cambridge University Press, 1979
- [18] C. Wetterich, “Average action and renormalization group equations”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **352** (1991) 529-584
C. Wetterich, “Exact evolution equation for the effective potential”, *Phys. Lett. B* **301** (1993) 9094, [arXiv:1710.05815]
M. Reuter, C. Wetterich, “Effective average action for gauge theories and exact evolution equations”, *Nuclear Physics B* **417** (1994) 181214
M. Reuter, “Nonperturbative evolution equation for quantum gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998): 971985,

- [arXiv:hep-th/9605030]
- O. Lauscher, M. Reuter, "Ultraviolet fixed point and generalized flow equation of quantum gravity", *Physical Review D* **65** (2001) 025013, [arXiv:hep-th/0108040]
- M. Reuter, F. Saueressig, "Renormalization group flow of quantum gravity in the Einstein-Hilbert truncation", *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 065016, [arXiv:hep-th/0110054]
- M. Niedermaier, M. Reuter, "The Asymptotic Safety Scenario in Quantum Gravity", *Living Rev. Relativ.* **9** (2006)
- D. Litim, "Renormalisation group and the Planck scale", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* **69** (2006) 27592778, [arXiv:1102.4624]
- R. Percacci, Roberto, "Asymptotic Safety", in "Approaches to Quantum Gravity: Towards a New Understanding of Space, Time and Matter", D. Oriti (ed.), Cambridge University Press, 2009, [arXiv:0709.3851]
- A. Eichhorn, "An asymptotically safe guide to quantum gravity and matter", *Front. Astron. Space Sci.* **5** (2019) 47, [arXiv:1810.07615]
- [19] E. Manrique, S. Rechenberger, F. Saueressig "Asymptotically Safe Lorentzian Gravity" *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (2011) 251302 [arXiv:1102.5012]
- A. Bonanno, G. Gionti, A. Platania, "Bouncing and emergent cosmologies from Arnowitt-Deser-Misner RG flows" *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) 065004, [arXiv:1710.06317]
- [20] B. Bahr, B. Dittrich, "Improved and Perfect Actions in Discrete Gravity", *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 124030, [arXiv:0907.4323 [gr-qc]]
- B. Bahr, B. Dittrich, S. Steinhaus, "Perfect discretization of reparametrization invariant path integrals", *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 105026, [arXiv:1101.4775]
- B. Bahr, B. Dittrich, S. He, "Coarse graining free theories with gauge symmetries: the linearized case", *New J. Phys.* **13** (2011) 045009, [e-Print: arXiv:1011.3667]
- B. Bahr, "On background-independent renormalization of spin foam models", *Class. Quant. Grav.* **34** (2017) 075001, [arXiv:1407.7746]
- B. Bahr, B. Dittrich, F. Hellmann, W. Kaminski, "Holonomy Spin Foam Models: Definition and Coarse Graining" *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 044048 [arXiv:1208.3388]
- [21] E. R. Livine, D. Oriti, "Coupling of spacetime atoms and spin foam renormalisation from group field theory" *JHEP* **0702** (2007) 092, [gr-qc/0512002]
- L. Freidel, R. Gurau, D. Oriti, "Group field theory renormalization - the 3d case: Power counting of divergences", *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 044007, [arXiv:0905.3772]
- S. Carrozza, D. Oriti, V. Rivasseau, "Renormalization of Tensorial Group Field Theories: Abelian $U(1)$ Models in Four Dimensions", *Commun. Math. Phys.* **327** (2014) 603-641, [arXiv:1207.6734]; "Renormalization of a $SU(2)$ Tensorial Group Field Theory in Three Dimensions" *Commun. Math. Phys.* **330** (2014) 581-637, [arXiv:1303.6772]
- J. B. Geloun, T. A. Koslowski, D. Oriti, A. D. Pereira "Functional Renormalization Group analysis of rank 3 tensorial group field theory: The full quartic invariant truncation" *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 126018, [arXiv:1805.01619]
