

Making a Quantum Universe: Symmetry and Gravity

Houri Ziaepour^{1,2}

¹ Institut UTINAM, CNRS UMR 6213, Observatoire de Besançon, Université de Franche Compté, 41 bis ave. de l'Observatoire, BP 1615, 25010 Besançon, France;

² Mullard Space Science Laboratory, University College London, Holmbury St. Mary, GU5 6NT, Dorking, UK; houriziaepour@gmail.com

Version April 3, 2024 submitted to Universe

Abstract: So far none of attempts to quantize gravity had led to a satisfactory model that not only describe gravity in the realm of a quantum world, but also its relation to elementary particles and other fundamental forces. Among other questions any quantum gravity model should explain are the origin of arrow of time, dimension of spacetime, and puzzles of semi-classical treatment of black holes. Here we outline preliminary results for a model of quantum universe in which gravity is fundamentally and by construction quantic. The model is based on 3 well motivated assumptions with compelling observational and theoretical evidence: Quantum mechanics is valid at all scales; Quantum systems are described by their symmetries; The Universe has infinite degrees of freedom. The last assumption means that the Hilbert space of the Universe has $SU(N \rightarrow \infty) \cong \text{area preserving Diff.}(S_2)$ symmetry and is parameterize by two angular variables. But in absence of a background spacetime dynamics is trivial and the Universe static. Nonetheless, we show that quantum fluctuations break the symmetry, divide the Universe to subsystems and add two continuous parameters to the dynamics: *distance* and *time*. We interpret the parameter space of the Hilbert space as the perceived classical spacetime and Einstein equation as projection of the dynamics in the Hilbert space on its parameter space. Finite dimensional symmetries of elementary particles emerge as a consequence of symmetry breaking without having any implication for the infinite dimensional symmetry. For this reason gravity is a universal force.

Keywords: quantum gravity; quantum mechanics; symmetry; quantum cosmology

1. Introduction

More than a century after discovery of general relativity and description of gravitational force as the modification of spacetime geometry by matter and energy, we still lack a convincing model explaining these processes in the framework of quantum mechanics. Appendix A briefly review the history of search for finding a Quantum GRavity (QGR) model. Despite tremendous effort of generations of scientists according to criteria discussed in the next paragraphs none of these models are fully satisfactory.

In what concerns the subject of this volume - representations of inhomogeneous Lorentz symmetry - called also Poincaré group, it was under special interest since decades ago for formulating gravity as a renormalizable quantum field. The similarity of the compact group of local Lorentz transformations to Yang-Mills gauge symmetry has encouraged quantum gravity models based on the first order formulation of general relativity, using vierbeins, and extension of gauge group of elementary particles to accommodate Poincaré group [1,2]. However, Coleman-Madula theorem [3] on S-matrix symmetries - local transformations of interacting fields that asymptotically approach Poincaré symmetry at infinity - invalidate any model in which Poincaré and internal symmetries are not factorized. Therefore, according

to this theorem total symmetry of a grand unification model including gravity must be a tensor product of spacetime and internal symmetries. Otherwise, the model must be supersymmetric [4]. However, we know that even if supersymmetry is present at Planck energy scale $M_P \equiv \sqrt{\hbar c/G_N}$, where \hbar is the Planck constant, c speed of light in vacuum, and G_N the Newton constant (or equivalently Planck length scale $L_P \equiv \hbar/cM_P$), it is broken at low energies. Moreover, violation of Coleman-Madula theorem and Lorentz symmetry at high energies can be conveyed to low energies [6] and violate e.g. equivalence principle and other tested properties of general relativity [7,8]. For these reasons modern approaches to unification of gravity as a gauge field with other interactions consider the two sector as separate gauge field models. In addition, in these models gravity sector usually has topological action to make the formulation independent of the geometry of underlying spacetime, see e.g. [9–11]. However, like other quantum gravity candidates these models suffer from various issues: Separation of internal and gravitational gauge sectors means that the model is not properly speaking a grand unification; Similar to other approaches to quantum gravity the nature of spacetime, its dimensionality, and its relation with internal symmetries are not addressed.

In fact we believe that in addition to consistency with general relativity, cosmology and particle physics, a quantum model unifying all forces should answer the following questions¹:

1. **Should spacetime be considered as a physical entity similar to quantum fields associated to particles, or rather it presents a configuration space ?**

General relativity changed spacetime from a rigid entity to a deformable media. But it does not specify whether it is a physical reality or a property of matter which ultimately determines its form, quantified by local metric and curvature. We remind that in the framework of Quantum Field Theory (QFT) vacuum is not the empty space of classical physics, see e.g. [13,14]. In particular, in presence of gravity the naive definition of quantum vacuum is frame dependent. A frame-independent definition exists [15] and it is very far from classical concept of an empty space. Explicitly or implicitly some of models reviewed in Appendix A address this question.

2. **Is there any relation between matter and spacetime ?**

In general relativity matter modifies the geometry of the spacetime, but they are considered as separate entities and there is no other relation between them. Aside from string theory in which spacetime and matter fields (compactified internal space) are considered and treated together, many QGR candidates concentrate their effort only on the construction of a quantized spacetime and gravitational interaction.

3. **Why do we perceive the Universe as a 3D space (plus time) ?**

None of extensively studied quantum gravity models discussed in Appendix A answer this question, despite the fact that it is the origin of many troubles for them. For instance, the enormous number of possible models in string theory is due to the inevitable compactification to reduce the dimension of space to observed 3+1. In background independent models the dimension of space is a foundational assumption and essential for many technical aspects of their construction. In particular, the definition of Ashtekar variables [12] for $SU(2) \cong SO(3)$ symmetry and its relation with spin foam [16] description of loop quantum gravity are based on the assumption of a 3D real space.

¹ Some quantum gravity models such as loop quantum gravity emphasize on the quantization of gravity alone. However, giving the fact that gravity is a universal force, its quantization necessarily has impact on other interactions and matter fields which are its source. Thus, any *quantum gravity only* model would be at best incomplete if it does not address the issues raised here.

These questions are in addition to well known puzzles which are extensively studied: **Physical origin of the arrow of time; Black hole apparent information loss; The issue of UV and IR singularities in QFT, Einstein gravity, and cosmology which a *theory of everything* including quantum gravity is expected to resolve, etc.**

Quantization of gravity is inevitable. Examples of inconsistencies in a universe where matter is ruled by quantum mechanics but gravity is classical are well known [17,18]. In addition, in [18] it is argued that there must be an inherent relation between gravity and quantum mechanics, otherwise, universality of Planck constant as quantization scale cannot be explained. See also [19] which advocates a context dependent Planck constant. Aside from these arguments the simple fact that there is no fundamental mass/energy scale in quantum mechanics - as the most fundamental theory in nature - means that it has to have a close relation with gravity which provides the only dimensionful constant, namely the Newton gravitational constant G_N or equivalently the Planck mass M_P . We should remind that a dimensionful scale does not appear in conformal or scale independent models. Moreover, conformal symmetry is broken by gravity. Indeed even in string theory, in which 2D conformal symmetry is essential for its construction, string tension parameter is dimensionful. Therefore, a *model of everything* must include a unique dimensionful parameter to play the role of a *ruler* for any thing else. Moreover, we need at least two other fundamental constants to describe physics and cosmology: the Planck constant \hbar and maximum speed of information transfer, which experiments show that is equal to the speed of light in classical vacuum. We discuss the reason for this claim further in this work.

In a previous work [20] we advocated foundational role of symmetries in quantum mechanics and reformulated its axioms accordingly, see Appendix B for a summary. Of course the crucial role of symmetries in quantum systems is well known. But axioms of quantum mechanics à la Dirac and von Neumann consider an abstract Hilbert space without mentioning its relation with the symmetries of the quantum system, which are usually the same as those of its classical Lagrangian. In addition, Hilbert space of quantum systems represents $SU(N)$ symmetry - see Appendix C for more details. Application of this group in general changes the amount of coherence of a given state. Quantification of coherence and its usefulness as a resource in quantum information theory have been only recently noticed and found popularity and interest in the literature [21,22].

Inspired by these observations, in this work we study a standalone quantum system with infinite number of commuting observables, without referencing to any spacetime. The Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_U of such system represents $SU(N \rightarrow \infty)$ symmetry, but its dynamics is trivial because in absence of a background the Lagrangian defined on the group manifold is invariant under linear transformation, which their space $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}] \cong SU(N \rightarrow \infty)$. Nonetheless, a symmetry breaking - more precisely factorization - divides the Hilbert space to blocks of tensor product of subspaces according to criteria studied in [23,24]. For each subsystem the rest of the Universe play the role of a *background* parameterized by 3 continuous quantities - just similar to the real space. Division of the Universe also leads to emergence of time and its arrow à la Page & Wootters [25] or similar methods [26]. We show that the parameter space is a curved (3+1)D space and is invariant under anisotropic Lorentz transformations. The curvature of parameter space is determined by quantum states of the subsystems and its negative signature originates from limited speed of quantum states variation. Based on these observations we interpret $SU(\infty)$ sector of the model as *Quantum Gravity*. The finite rank factorized symmetry become local gauge fields acting on the Hilbert space that presents matter.

These results demonstrate the importance of division of the Universe to subsystems that has a crucial role in the foundation of quantum mechanics. Furthermore, this model answers issues raised in questions 1-3 mentioned earlier. In particular, dimension of space, arrow of time, universality of gravitational force, and origin of speed limit are addressed.

Axiom and structure of the model is discussed in Sec. 2. Lagrangian of the model described in Sec. 4.3 and properties of the model after symmetry breaking and division of the Universe is detailed in Sec. 4. Additionally this section includes a brief comparison of this model with string and loop quantum gravity. Outlines and prospective for future investigations are presented in Sec. 5. Appendix A give a short recount of the history of quantum gravity models. Appendix B summaries axiom of quantum mechanics in symmetry language. State space and its associated symmetry is reviewed in Appendix C. Properties of $SU(\infty)$ and their representations are summarized in Appendix D and its Cartan decomposition in Appendix E. Finally, Appendix F discuss how parameter space of full and divided Universe are related.

2. An infinite quantum universe

Our departure point for constructing a quantum universe consists of 3 well motivated assumptions with compelling observational and theoretical evidence:

- I. Quantum mechanics is valid at all scales and applies to every entity, including the Universe as a whole;
- II. Any quantum system is described by its symmetries and its Hilbert space is a representation them;
- III. The Universe has infinite number of degrees of freedom.

The last assumption means that the Hilbert space of the Universe \mathcal{H}_U is infinite dimensional and represents the group $SU(N \rightarrow \infty)$. There are sufficient evidence in favour of such assumption. For instance, thermal distribution of photons at IR limit contains infinite number of quanta with energies approaching zero and there is no minimum energy. For this reason vacuum can be considered as superposition of multi-particle states of any type - not just photons - without any limit on their number. In general relativity there is no upper limit for gravitons wavelength and thereby their number. Of course one may argue that a lower limit on energy or spacetime volume may exist. Nonetheless, for any practical application the number of subsystems/quanta in the Universe can be considered to approach infinity. Indeed even in quantum gravity models that assume a symplectic structure for spacetime, such as spin foam/loop quantum gravity and causal sets, there is not a fixed lattice of spacetime and number of spacetime states is effectively infinite.

The algebra associated to the $SU(N \rightarrow \infty)$ coherence symmetry of the above model is defined as²:

$$[\hat{L}_a, \hat{L}_b] = \frac{\hbar}{cM_P} f_{ab}^c \hat{L}_c = L_P f_{ab}^c \hat{L}_c \quad (1)$$

where operators $\hat{L}_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U]$ are generators of the algebra and f_{ab}^c are the structure function of the symmetry group. They are normalized such that the r.h.s. of (1) explicitly depends on the Planck constant \hbar . If $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, the r.h.s. becomes null and the algebra becomes abelian and homomorphic to $\bigotimes^{N \rightarrow \infty} U(1)$, in agreement with the symmetry of configuration space of classical systems explained in Appendix C. The same happens if $M_P \rightarrow \infty$, that is when Planck mass scale is much larger than scale of interest. In both cases $L_P \rightarrow 0$. Assuming that the $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of the Universe can be associated to gravitational interaction - we will provide more evidence in favour of this claim later - the above limits mean that in both cases gravity becomes negligible³.

It is well known that $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U] \cong SU(\infty) \cong$ area preserving $\text{Diff}(S_2)$ [27,28]. In fact $SU(\infty)$ is homomorphic to area preserving diffeomorphism of any 2D Riemann surfaces [29–31]. This theorem can

² In this work all vector spaces and algebras are defined on complex number field \mathbb{C} , unless explicitly mentioned otherwise.

³ Although in (1) we showed the dimensional scale \hbar/M_P in the definition of operators and their algebra, for the sake of convenience in the rest of this work we include it in the operators, except when its explicit presentation is necessary for the discussion.

be heuristically understood as the following: Any 2D Riemann surface can be obtained from sphere by removing a measure zero set of pair of points and sticking the rest of the surface pair-by-pair together. This property may be important in presence of subsystems with singularity such as black holes, in which part of the parameter space may be inaccessible.

Homomorphism between $SU(\infty)$ and $\text{Diff}(S_2)$ makes it possible to expand \hat{L}_a 's with respect to spherical harmonic functions. Moreover, owing to the Cartan decomposition, $SU(\infty)$ generators can be described as tensor product of Pauli matrices [27,109], see Appendix E for a review. In particular, description of \hat{L}_a 's with respect to angular coordinates on the sphere (θ, ϕ) demonstrates that each of indices in (1) consists of a pair $(l, m) | l = 0, \dots, \infty; -l \leq m \leq +l$. Nonetheless, we continue to use single letters for the indices when there is no need for their explicit description.

The algebra (1) is not enough to make the system quantic and as usual \hat{L}_a must respect Heisenberg commutation relation:

$$[\hat{L}_a, \hat{J}_b] = -i\delta_{ab}\hbar. \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{J}_a \in \mathcal{H}_U^*$ is the dual of \hat{L}_a and \mathcal{H}_U^* is the dual Hilbert space of the Universe. As there is a one-to-one correspondence between \hat{L} 's and \hat{J} 's, they satisfy the same algebra and represent the same symmetry group, namely $SU(\infty)$ and have their own expansion to spherical harmonics. Owing to $SU(\infty) \cong \text{Diff}(S_2)$, vectors of the Hilbert space of the model are differentiable complex functions on the sphere. The Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U]$ is infinite dimensional and spherical harmonic functions constitute an orthogonal basis for \mathcal{H}_U .

The quantum Universe defined here is static because there is no background space or time in the model. Nonetheless, we claim that continuous degrees of freedom similar to space and time arise naturally when the Universe is divided to subsystems. There would be no need for any kind of fine-tuning, for instance selecting a specific initial condition or state or internal symmetry for subsystems/particles. The short argument goes as the following: In Standard model of particle physics states that constitute a basis physically exist. Assuming that this rule can be applied to structure of the Universe at all scales, and considering that \mathcal{H}_U is infinite dimensional, we conclude that the Universe must consist of infinite number of particles/subsystems. This conclusion is in agreement with the corollary in Appendix B about divisibility of a quantum Universe - derived from axioms of quantum mechanics. Thus this conclusion is independent of details of the model described here.

In the next sections we make this argument more rigorous and explain how it can lead to a 3+1 dimensional spacetime and internal gauge symmetry of elementary particles. But first we construct a Lagrangian for this static model and show that it is trivial.

3. Lagrangian of the Universe

Although the infinite dimensional Universe described in the previous section is static, it has to satisfy some constraints imposed by symmetries that we associated to it. They are analogous to constraints imposed on systems in thermodynamic equilibrium. Although there is no time variation in such systems, a priori small perturbations occur, for instance by absorption and emission of energy. They must be in balance with each others, otherwise the system lose its equilibrium. Therefore, it is useful to define a Lagrangian which quantifies these constraints. In the case of present model the Lagrangian must quantify the symmetry and its representation by \mathcal{H}_U .

As in QFT the Lagrangian must be invariant under transformations of fields by application of members of the symmetry group. Here the most appealing candidate is a Lagrangian similar to Yang-Mills

but without a *kinetic* term, because at this stage there is no background geometry in the model. In such situation the only available quantities for a Lagrangian are invariant of the symmetry group:

$$\mathcal{L}_U = \int d^2\Omega \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b} L_a^*(\theta, \phi) L_b(\theta, \phi) \text{tr}(\hat{L}_a \hat{L}_b) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \text{tr}(\hat{L}_a \rho(\theta, \phi)) \right], \quad d^2\Omega \equiv d(\cos \theta) d\phi \quad (3)$$

If we use description (A5) for \hat{L} operators, then indices $a = b = 1$. If we use (A12) presentation $a, b = (l, m)$, $l = 0, \dots, \infty; -m \leq l \leq +m$. The latter case explicitly demonstrates the Cartan decomposition of $SU(\infty)$ to $SU(2)$ described in Appendix E. Notice that (θ, ϕ) are *internal* variables [28], reflecting the fact that vectors of the Hilbert space representing $SU(\infty)$ are functions on a sphere. For the same reason in contrast to usual Lagrangians in QFT, there is no term containing derivatives with respect to these parameters in \mathcal{L}_U . If we use differential representation of \hat{L}_{lm} defined in (A5) and apply it to amplitudes $L_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$, the first term in the Lagrangian will depend on derivative of amplitudes, just like in the QFT. However, it is straightforward to see that derivatives with respect to $\cos \theta$ and ϕ will have different amplitudes and thereby the *kinetic* term will be unconventional and non-covariant, unless we consider amplitudes $L_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$ as metric of a deformed sphere. This is the explicit demonstration of $SU(\infty) \cong \text{Diff}(S_2)$ invariance of this Lagrangian.

Generators $\hat{T}_a, \hat{T}_b \in SU(N)$, $\forall N$ can be normalized such that $\text{tr}(T_a T_b) \propto \delta_{ab}$, see e.g. [27]. In analogy with field strength in Yang-Mills theories functions $L_a(\theta, \phi)$ can be interpreted as amplitude of the contribution of operator \hat{L}_a in the dynamics of the Universe. Due to global $U(1)$ symmetry of operators applied to a quantum state, L_a 's are in general complex. On the other hand, considering the Cartan decomposition of $SU(\infty)$ to tensor product of $SU(2)$ and the fact that $\sigma^\dagger = (\sigma^*)^t = \sigma$, we conclude that $\hat{L}_a^\dagger = \hat{L}_a$. Similar to QFT, one can use \mathcal{L}_U to define a path integral. But, in absence of time it presents excursion of states in the Hilbert space by application of \hat{L}_a operators. Nonetheless, owing to $SU(\infty)$ symmetry, variation of states is equivalent to gauge transformation and physically immeasurable.

The analogy of \mathcal{L}_U with Yang-Mills theory has interesting consequences. For instance, differential representation of \hat{L}_{lm} defined in (A5) means that $\text{tr}(\hat{L}_{lm} \hat{L}_{lm})$ can be considered as a symmetric rank-2 tensor on the sphere (more generally on any 2D compact manifold) which its diffeomorphism represents $SU(\infty)$. Thus, amplitudes L_{lm} should be their co-vector to make the first term a scalar on the 2D geometry. The only geometrical quantity with such properties is the Riemann scalar. Therefore, we conclude that the first term in the integrand of Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_U is proportional to the Riemann scalar $R^{(2)}$ and thereby this term is topological⁴.

The relation between gauge field term in \mathcal{L}_U and Riemann curvature is crucial for interpretation of this term as gravity when the Universe is divided to subsystems. We could also arrive to this conclusion inversely. Considering $SU(\infty) \cong \text{Diff}(S_2)$, in analogy with Einstein gravity in a static 2D curve space, we could write the Lagrangian with the first term replaced by $\int d^2\Omega \sqrt{|g^{(2)}|} R^{(2)}$, where $g^{(2)}$ is the determinant of metric on S_2 . Then, the definition of \hat{L}_{lm} operators in (A5) and amplitudes L_{lm} can be used to write $R^{(2)}$ with respect to \hat{L}_{lm} and relate metric of the 2D surface to amplitudes L_{lm} . We leave detailed demonstration of these relations to a future work. It is necessary to emphasize that in both representation of $SU(\infty)$, namely Cartan decomposition to tensor product of $SU(2)$ or diffeomorphism of 2D surfaces, angular coordinates θ and ϕ play the role of parameters which identify/index the members of the symmetry group. Consequently, their quantization is meaningless. Presuming the physical reality of Hilbert space and operators applied to it as discussed in Appendix C, we can interpret L_{lm} as the force mediator *particles*

⁴ We remind that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^2\Omega \sqrt{|g^{(2)}|} R^{(2)} = 4\pi\chi(\mathcal{M})$, where χ is the Euler characteristic of the compact Riemann 2D surface \mathcal{M} .

related to the symmetry represented by operators \hat{L}_{lm} , and ρ in the second term of the Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_U as density matrix of *matter*.

Although \mathcal{L}_U is static, we can apply variational principle with respect to amplitudes to find their equilibrium values. However, it is easily seen that the solution is trivial. At equilibrium $L_{lm} \rightarrow 0$ and $\rho_{lm} \rightarrow 0$. As $SU(\infty)^n \cong SU(\infty) \forall n$, this solution has properties of a frame independent vacuum of a many-particle Universe based on coherent states defined in [15]. Their similarity implicitly implies that the Universe is divisible and consist of infinite *particles* interacting through mediator particles - that is the action of \hat{L}_{lm} . We investigate this conclusion in more details in the next section.