- R. Gurau, "Colored Group Field Theory", *Commun. Math. Phys.* **304** (2011) 69-93, [arXiv:0907.2582]
- [22] R. Gurau, "The complete $1/N$ expansion of colored tensor models in arbitrary dimension" *Annales Henri Poincaré* **13** (2012) 399-423, [arXiv:1102.5759]
- R. Gurau, J. P. Ryan, "Colored Tensor Models - a review" *SIGMA* **8** (2012) 020, [arXiv:1109.4812]
- V. Bonzom, R. Gurau, A. Riello, V. Rivasseau "Critical behavior of colored tensor models in the large N limit" *Nucl. Phys. B* **853** (2011) 174-195, [arXiv:1105.3122]
- [23] M. Reisenberger, C. Rovelli, "Sum over Surfaces Form of Loop Quantum Gravity", *Phys. Rev. D* **56** (1997) 3490-3508
- L. Freidel, K. Krasnov, "Spin Foam Models and the Classical Action Principle", *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**:1183-1247, 1999, [hep-th/9807092]
- J. W. Barrett, L. Crane, "Relativistic Spin Networks and Quantum Gravity", *J. Math. Phys.* **39**:3296-3302, 1998, [gr-qc/9709028]
- J. W. Barrett, L. Crane, "A Lorentzian Signature Model for Quantum General Relativity", *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17**:3101-3118, 2000, [gr-qc/9904025]
- L. Freidel, K. Krasnov, "A New Spin Foam Model for 4d Gravity", *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25** (2008) 125018,

- [arXiv:0708.1595]
 J. Engle, E. Livine, R. Pereira, C. Rovelli, “LQG vertex with finite Immirzi parameter”, Nucl. Phys. **B799** (2008) 136-149, [arXiv:0711.0146]
 J. Engle, “A spin-foam vertex amplitude with the correct semiclassical limit”, Phys. Lett. **B724** (2013) 333-337, [arXiv:1201.2187]
 W. Kaminski, M. Kisielowski, J. Lewandowski, “Spin-Foams for All Loop Quantum Gravity” Class. Quant. Grav. **27** (2010) 095006, Erratum: Class. Quant. Grav. **29** (2012) 049502 [arXiv:0909.0939]
- [24] I. M. Gel'fand and N. Ya. Vilenkin, “Generalised Functions”, vol. 4: Applications of Harmonic Analysis, Academic Press, New York, London, 1964
- [25] M. Bojowald, “The BKL scenario, infrared renormalization, and quantum cosmology”, JCAP **1901** (2019) 026, [arXiv:1810.00238]
 N. Bodendorfer, F. Haneder, “Coarse graining as a representation change” Phys. Lett. **B792** (2019) 69-73, [arXiv:1811.02792]
 N. Bodendorfer, D. Wuhler, “Renormalisation with $SU(1, 1)$ coherent states on the LQC Hilbert space”, [arXiv:1904.13269]
- [26] C. Itzykson and J.-M. Drouffe, Statistical Field Theory”, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989
- [27] J. Froehlich, “An introduction to some topics in Constructive QFT”, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978
 J. Glimm and A. Jaffe, “Quantum Physics”, Springer Verlag, New York, 1987
 V. Rivasseau, “Constructive Field Theory and Applications: Perspectives and Open Problems”, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000) 3764-3775
- [28] “Dust as a standard of space and time in canonical quantum gravity” J. D. Brown, K. V. Kuchar, Phys. Rev. **D51** (1995) 5600-5629, [gr-qc/9409001]
 K. V. Kuchar, C. G. Torre, “Gaussian reference fluid and interpretation of quantum geometrodynamics” Phys. Rev. **D43** (1991) 419-441
- [29] A. Ashtekar, D. Marolf, J. Mourão, T. Thiemann, “Constructing Hamiltonian Quantum Theories from Path Integrals in a Diffeomorphism Invariant Context”, Class. Quant. Grav. **17** (2000) 4919-4940, [quant-ph/9904094]
- [30] K. Osterwalder, R. Schrader, Comm. Math. Phys. **31** (1973) 83, Comm. Math. Phys. **42** (1975) 281
- [31] L. P. Kadanoff, “Scaling Laws for Ising Models near T_c ”, Physics **2** (1966) 263-272
- [32] K. G. Wilson, “The renormalization group: Critical phenomena and the Kondo problem”, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47** (1975) 773
 M. E. Fisher, “The renormalization group in the theory of critical behavior”, Rev. Mod. Phys. **46** (1974) 597; Erratum Rev. Mod. Phys. **47** (1975) 543