4. Division to subsystems

There are many ways to see that the quantum vacuum (equilibrium) solution of a Universe with \mathcal{L}_U Lagrangian (3) is not stable. Of course there are quantum fluctuations. They are nothing else than random application of \hat{L}_{lm} operators, in other words random scattering of force mediator *quanta* by *matter*. They project the Hilbert space to itself. But owing to $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of Lagrangian, states are globally equivalent and the Universe maintain its equilibrium. Nonetheless, locally states are different and do not respond to \hat{L}_{lm} in the same manner. Here locality means restriction of Lagrangian and projection to a subspace of the Hilbert space. As state space is homomorphic to the space of smooth functions on the sphere $f(\theta, \phi)$, the restriction to a subspaces is equivalent to a local deformation of the 2D compact manifold. Moreover, difference between structure coefficients of $SU(\infty)$ can be used to define a *locality* or closeness among operators belonging to $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U]$. These observations are additional evidence to the argument given at the end of Sec. 4.3 in favour of divisibility of the quantum Universe introduced in Sec. 2 to multi-particles/subsystems.

A quantum system divisible to separate and distinguishable subsystems⁵ must fulfill 3 conditions [23]:

- There must exist sets of operators $\{A_i\} \subset \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ such that $\forall \bar{a} \in \{A_i\}$ and $\forall \bar{b} \in \{A_j\}$, and $i \neq j$, $[\bar{a}, \bar{b}] = 0$;
- Operators in each set $\{A_i\}$ must be local⁶;
- $\{A_i\}$'s must be complementarity, that is $\otimes_i \{A_i\} \cong \text{End}(\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}])$.

The most trivial way of fulfilling these conditions is having a reducible representation of symmetries by $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$. In the case of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U] \cong SU(\infty)$, as:

$$SU(\infty)^n \cong SU(\infty) \forall n \quad (4)$$

the above condition can be easily realized. Moreover instabilities, quantum correlations, and entanglement may create *local* symmetries among groups of states and/or operators. There are many examples of such grouping and induced symmetries in many-body systems, see e.g. [32] for a review. A hallmark of induced symmetry by quantum correlations is the formation of anyon quasi-particles having non-abelian symmetry in fractional quantum Hall effect [33]. On the other hand, there is only one state in the infinite dimensional Hilbert space in which all pointer states have the same probability: the maximally coherent state defined in (A2). Moreover, considering (4) irreducible representation of $SU(\infty)$ are partially entangled [24] and there is high probability of clustering of subspaces in a randomly selected state ρ of the Universe. To

⁵ In statistical quantum or classical mechanics distinguishability of particles usually means being able to say, for instance, whether it was particle 1 or particle 2 which was observed. Here by distinguishability we mean whether a particle/subsystem can be experimentally, i.e. through application of \hat{L}_{lm} to a subspace of parameter space can be detected and identified in isolation from other subsystems or the rest of the Universe.

⁶ This condition is defined for quantum systems in a background spacetime. In the present model there is not such a background. Nonetheless, as explained earlier, locality on the homomorphic 2D surface can be projected to $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U]$.

proceed we assume that such groupings indeed have occurred in the early Universe and continue to occur at Planck scale. They provide necessary conditions for division of the Universe to parts or particles with $SU(\infty) \times G \cong SU(\infty)$ as their symmetry. The *local* symmetry G is assumed to be a compact Lie group of finite rank and is respected by subsystems. Evidently different subsystems may have different internal symmetry. Nonetheless, without lack of generality we can consider G to be the tensor product of internal symmetries of all subsystems. Then some particles/subsystems may be in singlet representation of some of component groups but not others.

As the rank of G is assumed to be finite, complementarity condition dictates that the number of subsystems must be infinite to account for the infinite rank of \mathcal{H}_U . Despite division $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U] \cong SU(\infty)$ can be applied to all subsystems because $\{A_i\} \subset \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_i] \cong \text{Diff}(S_2)$, where \mathcal{H}_i is the Hilbert space of subsystem i . For the same reason, multiplicity of irreducible representations of G can be any number including infinity. Clustering of states and subsystems are usually the hallmark of strong interaction and quantum correlation [32]. Thus, interaction of subsystems through internal G symmetry is expected to be stronger than through $SU(\infty)$, thereby the weak gravitation c conjecture [34] is satisfied.

We could formulate the above Universe in a bottom-up manner too. Consider ensemble of infinite number of quantum systems - particles - each having finite symmetry G and coherently mixing with others. Their ensemble generates a Universe with $SU(\infty) \times G \cong SU(\infty)$ as symmetry represented by its Hilbert space. Therefore, top-down or bottom-up approaches to an infinitely divisible Universe give the same result. The bottom-up view helps to better understand the origin of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry. It shows that for each subsystem it is the presence of other infinite number of subsystems and its own interaction interaction with them that is seen as a $SU(\infty)$ symmetry.

Division of the Universe to subsystems has several consequences. First of all the global $U(1)$ symmetry of \mathcal{H}_U becomes local because the Hilbert spaces of subsystems \mathcal{H}_{s_α} , where index α runs over all subsystems, acquire their own phase symmetry. Therefore, we expect that there is at least one unbroken $U(1)$ local symmetry in nature. It may be indeed identified as $U(1)$ symmetry of the Standard Model. From now on we include this $U(1)$ to the internal symmetry of subsystems G . Additionally, the infinite number of subsystems in the Universe means that each of them has its own representation of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry homomorphic to area preserving $\text{Diff}(S_2)$. However, these representations are not isolated and are part of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of the whole Universe, very similar to finite intervals on a line, which are homomorphic to $R^{(1)}$ and at the same time part of it and have the same algebra. This means that the *memory* of being part of the whole Universe would not be washed out with division to subsystems. Otherwise, according to the corollary discussed in Appendix B subsystems could be considered as separate universes. Area of the Riemann surface which its diffeomorphism is homomorphic to $SU(\infty)$ is irrelevant when only one $SU(\infty)$ is considered. But it becomes relevant and observable when it is compared with its counterpart for other subsystems. More precisely Homomorphism between Hilbert spaces of two subsystems s and s' defined as $\mathcal{R}_{ss'} : \mathcal{H}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{s'}$ can be considered as an addition parameter necessary for identifying and indexing subsystems. A more qualitative description of how a third continuous parameter emerges from division of Universe to subsystem is given in Appendix F.

4.1. Parameter space

In Appendix F we explain how the division to subsystems extends the parameter space to a curved $R^{(3)}$. By extending the relation between 2D Riemann curvature and density matrix described in Sec. 4.3 to infinite subsystems we conclude that curvature of the parameter space is determined by the state of the subsystems, see Sec. 4.2 for more details. Thus, we conclude that what we perceive as classical spacetime is in fact the parameter space of an underlying quantum Universe. Because the model discussed here is inherently quantic, demonstration of this claim needs description of a classical system in the framework

of this model. However, in Sec. 4.3 we show that the contribution of gravity vanishes for $\hbar/M_P \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, considering naively the limit of $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ is not sufficient. For this reason we leave investigation of the classical limit of the model for future works.

The last step for construction of a dynamical quantum Universe is the introduction of a clock using comparison between variation of states of two subsystems, tagged as *system* and *clock*, under application of operators $\hat{L}_\alpha \in SU(\infty) \times G$ by a third subsystem, tagged as *observer* who plays the role of a reference. The necessity of an observer/reference is consistent with the foundation of quantum mechanics as described in [20]. In the context of the present model this discrimination can be understood as the following: The common $SU(\infty)$ symmetry between all subsystems means that any variation of full state by application of \hat{L}_α is a gauge transformation when considered globally. Therefore, variations are meaningful only when operators are restricted to part of the Universe and the other part acts as a witness.

Technical details of introducing a clock and relative time in quantum mechanics is intensively studied in the literature, see e.g. [26] for a review and proof of the equivalence of different approaches. Here we describe this procedure through an example. Consider the application of operators $\hat{L}_c \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_c]$ and $\hat{L}_s \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_s]$ to a subsystem of the Universe called *clock* and to another subsystem called *system* such that:

$$\hat{L}_c \rho_c \hat{L}_c^\dagger = \rho_c + d\rho_c, \quad \hat{L}_s \rho_s \hat{L}_s^\dagger = \rho_s + d\rho_s \quad (5)$$

Because these operations are local and restricted to subsystems, they are not gauged out. One way of associating a c-number quantity to these variations is $dt \equiv |\text{tr}(\rho_c(t)d\rho_c)|$. This quantity is positive and by definition incremental. Hamiltonian operator $H_s \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_s]$ of the system according to this clock would be an operator for which $d\rho_s/dt = -i/\hbar[H_s, \rho_s]$. More generally, defining a clock is equivalent to comparing excursion path of two subsystems in their respective Hilbert space under successive application of \hat{L}_c and \hat{L}_s to them, respectively. The arrow of time arises because through the common $SU(\infty)$ symmetry any operation - even a local one - is communicated to the whole Universe. Inversing changes amounts to performing an inverse operation on all subsystems. Therefore, although dynamical equation of one system may be locally symmetric with respect to time reversal, due to global effect of every operation, its effect cannot be easily reversed.

This final stride brings the dimension of continuous parameter space necessary for describing state of an infinite dimensional Universe and its constituents to 3+1. Evidently, in addition to these *external* parameters each subsystem represents the internal symmetry G , which its representations have their own parameters. In the same way, we can define a conjugate parameter space in the dual space for operators \hat{f}_a defined in (2). Therefore, in contrast to some quantum gravity candidates the model studied here does not have a preference for position or momentum space.

4.2. Metric signature

In the previous paragraphs we indicated the dimension of parameter space of subdivided Universe as 3+1. This implicitly means that we have considered a Lorentzian spacetime. Indeed using Heisenberg uncertainty relation, a constraint on the minimum time necessary for transition of a quantum state ρ_1 to another state ρ_2 in a system with Hamiltonian H can be obtained as [22,35]:

$$\Delta t_{\min} = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\cos^{-1} A(\rho_1, \rho_2)}{\sqrt{Q(\rho_1, H)}} \quad (6)$$

$$A(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \text{tr}(\sqrt{\rho_1} \sqrt{\rho_2}), \quad Q(\rho, H) = \frac{1}{2} |\text{tr}([\sqrt{\rho}, H]^2)| \quad (7)$$

Considering ρ_1 as the state of Universe after selecting and separating an observer and a clock, for $\rho_2 = \rho_1 + d\rho_1$, expansion of (6) leads to:

$$ds^2 = \frac{dt^2}{2\hbar^2} \text{tr}[\sqrt{\rho_1}, H]^2, \quad ds^2 \equiv \text{tr}(\sqrt{d\rho_1} \sqrt{d\rho_1}^\dagger) \quad (8)$$

The infinitesimal variable ds is similar to a Riemann metric for a system at rest, that is when $d\vec{x} = 0$. Thus, we identify it with classical separation and $\text{tr}[\sqrt{\rho_1}, H]^2/2\hbar^2$ with g_{00} component of Riemann metric for the selected clock and observer. Transformation of parameter space coordinates, for instance to one in which state of the system has variable *spatial* parameters, changes the metric to $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu$. The legitimacy of coordinate transformation in the parameter space and covariance of the model is discussed in the next section.