- [33] P. Hasenfratz, “Prospects for perfect actions”, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **63** (1998)
- [34] F. J. Wegner, Phys. Rev. **B5** (1972)
 F. J. Wegner, “Flow equations for Hamiltonians”, Nucl. Phys. **B90** (2000) 141-146
- [35] S. D. Glazek, K. G. Wilson, “Renormalization of Hamiltonians” Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 5863
- [36] M. Weinstein, “Hamiltonians, path integrals, and a new renormalization group” Phys. Rev. **D 47** (1993) 5499
 Joan Elias-Miro, Slava Rychkov, Lorenzo G. Vitale, “NLO Renormalization in the Hamiltonian Truncation”, Phys. Rev. **D96** (2017) 065024
- [37] J. Kijowski, W. Szczyrba, “A Canonical Structure for Classical Field Theories”, Commun. Math. Phys. **46** (1976) 183-206
 J. Kijowski, “Symplectic geometry and second quantization”, Reports on Mathematical Physics **11** (1977) 97
- [38] A. Okolow, “Construction of spaces of kinematic quantum states for field theories via projective techniques”, Class. Quant. Grav. **30** (2013) 195003, [arXiv:1304.6330]
 J. Kijowski and A. Okolow, “A modification of the projective construction of quantum states for field theories”, Journal of Mathematical Physics **58** (2017) 062303
- [39] S. Lanery, T. Thiemann, “Projective Limits of State Spaces I. Classical Formalism” J. Geom. Phys. **111** (2017) 6-39, [arXiv:1411.3589]; “Projective Limits of State Spaces II. Quantum Formalism” J. Geom. Phys. **116** (2017) 10-51, [arXiv:1411.3590]

- [40] A. Stottmeister, T. Thiemann, “Coherent states, quantum gravity and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, III: Applications to loop quantum gravity” J. Math. Phys. **57** (2016) 083509, [arXiv:1504.02171]
A. Brothier, A. Stottmeister, “Operator-algebraic construction of gauge theories and Jones’ actions of Thompson’s groups”, [arXiv:1901.04940]; “Canonical quantization of 1+1-dimensional Yang-Mills theory: An operator-algebraic approach”, [arXiv:1907.05549]
A. Stottmeister, V. Morinelli, G. Morsella, Y. Tanimoto, “Operator-algebraic renormalization and wavelets”, [arXiv:2002.01442]
- [41] S. R. White, “Density-matrix algorithms for quantum renormalisation groups”, Phys. Rev. **B48** (1993) 345
- [42] M. Levin, C. Nave, “Tensor renormalization group approach to 2D classical lattice models”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** (2207) 120601, [arXiv:cond-mat/0611687]
- [43] R. Orus, “A Practical Introduction to Tensor Networks: Matrix Product States and Projected Entangled Pair States”, Annals of Physics **349** (2014) 117-158, [arXiv:1306.2164]
- [44] G. Vidal, “Entanglement Renormalization”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** (2007) 220405
- [45] G. Evenbly, G. Vidal, “Algorithms for entanglement renormalization”, Phys. Rev. **B79** (2009) 144108
G. Evenbly, G. Vidal, “Entanglement renormalization in free bosonic systems: real-space versus momentum-space renormalization group transforms” New J.Phys. **12** (2010) 025007, [arXiv:0801.2449]
- [46] P. Kaye, R. Laflamme, M. Mosca, “An Introduction to Quantum Computing”, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007
- [47] B. Dittrich, “From the discrete to the continuous - towards a cylindrically consistent dynamics”, New J. Phys. **14** (2012) 123004, [arXiv:1205.6127]
B. Dittrich, S. Steinhaus, “Time evolution as refining, coarse graining and entangling”, New J. Phys. **16** (2014) 123041, [arXiv:1311.7565]
B. Dittrich, “The continuum limit of loop quantum gravity - a framework for solving the theory”, [arXiv:1409.1450]
- [48] Y. Yamasaki. “Measures on Infinite Dimensional Spaces”, World Scientific, Singapore, 1985
- [49] T. Balaban, J. Imbrie and A. Jaffe, “Exact renormalisation group for gauge theories”, in “Proceedings of the 1983 Cargèse Summer School”
T. Balaban and A. Jaffe. Constructive gauge theory. In “Proceedings of the 1986 Erichi Summer School”.
- [50] B. Bahr, “Operator Spin Foams: holonomy formulation and coarse graining”, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **360** (2012) 012042, [arXiv:1112.3567]
B. Bahr, F. Hellmann, W. Kaminski, M. Kisielowski, J. Lewandowski, “Operator Spin Foam Models”, Class. Quant. Grav. **28** (2011) 105003, [arXiv:1010.4787]
- [51] Jose A. Zapata, “Loop quantization from a lattice gauge theory perspective” Class. Quant. Grav. **21** (2004) L115-L122, [gr-qc/0401109]
A. Corichi, J. A. Zapata, “On diffeomorphism invariance for lattice theories”, Nucl. Phys. **B493** (1997) 475-490, [gr-qc/9611034]
J. Kijowski, A. Okolow, “A modification of the projective construction of quantum states for field theories”, J. Math Phys. **58** (2016)
- [52] B. Dittrich, M. Martin-Benito, S. Steinhaus, “Quantum group spin nets: refinement limit and relation to spin foams” Phys. Rev. **D90** (2014) 024058, [arXiv:1312.0905]
B. Dittrich, E. Schnetter, J. S. Cameron, S. Steinhaus, “Coarse graining flow of spin foam intertwiners” Phys. Rev. **D94** (2016) 124050, [arXiv:1609.02429]
- [53] A. Eichhorn, T. Koslowski, A. D. Pereira, “Status of background-independent coarse-graining in tensor models for quantum gravity”, Universe **5** (2019) 53, [arXiv:1811.12909]
- [54] A. Komar, “General Relativistic Observables via Hamilton Jacobi Functionals”, Phys. Rev. **D4** (1971) 923-927
- [55] A. D. Popolo, M. Le Delliou, “Small scale problems of the Λ CDM model: a short review” Published in Galaxies **5** (2017) 17, [arXiv:1606.07790]
- [56] C. Rovelli, “Time in Quantum Gravity: Physics Beyond the Schrodinger Regime”, Phys. Rev. **D43** (1991) 442-456
A. S. Vytheeswaran, “Gauge unfixing in second class constrained systems”, Annals Phys. **236** (1994) 297-324
P. Mitra, R. Rajaraman, “Gauge-invariant reformulation of an anomalous gauge theory”, Physics Letters

B225 (1989) 267–271

- R. Anishetty, A. S. Vytheswaran, “Gauge invariance in second-class constrained systems”, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **26** (1993) 5613–5619
- B. Dittrich, “Partial and complete observables for canonical general relativity”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 6155–6184, [gr-qc/0507106]
- T. Thiemann, “Reduced phase space quantization and Dirac observables” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 1163–1180 [gr-qc/0411031]
- [57] M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim. “Quantisation of Gauge Systems”, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992
- [58] P. A. M. Dirac, “Lectures on Quantum Mechanics”, Belfer Graduate School of Science, Yeshiva University Press, New York, 1964
- [59] R. M. Wald, “General Relativity”, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1989
- [60] K. Giesel, S. Hofmann, T. Thiemann, O. Winkler, “Manifestly Gauge-Invariant General Relativistic Perturbation Theory. I. Foundations” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27** (2010) 055005; “Manifestly Gauge-invariant general relativistic perturbation theory. II. FRW background and first order”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27** (2010) 055006 [arXiv:0711.0117]
- [61] M. Domagala, K. Giesel, W. Kaminski, J. Lewandowski, “Gravity quantized: Loop Quantum Gravity with a Scalar Field”, *Phys. Rev.* **D82** (2010) 104038, [arXiv:1009.2445]
- [62] J. B. Kogut, L. Susskind, “Hamiltonian Formulation of Wilson’s Lattice Gauge Theories”, *Phys. Rev.* **D11** (1975) 395–408
- [63] O. Bratteli, D. W. Robinson, “Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics”, vol. 1,2, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1997
- [64] B. C. Hall, “Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Representations”, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2015
- [65] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, “Discreteness of volume and area in quantum gravity”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B442** (1995), 593–622; Erratum: *Nucl. Phys.* **B456** (1995) 753, [gr-qc/9411005]
A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, “Quantum theory of geometry I: Area Operators” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) A55–A82, [gr-qc/9602046]; “Quantum theory of geometry II: Volume operators”, *Adv. Theo. Math. Phys.* **1** (1997) 388–429, [gr-qc/9711031]
- [66] T. Thiemann, “Complexifier coherent states for canonical quantum general relativity”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 2063–2118, [gr-qc/0206037]