We make two important conclusion from (7) and (8): Metric of the parameter space of the model, and thereby its Riemann curvature are related to quantum density matrix. This result is in agreement with conclusion of [36] that Einstein equation is an equation of state and should not be quantized. The second conclusion is that the signature of the metric must be negative because the state and thereby its parameters cannot change arbitrarily fast. The maximum speed is universal because two sides of (8) can be rescaled. However, we know that in perturbative QFT virtual and off-shell particles do not respect the maximum speed - quantum mechanics is not strictly causal. These cases correspond to non-unitary evolution of subsystems due to non-separability and entanglement between subsystems. [22]. And indeed virtual and off-shell particles cannot be observed directly in an experiment, otherwise maximum speed of information transfer were violated.

4.3. Lagrangian of subsystems

The Lagrangian of the Universe after division to subsystems and definition and separation of reference observer and clock takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{U_s} = & \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{16\pi G_N \hbar} \sum_{l,m,l',m'} \text{tr}(L_{lm}^*(x) L_{l'm'}(x) \hat{L}_{lm} \hat{L}_{l'm'}) + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{a,b} \text{tr}(T_a^*(x) T_b(x) \hat{T}_a \hat{T}_b) + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{1}{8(\pi G_N)^{1/2}} \sum_{l,m,a} \text{tr}(L_{lm}(x) T_a(x) \hat{L}_{lm} \otimes \hat{T}_a) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{lm} \text{tr}(\hat{L}_{lm} \otimes \mathbb{1}_G \rho(x)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \text{tr}(\mathbb{1}_{SU(\infty)} \otimes \hat{L}_a \rho(x)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The terms of this Lagrangian can be interpreted as the following. The first term is the Lagrangian for ensemble of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of all subsystems except observer and clock. For this reason, amplitudes $L_{l'm'}(x)$ depend on all the parameters and not just internal variables of $SU(\infty)$. Although apparently the nature of (r, t) and (θ, ϕ) coordinates are different - the former couple arise from division of the Universe to subsystems, whereas the latter are internal - due to quantum mixing between subsystems as well as their interactions *internal* and *external* variables lose their differences and the parameter space becomes a covariant 3+1 dimension space. We notice that if $\hbar G_N \propto \hbar^2/M_P^2 \rightarrow 0$ the first term will be canceled. Therefore, naive classical limit of the model does not include this term, which we identify as pure gravity.

The second and third terms together correspond to the Lagrangian of pure gauge fields for local G symmetry and will have the standard form of Yang-Mills models if $T_a(x)$ fields are 2-forms in (3+1)D parameter space. The last two terms present interaction of matter with gravitational and internal gauge fields, respectively. We leave explicit description of terms in this Lagrangian with respect to parameters, demonstration of properties discussed here and comparison of \mathcal{L}_{U_s} with that of QFT with semi-classical gravity to a future work.

4.4. Comparison with other quantum gravity models

It is useful to compare this model with string theory and Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) - the two most popular quantum gravity candidates,

A common aspect of string/superstring theory with present model is the presence of a 2D manifold in their foundation. However, in contrast to string theory in which a 2D world sheet is introduced as an axiom without any observational support, the presence of a 2D manifold here is a consequence of the infinite symmetry of the Universe, which has compelling observational support. Moreover, the 2D nature of the underlying Universe manifests itself only when the Universe is considered as a whole. Otherwise, it is always perceived as a (3+1)D continuum (plus parameters space of internal symmetry of subsystems).

In string theory matter and spacetime are fields living on the 2D world sheet, or equivalently the world sheet can be viewed as being embedded in a multi-dimensional space without any explanation for the origin of such non-trivial structures. On the other hand, in present model the approach to matter is rather *bottom-up*. The Cartan decomposition of $SU(\infty)$ to smaller groups, in particular $SU(2)$ means that they can be easily break and separate from the pool of the $SU(\infty)$ symmetry - for instance by quantum correlation between pair of subsystem- without affecting the infinite symmetry. And indeed it seems to be the case because $SU(2)$ and $SU(3) \subset SU(2) \times SU(2) \cong SU(4)$ are Standard Model symmetries. Additionally, string theory is fundamentally first quantized and string based field theories are considered as low energy effective descriptions. But as explained in the previous sections, in the present model owing to its infinite dimensional symmetry, Hilbert and Fock spaces are homomorphic and the the model can be straightforwardly considered as first or second quantized.

Importance of $SU(2)$ symmetry in the construction of LQG and its presentation as spin foam [16] is shared with the present model. However, $SU(2) \cong SO(3)$ manifold on which Ashtekar variables are defined has its origin in the ADM (3+1)D formalism, based on the presumption that spacetime and thereby quantum gravity should be formulated in the physical spacetime. Moreover, LQG does not address the origin of matter as the source of gravity, neither the origin of the Standard Model symmetries. The present model explains both the dimension of spacetime and relation between quantum gravity, matter, and SM symmetries.

A concept that string theory and LQG does not consider - at least not in their foundation - is the fact that in quantum mechanics discrimination between observer and observed is essential and models which do not consider this concept in their construction - specially when the models is intended to be applied to the whole Universe - are somehow *metaphysical*, because they implicitly consider that the observer is out of this Universe.

5. Outline and prospects

In this work we proposed a new approach to quantum gravity by constructing a model in which gravity is fundamentally quantic. We explained some of properties of this model and how it may answer questions we raised in the Introduction section. However, many of arguments and calculations reported here are preliminary and need improvement and extension before the model can be considered as interesting and compelling. In any case, testing quantum gravity models is very hard and present model is not an exception. There is however a difference between this one and other candidates of quantum gravity. It is based on assumptions which are well tested. The only addition to usual quantum mechanics is a dimensionful parameter \hbar/M_P . We remind that gravity and other interactions are not conformal and existence of a dimensionful scale in the formulation of a unified theory that include gravity and cosmology is inevitable. Another novelty is that the model is quantic by construction rather than being quantized version of a classical field theory.

A crucial subject that needs more investigation in the framework of this model is its semi-classical limit. We gave a bottom-up description for emergence of internal symmetries. But we did not explained how the hierarchy of couplings arises. We conjecture that clustering of subsystems, which leads to the emergence of internal symmetries determines also their couplings, probably through processes analogous to the formation of moiré super-lattice, which generates strong interaction between electrons in the magic angle rotation of 2D materials. The fact that in this model the Universe as whole can be considered 2-dimensional because of its $SU(\infty)$ symmetry, which is also respected by subsystems, means that the necessary ingredients for moiré-like structures are available.

Among other topics which must be addressed black holes and puzzles of semi-classical approaches to their entropy, quantum state, and entanglement with the rest of the Universe are of prominent importance. As the model studied here is inherently quantic, we need a purely quantic definition for black holes. Naively, a quantum black hole may be defined as a many particle system in a quantum well in real space, which in this model is interpreted as its parameter space. However, we know that in the framework of quantum field theory in curved spacetimes, black holes are not really contained in a limited region of space and due to the Hawking radiation their potential well is not perfect and their matter content extend to infinity.

Other interesting issues which should be investigated in the context of this model are inflation and dark energy. Notably, it would be useful to see whether the topological nature of 2D Lagrangian of the whole Universe can have observable consequences, for instance as a small but nonzero vacuum energy. As for inflation, an exponential decoupling and decoherence of particles/subsystems in the early universe may be interpreted as *inflation* and extension of spacetime.

In conclusion the inhomogeneous Lorentz transformation may be the classical interface of a much deeper and global realm of a quantum Universe.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Institut Hanry Poincaré for hospitality and bibliographic assistance during accomplishment of this work.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Appendix A. A very brief summary of the best studied quantum gravity models

Introduction of quantum mechanical concepts to general relativity was first mentioned by Einstein himself in his famous 1916 paper. The first detailed work on the topic was by Léon Rosenfeld in 1930 [37], in which the action of Einstein-Hilbert model with matter is quantized by replacing classical variables with hermitian operators, see e.g. [38] for the history of early approaches to quantum gravity. As we know now, this canonical quantization and its more modern variants based on the quantization of 3+1 dimensional Hamiltonian description, notably Wheeler-DeWitt (WD) formalism [39,40] leads to nonrenormalizable models⁷.

Another model inspired by the ADM Hamiltonian formulation of GR [41], the Dirac Hamiltonian description of quantum mechanics [42], and the WD approach to QGR is Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG), see e.g. [43,44] and references therein. In this approach, triads defined on a patch of the 3D space - what is called Ashtekar variables [12] - replace spatial coordinates and are considered as Hermitian operators acting on the Hilbert space of the Universe. Their conjugate operators form a $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory and provide a connection - up to an undefined constant called Immirzi parameter - for the quantized 3D space.

⁷ We should emphasize that references given in this appendix are only one or two examples of works on the subjects on which tens or even hundreds of articles can be found in the literature.

However, to implement diffeomorphism of general relativity without referring to a fixed background, the physical quantized entities are holonomies - gauge invariant nonlocal fluxes and Wilson loops defined on 2D surfaces and their boundaries, respectively. Similar to WD formalism in LQG Hamiltonian is a constraint and therefore there is no explicit time in the model [43]. Recently it is shown that a conformal version of LQG has an explicit time parameter [45], but the conformal symmetry must be broken to induce a mass or distance scale in the model. Other issues in LQG are lack of explicit global Lorentz invariance, absence of any direct connection to matter, and most importantly quantization of space which violates Lorentz invariance even when the absence of time parameter in the model is neglected.

Regarding the violation of Lorentz invariance, even if the discretization is restricted to distances close to the Planck scale, matter interaction propagates it to larger distances [6]. This issue is also present in other background independent approaches to quantum gravity in which in one way or another the spacetime is discretized. Examples of such quantum gravity models are symplectic quantum geometry [46] and dynamical triangulations, in which space is assumed to consist of a dynamical lattice [47,48]. See also [49] for a recent review of these approaches to quantum gravity and [50] for some of their issues, in particular a likely absence of a UV fixed point which is necessary for renormalizability of these models. Therefore, the claimed quantization of space volume or in other words emergence of a fundamental length scale in UV limit of these models is still uncertain. Another example is causal sets - a discretization approach with causally ordered structures [51], see e.g. [52] for a review. They probably suffer from the same issue as other discretization models, notably breaking of Lorentz symmetries, see e.g. [53], but also [54] for counter-arguments. We should remind that all quantum gravity models depend on a length (or equivalent mass) scale, namely the Planck length L_P (or mass M_P). Dimensionful quantities need a *unit*, which does not arise from dimensionless or scale invariant quantities. Therefore, discretization is not a replacement for a dimensionful fundamental constant in quantum gravity models.

In early 1980's the discovery of both spin-1 and spin-2 fields in 2D conformal quantum field theories embedded in a D -dimensional spacetime - called *string* models - opened a new era and discipline for seeking a reliable quantum model for gravity, and ultimately unifying all fundamental forces in a *Great Unified Theory(GUT) of everything*. Nambu-Goto and Polyakov string theories were studied in 1970's as candidates for describing strong interaction of hadrons. Although with the establishment of Quantum Chromo-Dynamics (QCD) as the true description of strong nuclear force string theories seemed irrelevant, their potential for quantizing spacetime [55,56] gave them a new role in fundamental particle physics. String and superstring theories became and continue to be by far the most extensively studied candidates of quantum gravity and GUT⁸.

Quantized strings/superstring models are finite and meaningful only for special values of spacetime dimension D . For these cases the central charge of Virasoro algebra or its generalization to affine Lie algebra vanishes when the contribution of all fields, including ghosts of the conformal theory on the 2D world-sheet are taken into account. Without this restriction the theory is infested by anomalies, singularities, and misbehaviour. The allowed dimension is $D = 26$ for bosonic string theories and $D = 10$ for superstrings. The group manifold on which a viable string model can live is restricted as well. For instance, the allowed symmetry in heterotic Polyakov model is $SO(32)$ or $E_8 \times E_8$. Wess-Zumino-Novikov-Witten (WZNW) models with 2D affine Lie algebras provide more variety of symmetries, including coset groups. However, restriction on dimension/rank of symmetry groups remains the same. Therefore, to make contact with real world, which has 3+1 dimensions, the remaining dimensions must be compactified.

⁸ A textbook description and references to original works can be found in textbooks such as [57,58].

Initially the inevitable compactification of fields in string models was welcomed because it might explain internal global and local (gauge) symmetries of elementary particles, in a similar manner as in Kaluza-Klein unification of gravity and electromagnetism [59,60]. However, intensive investigations of the topic showed that compactification generates a plethora of possible models. Some of these models may be considered more realistic than others based on the criteria of having a low energy limit containing the Standard Model symmetries. But, unobserved massless moduli, which may make the Universe overdense if they acquire a mass at string or even lower scales, strongly constrains many of string models. Therefore, moduli must be stabilized [61,62]. For instance, they should acquire just enough effective mass to make them a good candidate for dark matter [63]. Moreover, in string theories there is no natural inflation candidate satisfying cosmological observations without fine-tuning. Although moduli are considered as potential candidates for inflation [64], small non-Gaussianity of Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) anisotropies [65] seems to prefer single field inflation [66]. In addition, single field slow roll inflation may be inconsistent [67] with constraints to be imposed on a scalar field interacting with quantum gravity in the framework of swampland extension of string models landscape [68]. Some researchers still believe that a genuinely non-perturbative formulation of superstring theories may solve many of these issues⁹. However, the absence of any evidence of supersymmetry up to $\sim \text{TeV}$ energies at LHC - where it was expected such that it could solve Higgs hierarchy problem [69] - is another disappointing result for string models.

Observation of accelerating expansion of the Universe due to a mysterious dark energy with properties very similar to a cosmological constant - presumably a nonzero but very small vacuum energy - seems to be another big obstacle for string theory [70] as the only quantum gravity candidate claiming to be the theory of every thing. The landscape of string vacua has $\gtrsim 10^{200-500}$ minima - depending on how models are counted [71]. But there is no rule to determine which one is more likely and why the observed density of dark energy - if it is the vacuum energy - is $\sim 10^{123}$ fold less than its expected value, namely M_P^4 . To tackle and solve some of these issues, extension and/or reformulation of string theories have led to its variants such as matrix models [72], M-theory, F-theory, and more recently swampland [68] and weak gravity conjecture [34,73].

In early 1999 Randall-Sundrum brane models [74,75] and their variants, inspired by D-branes in toroidal compactification of open strings and propagation of graviton closed strings in the bulk of one or two extra non-compactified warped dimensions, generated a great amount of excitement and were subject of intensive investigations. By confining all fields except gravitons on 4D branes these models are able to lower the fundamental scale of quantum gravity to TeV energies - presumably the scale of weak interaction - and explain the apparent weakness of gravitational coupling and high value of Planck mass. Thus, a priori brane models solve the problem of coupling hierarchy in Standard Model of particle physics. In addition, an effective small cosmological constant on the visible brane may be achievable [76,77]. However, in general brane models have a modified Friedmann equation, which is strongly constrained by observations [78–80]. Moreover, it is shown that the confinement of gauge bosons on the brane(s) violates gauge symmetries, and if gauge fields propagate to the bulk, so do the matter [81,82]. Nonetheless, some methods for their localization on the brane are suggested [83,84]. On the other hand, observation of ultra high energy cosmic rays constrains the scale of quantum gravity and characteristic scale of warped extra-dimension to $> 100 \text{ TeV}$ [85,86]. This constraint is consistent with other theoretical and experimental issues of brane models, specially in the context of black hole physics: instability of macroscopic black holes,

⁹ Non-supersymmetric string models may have no non-perturbative formulation and should be considered as part of a supersymmetric model, see e.g. Chapter 8 of [58].

nonexistence of an asymptotically Minkowski solution [87,88], and observational constraint [89] on the formation of microscopic black holes in colliders at TeV energies [90].

In the view of these difficulties more drastic ideas have emerged: UV/IR correspondence of gravity, meaning that at UV scales graviton condensate behaves asymptotically similar to classical gravity in general relativity [91,92]; gravity and spacetime as an emergent effect from thermodynamics and entropy [93,94] or condensation of more fundamental fields [95,96], etc.

More recently, the development of quantum information theory and its close relation with entanglement of quantum states, their entropy and the puzzle of information loss in Hawking radiation of black holes have promoted models which interpret gravity and spacetime as an emergent effect of entanglement [97–99] and tensor networks [101,102]. These ideas are in one way or another related to holography principle and Ads/CFT equivalence conjecture [103]. In these models spacetime metric and geometry emerge from tensor decomposition of the Hilbert space of the Universe to entangled subspaces. The resulted structures are interpreted as graphs and a symplectic geometry is associated to them. In the continuum limit the space of graphs can be considered as a quantum spacetime. In a somehow different approach in the same category of models the concept of *locality* specified by subalgebras is used to decompose the Universe. Local observables belong to spacelike subspaces in a given reference frame/basis [104,105]. This means that in these models a background spacetime is implicitly postulated without being precise about its origin and nature. Although in addition to spacetime subsystems/subalgebras should somehow present matter, it is not clear how they are related. Moreover, the problem of the dimension of the spacetime and how it acquires its observed value is not discussed. In any case, investigation of these approaches to quantum gravity is still in its infancy and their theoretical and observational consistency are not fully worked out.

Appendix B. Quantum mechanics postulates in symmetry language

In this appendix we reformulate axioms of quantum mechanics à la Dirac [106] and von Neumann [107] with symmetry as a foundational concept:

- i. A quantum system is defined by its symmetries. Its state is a vector belonging to a projective vector space called *state space* representing its symmetry group. Observables are associated to self-adjoint operators. The set of independent observables is isomorphic to subspace of commuting elements of the space of self-adjoint (Hermitian) operators acting on the state space and generates the maximal abelian subalgebra of the algebra associated to symmetry group.
- ii. The state space of a composite system is homomorphic to the direct product of state spaces of its components. In the special case of separable components, this homomorphism becomes an isomorphism. Components may be separable - untangled - in some symmetries and inseparable - entangled - in others. The symmetry group of the composite system is a subgroup of direct product of its components.
- iii. Evolution of a system is unitary and is ruled by conservation laws imposed by its symmetries and their representation by the state space.
- iv. Decomposition coefficients of a state to eigen vectors¹⁰ of an observable presents the coherence/degeneracy of the system with respect to its environment according to that observable. Projective measurements **by definition** correspond to complete breaking of coherence/degeneracy. The outcome of such measurements is the eigen value of the eigen state to which the symmetry is

¹⁰ More precisely *rays* because state vectors differing by a constant are equivalent.

- broken. This spontaneous decoherence (symmetry breaking)¹¹ reduces the state space to the subspace generated by other independent observables, which represent remaining symmetries/degeneracies.
- v. A probability independent of measurement details is associated to eigen values of an observable as the outcome of a measurement. It presents the amount of coherence/degeneracy of the state before its breaking by a projective measurement. Physical processes that determine the probability of each outcome are collectively called *preparation*¹².

These axioms are very similar to their analogues in the standard quantum mechanics except that we do not assume an abstract Hilbert space. The Born rule and classification of the state space as a Hilbert space can be demonstrated using axioms (i) and (v) and properties of statistical distributions [20]. We remind that the symmetry represented by the Hilbert space of a quantum system is in addition to the global $U(1)$ symmetry of states which leaves probability of outcomes in a projective measurement unchanged. When system is divided to subsystems that can be approximately considered as non-interacting, each subsystem acquire its own *local* $U(1)$ symmetry. Even in presence of interaction between subsystems a local $U(1)$ symmetry can be considered, as long as the interaction does not change the Hilbert space of subsystems. We notice that axiom ii slightly diverges from its analogue in the standard quantum mechanics. It emphasizes on the fact that the symmetry group represented by a composite system can be smaller than the tensor product of those of its components. In particular, entanglement may reduce the dimension of Hilbert space and thereby the rank of symmetry group that it represents.

A corollary of these axioms is that without division of the Universe to *system(s)* and *observer(s)* the process of measurement is meaningless. In another word, an indivisible universe is trivial and homomorphic to an empty set. In standard quantum mechanics the necessity of the division of the Universe to subsystems arises in the Copenhagen interpretation, which has many issues, see e.g. [108] for a review. In covariant quantum models and ADM canonical quantization of gravity, in which Hamiltonian is always null and naively the Universe seems to be static, relational definitions of time is based on the division of the Universe to subsystems, see e.g. [26].