T. Thiemann, “Gauge field theory coherent states (GCS): I. General properties”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001) 2025–2064, [hep-th/0005233]
T. Thiemann, O. Winkler, “Gauge field theory coherent states (GCS): II. Peakedness properties”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001) 2561–2636, [hep-th/0005237]; “Gauge field theory coherent states (GCS): III. Ehrenfest theorems”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001) 4629–4681, [hep-th/0005234]
- [67] K. Giesel, T. Thiemann, “Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG) I. Conceptual setup”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 2465–2498 [gr-qc/0607099]; Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG) II. Semiclassical analysis”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 2499–2564, [gr-qc/0607100]; “Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG) III. Semiclassical perturbation theory”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 2565–2588, [gr-qc/0607101]; “Algebraic quantum gravity (AQG). IV. Reduced phase space quantisation of loop quantum gravity”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27** (2010) 175009, [arXiv:0711.0119]
- [68] M. Gaul, Carlo Rovelli, “A Generalized Hamiltonian constraint operator in loop quantum gravity and its simplest Euclidean matrix elements”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001) 1593–1624, [gr-qc/0011106]
- [69] T. Thiemann, O. Winkler, “Gauge field theory coherent states (GCS): IV. Infinite tensor product and thermodynamic limit”, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** (2001) 4997–5033, [hep-th/0005235]
- [70] W. Rudin, “Real and Complex Analysis”, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1987
- [71] R. Geroch, “The domain of dependence”, *Journ. Math. Phys.* **11** (1970), 437 – 509
A. N. Bernal, M. Sanchez, “On Smooth Cauchy hypersurfaces and Geroch’s splitting theorem” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **243** (2003) 461–470, [gr-qc/0306108]
- [72] B. Simon, “The $P(\phi)_2$ Euclidean (Quantum) Field Theory”, Princeton University Press, 1974 J. Glimm, “Boson Fields with the ϕ^4 Interaction in Three Dimensions”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **10** (1968) 1–47. J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, Positivity of the ϕ_3^4 Hamiltonian”, *Fortschr. Phys.* **21** (1973) 327376
- [73] R. Haag, “Local Quantum Physics”, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984

- [74] R. V. Kadison, J. R. Ringrose, "Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras", vol. 1,2, Academic Press, London, 1983
- [75] B. Simon, "Positivity of the Hamiltonian Semigroup and the Construction of Euclidean Region Fields", *Helvetica Physics Acta* **46** (1973)
 B. Simon, R. Hegh-Krohn, "Hypercontractive semigroups and two dimensional self-coupled Bose fields", *Journal of Functional Analysis* **9** (1972) 121-180.
- [76] G. Roepstorff, "Path Integral Approach to Quantum Physics", Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996
- [77] Paul Halmos, "Naive set theory", Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974
- [78] W. H. Zurek, "Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical", *Reviews of Modern Physics* **75** (2003) 715, [arXiv:quant-ph/0105127]
- [79] M. Reed, B. Simon, "Methods of modern mathematical physics", vol. I-IV, Academic Press, 1980
- [80] V. A. Zagrebnov, "The Trotter-Lie product formula for Gibbs semigroups" *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **29** (1988) 888
 H. Neidhardt, V. A. Zagrebnov, "The Trotter-Kato product formula for Gibbs semigroups", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **131** (1990) 333–346
 M. Matolcsi, R. Shvidkoy, "Trotter's product formula for projections", *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **81** (2003) 309–317
 W. Arendt, C. J. K. Batty, "Absorption semigroups and Dirichlet boundary conditions", *Math. Ann.* **295** (1993) 427-448
- [81] K. Liegener, T. Thiemann, "Hamiltonian Renormalisation V. Free Vector Bosons", in preparation
- [82] H. Sahlmann, T. Thiemann, O. Winkler, "Coherent states for canonical quantum general relativity and the infinite tensor product extension", *Nucl. Phys. B* **606** (2001), 401-440, [gr-qc/0102038]
- [83] P. Federbush, "A New formulation and regularization of gauged theories using a nonlinear wavelet expansion" *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **94** (1995) 1135-1146, [hep-ph/9505368]