Appendix C. State space symmetry and coherence

The choice of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} to present possible states of a system is usually based on the symmetries of its classical Lagrangian. Although these symmetries have usually a finite rank - the number of simultaneously measurable observables - the Hilbert space presenting them may be infinite dimensional. For example, translation symmetry in a 3D space is homomorphic to $U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1)$ and has a global $SU(2) \cong SO(3)$ symmetry under rotation of coordinates. They can be presented by 6 parameters/observables. Thus, the rank of the symmetry is finite. Nonetheless, due to the abelian nature of $U(1)$ group, the Hilbert space of position operator \mathcal{H}_X is infinite dimensional. More generally, the dimension of the Hilbert space depends on the dimension of the representation of the symmetry group of Lagrangian and its reducibility. The Hilbert space of a multi-particle system can be considered as a reducible representation of the symmetry, even if single particles are in irreducible representation. In particular, Fock space of a many-particle system can be presented as an infinite dimensional Hilbert space representing symmetries of the Lagrangian in a reducible manner. This property is important for the construction of the quantum Universe model studied here because it demonstrates that the infinite size of

¹¹ Ref. [20] explains why decoherence should be considered as a spontaneous symmetry breaking similar to a phase transition.

¹² Literature on foundation of quantum mechanics consider an intermediate step called *transition* between preparation and measurement. Here we include this step to preparation or measurement operations and do not consider it as a separate physical operation.

the physical space can be equally interpreted as manifestation of infinite number of particles/subsystems in a composite Universe.

Ensemble of linear operators acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ represents $SU(N)$ group where N is the dimension of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and can be infinite. As discussed in details in [20] configuration space of classical (statistical) systems have $\bigotimes^N U(1)$ symmetry where each $U(1)$ is isomorphic to the continuous range of values that an observable may have. Thus, quantization extends the symmetry of classical configuration space to $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}] = SU(N) \times U(1) \cong U(N) \supset \bigotimes^N U(1)$, where here we have also considered the global $U(1)$ symmetry of the Hilbert space.

Application of linear operators can be interpreted as changing the state by a Positive Operator Valued Measurement (POVM), through interaction with another system or more generally with the rest of the Universe. In particular, a projective measurement and decoherence makes the state completely incoherent $\hat{\rho}_{inc}$:

$$\hat{B}\hat{\rho}_c\hat{B}^\dagger \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_{inc} = \sum_i \rho_i \hat{\rho}_i, \quad \hat{\rho}_i \equiv |i\rangle\langle i| \quad (A1)$$

where $\hat{B} \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ and $|i\rangle$ is an eigen basis for the measured observable. We remind that the space of simultaneously observable operators corresponds to the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$. Coefficients ρ_i are probability of occurrence of eigen value of $|i\rangle$ as outcome of the measurement. Because $\hat{\rho}_{inc}$ is diagonal, completely incoherent states $\hat{\rho}_{inc}$ represent the Cartan subgroup of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$. A maximally coherent state in the above basis is defined as:

$$\hat{\rho}_{maxc} \propto \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle\langle j| \quad (A2)$$

This is a pure state in which all eigen states have the same occurrence probability in a projective measurement. Notice that due to the projectivity of Hilbert space $\hat{\rho}_{maxc}$ is unique and application of any other member of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ reduces its coherence, quantified for instance by fidelity or Fubini-Study metric [21]. More generally, action of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ members changes coherence of any state which is not completely incoherent. For this reason, we call $SU(N)$ symmetry of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ the *coherence symmetry*¹³.

It is useful to remind that in particle physics generators of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ space physically exist and are not abstract operation of an apparatus controlled by an experimenter. In the Standard Model (SM) $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}]$ is generated by vector boson gauge fields in fundamental representation of SM symmetry group. They act on the Hilbert space generated by matter fields. If gravity, which is the only known universal interaction follows the same rule, we should be able to define a Hilbert space for matter on which linear operators representing gravity act.

Regarding the example of translational and rotational symmetry of the physical space in the first paragraph, despite the fact that the dimension of the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_X] \cong SU(N \rightarrow \infty)$ is infinite, and a priori there must be infinite simultaneously observable quantities in the physical space, in quantum mechanics only a 3D vector observable, namely the position of a particle/system is associated to $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_X]$. QFTs define field operators at every point of the space and assume that at equal time operators at different positions commute (or in the case of fermions anti-commute). However, in the formulation of QFT models position is a parameter not an operator. These different interpretations of spacetime highlight the ambiguity of its nature in quantum contexts - as described in question 2 in the Introduction section.

¹³ In some quantum information literature coherence symmetry is called *asymmetry* [22]. In this work we call it *coherence symmetry* or simply *coherence* to remind that its origin is quantum degeneracy and indistinguishability/symmetry of states before a projective observation.

Appendix D. $SU(\infty)$ and its polynomial representation

Special unitary group $SU(N)$ can be considered as N -dimensional representation of $SU(2)$. For this reason generators $T_{lm}^{(N)}$ of the associated Lie algebra $su(N)$ can be expanded as a matrix polynomial of N -dimensional generators of $SU(2)$. Indices (l, m) in these generators are the same as in $SU(2)$ representations: $l = 0, \dots, N-1$, $m = -l, \dots, +l$. Lie bracket of generators $T_{lm}^{(N)}$ is defined as:

$$[\hat{T}_{lm}^{(N)}, \hat{T}_{l'm'}^{(N)}] = f_{lm,l'm'}^{(N)l''m''} \hat{T}_{l''m''}^{(N)} \quad (A3)$$

Structure coefficients $f_{lm,l'm'}^{(N)l''m''}$ of $su(N)$ can be written with respect to 3j and 6j symbols, see e.g. [27] for their explicit expression. For $N \rightarrow \infty$, after rescaling the generators $\hat{T}_{lm}^{(N)} \rightarrow (N/i)^{1/2} \hat{T}_{lm}^{(N)}$, they satisfy the following Lie brackets:

$$[\hat{L}_{lm}, \hat{L}_{l'm'}] = f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''} \hat{L}_{l''m''} \quad (A4)$$

where $\hat{L}_{lm} \equiv \hat{T}_{lm}^{(N \rightarrow \infty)}$ and coefficients $f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''}$ are $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit of $f_{lm,l'm'}^{(N)l''m''}$. In addition, it is shown [27] that \hat{L}_{lm} can be expanded with to spherical harmonic functions $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$ defined on a sphere, i.e. the manifold associated to $SU(2)$:

$$\hat{L}_{lm} = \frac{\partial Y_{lm}}{\partial \cos \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} - \frac{\partial Y_{lm}}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \cos \theta} \quad (A5)$$

$$\hat{L}_{lm} Y_{l'm'} = -\{Y_{lm}, Y_{l'm'}\} = -f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''} Y_{l''m''} \quad (A6)$$

$$\{f, g\} \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial \cos \theta} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \phi} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \cos \theta}, \quad \forall f, g \text{ defined on the sphere} \quad (A7)$$

where $\theta = [0, \pi]$ and $\phi = [0, 2\pi]$ are angular coordinates and $\{f, g\}$ is the Poisson bracket of continuous functions f and g on the sphere. We notice that although generators \hat{L}_{lm} are linear combination of $\partial/\partial \cos \theta$ and $\partial/\partial \phi$, the latter operators cannot be considered as generators of $SU(N \rightarrow \infty)$ because they commute with each other and only generate an abelian subspace of $SU(\infty)$ group.

Using (A5) to (A7), coefficients $f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''}$ can be determined:

$$f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''} = \frac{(2l''+1)}{4\pi} \int d\Omega Y_{l''m''}^* \{Y_{lm}, Y_{l'm'}\}, \quad Y_{lm}^* = Y_{l,-m} \quad d\Omega \equiv d(\cos \theta) d\phi \quad (A8)$$

Here we normalize Y_{lm} such that:

$$\int d\Omega Y_{l'm'}^* Y_{lm} = \frac{4\pi}{(2l+1)} \delta_{ll'} \delta_{mm'} \quad (A9)$$

Although \hat{L}_{lm} is defined in discrete (l, m) space - analogous to a discrete Fourier mode - we can use inverse expansion to define operators which depend only on continuous angular coordinates:

$$\hat{L}(\theta, \phi) \equiv \sum_{l,m} Y_{lm}^* \hat{L}_{lm} \quad (A10)$$

As $\{\hat{L}(\theta, \phi)\}$ are linear in \hat{L}_{lm} and contain all these generators, they are also generators of $SU(N \rightarrow \infty) \cong \text{Diff}(S_2)$ and coefficients in their Lie bracket can be expressed with respect to θ and ϕ :

$$\mathfrak{f}((\theta, \phi), (\theta', \phi'); (\theta'', \phi'')) = \sum_{lm,l'm',l''m''} Y_{lm}^*(\theta, \phi) Y_{l'm'}^*(\theta', \phi') Y_{l''m''}(\theta'', \phi'') f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''} \quad (A11)$$

Coefficients \mathbf{f} are anti-symmetric with respect to the first two sets of parameters and can be considered as a 2-form on the sphere. Lie algebra of $\hat{L}(\theta, \phi)$ operators can be written as:

$$[\hat{L}(\theta_1, \phi_1), \hat{L}(\theta_2, \phi_2)] = \int d\Omega_3 \mathbf{f}((\theta_1, \phi_1), (\theta_2, \phi_2); (\theta_3, \phi_3)) \hat{L}(\theta_3, \phi_3) \quad (\text{A12})$$

Operators $\hat{L}(\theta, \phi)$ can be considered as continuous limit of \hat{L}_{lm} 's and both set of generators are vectors and live on the tangent space of the sphere.

Appendix E. Cartan decomposition of $SU(\infty)$

Representations of $su(N)$ algebra can be decomposed to direct sum of smaller su algebras, see e.g. [109] and references therein. In the case of $SU(\infty)$ the fact that its algebra is homomorphic to Poisson brackets of spherical harmonic functions, which in turn correspond to representations of $SU(2) \cong SO(3)$, means that $su(\infty)$ algebra should be expandable as direct sum of representations of $SU(2)$, see e.g. [27,28] for detailed demonstration. Thus, up to a normalization factor depending only on l , generators of $su(\infty)$ algebra \hat{L}_{lm} can be expanded as:

$$\hat{L}_{lm} = \mathcal{R} \sum_{i_\alpha=1, 2, 3, \alpha=1, \dots, l} a_{i_1, \dots, i_l}^{(m)} \sigma_{i_1} \cdots \sigma_{i_l} \quad (\text{A13})$$

where σ_{i_α} 's are $N \rightarrow \infty$ representation of Pauli matrices [27]. Coefficients $a^{(m)}$ are determined from expansion of spherical harmonic functions with respect to spherical description of Cartesian coordinates, see [27] for details. This explicit description shows that up to a constant factor \hat{L}_{lm} operators can be considered as tensor product of 2×2 Pauli matrices, and $SU(\infty) \cong SU(2) \otimes S(2) \otimes \dots$. This relation can be understood from properties of $SU(N)$ group. Notably $SU(N) \supseteq SU(N-K) \otimes SU(K)$. For $N \rightarrow \infty$ and finite K , $SU(N-K \rightarrow \infty) \cong SU(\infty)$. Therefore $SU(\infty)$ is homomorphic to infinite tensor product of SU groups of finite rank, in particular $SU(2)$ - the smallest non-abelian SU group. This shows that $SU(2)$ group, which has a key role in some quantum gravity models, notably in LQG, simply presents a mathematical description rather than a fundamental physical entity. The description of $SU(\infty)$ as tensor product of $SU(2)$ is comparable with Fourier transform, which presents the simplest decomposition to orthogonal functions, but can be replaced by another orthogonal function. It is only the application that determines which one is more suitable.

Appendix E.1. Eigen functions of $\hat{L}(\theta, \phi)$ and \hat{L}_{lm}

We define eigen functions of $\hat{L}(\theta, \phi)$ and \hat{L}_{lm} operators as the followings:

$$\hat{L}(\theta, \phi) \eta(\theta, \phi) = N \eta(\theta, \phi) \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$\hat{L}_{lm} \zeta_{lm} = N' \zeta_{lm} \quad (\text{A15})$$

where N and N' are constants¹⁴. N' may depend on (l, m) . Using definition of $\hat{L}(\theta, \phi)$ and \hat{L}_{lm} and properties of spherical harmonic functions, solutions of equations (A14) and (A15) are:

$$\begin{cases} \eta(\theta, \phi) = iN \sum_{lm} \frac{(l+m)!}{m A_l (l-m)!} [\mathcal{F}_{lm}(\cos \theta) - \mathcal{F}_{lm}(\cos \theta_0(t))] + \eta(\theta_0(t)) \\ \phi + H(\cos \theta) = -[H(\cos \theta_0(t)) - \phi_0(t)] \end{cases} \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$A_l \equiv \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2l+1}} \quad \mathcal{F}_{lm} \equiv \int d(\cos \theta) |P_{lm}(\cos \theta)|^{-2}, \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$H(\cos \theta) \equiv \int d(\cos \theta) \frac{\sum_{lm} \frac{A_l (l-m)!}{(l+m)!} \frac{\partial |P_{lm} \cos \theta|^2}{2 \partial \cos \theta}}{\sum_{l'm'} \frac{im' A_{l'} (l'-m')!}{(l'+m')!} |P_{l'm'}(\cos \theta)|^2} \quad (\text{A18})$$

where t parameterizes tangent surface at initial point (θ_0, ϕ_0) . Elimination of this parameter from two equations in (A16) determines $\eta(\theta, \phi)$ for a set of initial conditions. Because the second equation does not depend on N , without loss of generality we can scale initial value $\eta(\theta_0) \rightarrow iN\eta(\theta_0)$. With this choice the eigen value N can be factorized, and because the Hilbert space is projective, N can be considered as an overall normalization factor and irrelevant for physics. Therefore, each set of parameters (θ, ϕ) present a unique pointer state for the Hilbert space.

In the same way we can calculate eigen functions of \hat{L}_{lm} as a parametric function:

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_{lm}(\theta) = -N' e^{m^2 W_{lm}(\theta_0)} \sqrt{\frac{(l+m)!}{(l-m)!}} [Z_{lm}(\theta) - Z_{lm}(\theta_0(t))] + \zeta_{lm}(\theta_0(t)) \\ \phi - im W_{lm}(\theta) = \phi_0(t) - im W_{lm}(\theta_0(t)) \end{cases} \quad (\text{A19})$$

$$W_{lm} \equiv \int d(\cos \theta) \frac{(1 - \cos \theta^2) P_{lm}(\cos \theta)}{(l-m+1) P_{(l+1)m}(\cos \theta)} - (l+1) P_{lm}(\cos \theta) \quad (\text{A20})$$

$$Z_{lm} \equiv \int d(\cos \theta) \frac{e^{-m^2 W_{lm}(\cos \theta)}}{(l-m+1) P_{(l+1)m}(\cos \theta)} - (l+1) P_{lm}(\cos \theta) \quad (\text{A21})$$

Similar to $\eta(\theta, \phi)$, redefinition of initial value $Z_{lm}(\theta_0(t)) \rightarrow Z_{lm}(\theta_0(t)) N' e^{m^2 W_{lm}(\theta_0)}$ leads to a unique eigen function for \hat{L}_{lm} .

Considering diffeomorphism invariance of the model, it is always possible to redefine coordinates such that $\theta = \text{const.}$ and $\phi = \text{const.}$ constitute a basis and any state can be written as:

$$|\psi\rangle = \int d^2\Omega \psi(\theta, \phi) |\theta, \phi\rangle \quad (\text{A22})$$

Thus, as explained in the main text, vectors of the Hilbert space representing $SU(\infty)$ are complex functions on 2D surfaces. As $SU(\infty) \cong \text{Diff}(S_2)$, the range of (θ, ϕ) is $\theta = [0, \pi]$ and $\phi = [0, 2\pi]$. However, $SU(\infty)$ may be represented by diffeomorphism of 2D surfaces of higher genus. In this case $|\theta + n\pi, \phi + 2n'\pi\rangle$ for any integer n and n' may present different states. States can be also expanded with respect to $|l, m\rangle$ [27].

¹⁴ A priori N and N' can depend on (θ, ϕ) . However, their dependence on angular parameters can be included in η . Therefore, only constant eigen values matter.

Appendix F. Pasteurization of subsystems and Riemann curvature

There are various ways to see that division of the Universe defined in Sec. 2 to subsystems will induce a new continuous parameter. Considering that each subsystem represent $SU(\infty) \times G$ as discussed in Sec. 4, when $SU(\infty)$ representation of different subsystems are compared, e.g. through a morphism, the radius of S_2 which its area preserving diffeomorphism represents $SU(\infty)$ becomes relevant, because different radius means different area. This dependence allows to classify subsystems according to a size scale. More precisely, in definition of \hat{L}_{lm} in (A5), $Y_{lm} \propto r^l$, where r is the distance to center in spherical coordinates when the 2D surface is embedded in $R^{(3)}$. If we factorize the r term from Y_{lm} , the algebra of \hat{L}_{lm} defined in (A4) becomes:

$$[\hat{L}_{lm}, \hat{L}_{l'm'}] = r^{l''-l'-l} f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''} \hat{L}_{l''m''} \quad (\text{A23})$$

where all \hat{L}_{lm} operators are defined for $r = 1$ (in an arbitrary unit). Equation (A23) shows that r can be interpreted as a coupling which quantifies the strength of correlation between \hat{L}_{lm} operators. Moreover, as $SU(\infty)^n \cong SU(\infty) \forall n$, \hat{L}_{lm} 's of subsystems are part of \hat{L}_{lm} 's of the full system. Consequently, subsystems are never completely isolated and interact through an algebra similar to (A23), but their r factors can be different.

In conclusion, after the division of the Universe to subsystems, parameter space of the model becomes 3D and matrix density and amplitudes in (3) will depend on a third continuous parameter $r = (0, \infty)$. Despite the division, subsystems continue to interact through exchange of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry mediator. Thus, this interaction is universal and can be identified with gravity. Moreover, Lagrangian of subsystems defined in (9) respects equivalence principle. Nonetheless, subsystems are distinguishable through their representation of G group.

In classical gravity and in QFT in curved spacetimes Lagrangians include Riemann curvature as purely gravitational term. Therefore, it is important to investigate how the fully quantum model proposed here relates to classical gravity in these models. In particular, how its Lagrangian is related to the Riemann curvature of classical spacetime. This is a nontrivial task because by construction, when $\hbar/M_P \rightarrow 0$ the gravitation term in the Lagrangian (9) cancels. Therefore, we must find an indirect strategy permitting to see how an observer, who does not have the possibility to detect quantum effects of gravity in scales comparable to \hbar/M_P , may perceive the Universe. We leave this investigation for a future work. Here we only explain how a curved parameter space arises in the model.

In Sec. 4.3 we explained how 2D Riemann curvature arises in full Universe Lagrangian when one uses differential representation of \hat{L}_{lm} . Here we describe how the 3+1 parameter space becomes curved when the Universe is divided to subsystems and a clock is defined. Consider one set of deformed 2D spheres as a set of subsystem states¹⁵ - this is equivalent to application of one member of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry to vacuum state of each subsystem. We order 2D surfaces and define a projection between neighbour surfaces¹⁶ such that if on i^{th} surface the point (θ_i, ϕ_i, r_i) is projected to $(\theta_{i+1}, \phi_{i+1}, r_{i+1})$ on $(i+1)^{th}$ surface, the distance in $R^{(3)}$ between points in an infinitesimal surface $\Delta\Omega_i < \epsilon^2$ containing (θ_i, ϕ_i, r_i) and infinitesimal surface $\Delta\Omega_{i+1} < \epsilon'^2$ containing $(\theta_{i+1}, \phi_{i+1}, r_{i+1})$ approaches zero if $\epsilon, \epsilon' \rightarrow 0$. Then, the path connecting closest points on $\Delta\Omega_i$ and $\Delta\Omega_{i+1}$ define an orthogonal direction in a deformed $S_2 \times R^{(1)} \cong R^{(3)}$. The Riemann curvature of this space can be determined from sectional curvature. When parameter space is extended to include time, a similar procedure relates quantum gravitational term in (9) to Riemann curvature of its (3+1)D parameter space.

¹⁵ As mentioned before, states are smooth functions on the sphere. Here we identify states with surface of the deformed sphere which is a smooth function constrained of (θ, ϕ, r) coordinates.

¹⁶ This projection is isomorphic to a homomorphism between $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_s]$ of subsystems

References

1. Utiyama, R., "Invariant theoretical interpretation of interaction", *Phys. Rev.* **101**, (1956) 1597.
2. Kibble, T.W.B., "Lorentz invariance and the gravitational field", *J. Math. Phys.* **2**, (1961) 212.
3. Coleman, S., Mandula, J., "All possible symmetries of the S matrix", *Phys. Rev.* **159**, (1967) 1251.
4. Haag, R., Lopuszanski, J.T., Sohnius, M., "All possible generators of supersymmetries of the S matrix", *Nucl. Phys. B* **88**, (1975) 257.
5. Percacci, R., "Mixing internal and spacetime transformations: some examples and counterexamples", *J. Phys. A* **41**, (2008) 335403, [[arXiv:0803.0303](#)].
6. Collins, J., Perez, A., Sudarsky, D., Urrutia, L., Vucetich, H., "Lorentz invariance and quantum gravity: an additional fine-tuning problem?", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, (2004) 191301, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0403053](#)].
- 7.
8. Abdo, A., Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., *et al.*, "A limit on the variation of the speed of light arising from quantum gravity effects", *Nature* **462**, (2009) 331, [[arXiv:0908.1832](#)].
9. Wilczek, F., "Riemann-Einstein Structure from Volume and Gauge Symmetry", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, (1998) 4851, [[arXiv:hep-th/9801184](#)].
10. Torres-Gomez, A., Krasnov, K., "Gravity-Yang-Mills-Higgs unification by enlarging the gauge group", *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, (2010) 085003, [[arXiv:0911.3793](#)].
11. Barrett, J.W., Kerr, S., "Gauge gravity and discrete quantum models", [[arXiv:1309.1660](#)]
12. Ashtekar, A., "New Variables for Classical and Quantum Gravity", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, (1986) 2244.
13. Birrell, N.D., Davies, P.C.W., "Quantum fields in curved space", Cambridge University Press (1982).
14. Parker, L., Toms, D., "Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime", Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK (2009).
15. Ziaepour, H., *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **27**, (2012) 1250154, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.3304>[[arXiv:1205.3304](#)].
16. Livine, E.R., "Projected Spin Networks for Lorentz connection: Linking Spin Foams and Loop Gravity", *Class.Quant.Grav.* **19**, (2002) 5525, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0207084](#)].
17. Eppley, K., Hanna, E., "The Necessity of Quantizing the Gravitational Field", *Found. Phys.* **7**, (1977) 51.
18. Ziaepour, H., "And what if gravity is intrinsically quantic ?", *J. Phys.: Conf. Series* **174**, (2009) 012027, [[arXiv:0901.4634](#)].
19. Barrow, J.D., Magueijo, J., "A contextual Planck parameter and the classical limit in quantum cosmology", [[arXiv:2006.16036](#)].
20. Ziaepour, H., "Symmetry as a foundational concept in Quantum Mechanics", *J. Phys.: Conf. Series* **626**, (2015) 012074 [[arXiv:1502.05339](#)]
21. Baumgratz, T., Cramer, M., Plenio, M.B., "Quantifying Coherence", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, (2014) 140401, [[arXiv:1311.0275](#)].
22. Mondal, D., Datta, C., Sazim, S., "Quantum Coherence Sets The Quantum Speed Limit For Mixed States", *Phys. Lett. A* **380**, (2016) 689, [[arXiv:1506.03199](#)].
23. Zanardi, P., Lidar, D., Lloyd, S., "Quantum tensor product structures are observable-induced", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, (2004) 060402, [[arXiv:quant-ph/0308043](#)].
24. Mazenc, E.A., Ranard, D., "Target Space Entanglement Entropy", [[arXiv:1910.07449](#)].
25. Page, D.N., Wootters, W.K., "Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables", *Phys. Rev. D* **27**, (1983) 2885.
26. Hoehn, P.A., Smith, A.R.H., Lock, M.P.E., "The Trinity of Relational Quantum Dynamics", [[arXiv:1912.00033](#)].
27. Hoppe, J., "Quantum theory of a massless relativistic surface and a two-dimensional bound state problem", Ph.D. thesis, MIT (1982), Aachen preprint PITHA86/24.
28. Floratos, E.G., Iliopoulos, J., Tiktopoulos, G., "A note on $SU(\infty)$ classical Yang-Mills theories", *Phys. Lett. B* **217**, (1989) 285.
29. Hoppe, J., "Diffeomorphism, Group, Quantization, and $SU(\infty)$ ", *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **4**, (1989) 5235.
30. Hoppe, J., Schaller, P., "Infinitely Many Versions of $SU(\infty)$ ", *Phys. Lett. B* **237**, (1990) 407.

31. Zunger, Y., “Why Matrix theory works for oddly shaped membranes”, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, (2001) 086003, [[arXiv:hep-th/0106030](#)].
32. Kitaev, A., “Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond”, [[arXiv:cond-mat/0506438](#)].
33. Nakamura, J., Liang, S., Gardner, G.C., Manfra, M.J., “Direct observation of anyonic braiding statistics at the $\nu = 1/3$ fractional quantum Hall state”, [[arXiv:2006.14115](#)].
34. Arkani-Hamed, N., Motl, L., Nicolis, A., Vafa, C., “The String Landscape, Black Holes and Gravity as the Weakest Force”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **06**, (2007) 060, [[arXiv:hep-th/0601001](#)].
35. Mandelstam, L., Tamm, I., *J. Phys. (USSR)* **9**, (1945) 1.
36. Jacobson, T., “Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, (1995) 1260, [[arXiv:gr-qc/9504004](#)].
37. Rosenfeld, L., “Zur Quantelung der Wellenfelder”, *Annal der Physik* **397**, (1930) 113.
38. Rocci, A., “On first attempts to reconcile quantum principles with gravity”, *J. Phys.: Conf. Series* **470**, (2013) 012004, [[arXiv:1309.7336](#)].
39. Dewitt, B., “Quantum Theory of Gravity. I. The Canonical Theory”, *Phys. Rev.* **160**, (1967) 1113.
40. Hartle, J.B., Hawking, S.W., “Wave function of the Universe”, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, (1983) 2960.
41. Arnowitt, R., Deser, S., Misner, C., “Dynamical Structure and Definition of Energy in General Relativity”, *Phys. Rev.* **116**, (1959) 1322, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0405109](#)].
42. Dirac, P., “Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics”, *Proc.Roy.Soc.Lond. A* **246**, (1958) 326.
43. Rovelli, C., “Quantum Gravity”, Cambridge University Press (2004).
44. Ashtekar, A., Lewandowski, J., “Background Independent Quantum Gravity: A Status Report”, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **21**, (2004) R53, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0404018](#)].
45. Wang, C. H., Rodrigues D.P.F., “Closing the gaps in quantum space and time: Conformally augmented gauge structure of gravitation”, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, (2018) 124041 [[arXiv:1810.01232](#)].
46. Crnkovic, C., “Symplectic geometry of covariant phase space”, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **5**, (1988) 1557.
47. Migdal, A.A., “Quantum Gravity as Dynamical Triangulation”, in “Two Dimensional Quantum Gravity and Random Surfaces”, pp. 41-79, Edited By: D J Gross, T Piran and S Weinberg, World Scientific (1991).
48. Ambjorn, J., Carfora, M., Marzuoli, A., “The Geometry of Dynamical Triangulations”, Springer (1997).
49. Ambjørn, J., Görlich, A., Jurkiewicz, J., Loll R., “Quantum Gravity via Causal Dynamical Triangulations”, In: “Springer Handbook of Spacetime.”, Ashtekar A., Petkov V. (eds), Springer Handbooks. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2014), [[arXiv:1302.2173](#)].
50. Ambjorn, J., Gizbert-Studnicki, J., Goerlich, A., Jurkiewicz, J., Loll, R., “Renormalization in quantum theories of geometry”, [[arXiv:2002.01693](#)].
51. Sorkin, R.D., “A Unitary Substitute for Continuous Topology”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **30**, (1991) 923.
52. Dowker, F., “Causal sets and the deep structure of spacetime”, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0508109](#)].
53. Mattingly, D., “Causal sets and conservation laws in tests of Lorentz symmetry”, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, (2008) 125021, [[arXiv:0709.0539](#)].
54. Dowker, F., Sorkin, R.D., “Symmetry-breaking and zero-one law”, to appear in *Class.Quant.Grav.* **20 March**, (2020) [[arXiv:1909.06070](#)].
55. Polyakov, A.M., “Quantum geometry of bosonic string”, *Phys. Lett. B* **103**, (1981) 207.
56. Polyakov, A.M., “Quantum geometry of fermionic string”, *Phys. Lett. B* **103**, (1981) 211.
57. Green, M.B., Schwarz, J.H., Witten, E., “Superstring theory I & II”, Cambridge University Press, (1987).
58. Polchinski, J., “String theory I & II”, Cambridge University Press, (2005).
59. Kaluza, Th., *Sitz. Preuss. Akad.* **K1**, (1921) 966.
60. Klein, D., *Z. Phys.* **37**, (1926) 895.
61. Nakamura, S., Yamaguchi, M., “Gravitino Production from Heavy Moduli Decay and Cosmological Moduli Problem Revived”, *Phys. Lett. B* **638**, (2006) 389, [[arXiv:hep-ph/0602081](#)].
62. Davis, S.C., Postma, M., “Successfully combining SUGRA hybrid inflation and moduli stabilisation”, *J. Cosmol. Astrop. Phys.* **0804**, (2008) 022, [[arXiv:0801.2116](#)].
63. Shih, D., “Pseudomoduli Dark Matter”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **0909**, (2009) 046, [[arXiv:0906.3346](#)].

64. Dimopoulos, K., Axenides, M., “Hybrid Inflation without Flat Directions and without Primordial Black Holes”, *J. Cosmol. Astrop. Phys.* **0506**, (2005) 008, [[arXiv:hep-ph/0310194](#)].
65. Planck Collaboration; “Planck 2018 results. IX. Constraints on primordial non-Gaussianity, [[arXiv:1905.05697](#)].
66. Maldacena, J., “Non-Gaussian features of primordial fluctuations in single field inflationary models”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **0305**, (2003) 013, [[arXiv:astro-ph/0210603](#)].
67. Kinney, W.H., Vagnozzi, S., Visinelli, L., “The zoo plot meets the swampland: mutual (in)consistency of single-field inflation, string conjectures, and cosmological data”, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **36**, (2019) 117001, [[arXiv:1808.06424](#)].
68. Vafa, C., “The String Landscape and the Swampland”. [[arXiv:hep-th/0509212](#)].
69. Susskind, L., “Dynamics of spontaneous symmetry breaking in the Weinberg-Salam theory”, *Phys. Rev. D* **20**, (1979) 2619.
70. Bousso, R., “The Cosmological Constant Problem, Dark Energy, and the Landscape of String Theory”, proceedings of “Subnuclear Physics: Past, Present and Future”, Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Vatican (October 2011), [[arXiv:1203.0307](#)].
71. Kumar, J., “A Review of Distributions on the String Landscape”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **21**, (2006) 3441, [[arXiv:hep-th/0601053](#)].
72. Steinacker, H., “Emergent Gravity from Noncommutative Gauge Theory”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **0712**, (2007) 049, [[arXiv:0708.2426](#)].
73. Banks, T., Johnson, M., Shomer, A., “A note on Gauge Theories Coupled to Gravity”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **0609**, (2006) 049, [[arXiv:hep-th/0606277](#)].
74. Randall, L., Sundrum, R., “A Large Mass Hierarchy from a Small Extra Dimension”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, (1999) 3370, [[arXiv:hep-ph/9905221](#)].
75. Randall, L., Sundrum, R., “An Alternative to Compactification”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, (1999) 4690, [[arXiv:hep-th/9906064](#)].
76. Steinhardt, P.J., “General considerations of the cosmological constant and the stabilization of moduli in the brane-world picture”, *Phys. Lett. B* **462**, (1999) 41, [[arXiv:hep-th/9907080](#)].
77. Deffayet, C., Dvali, G., Gabadadze, G., “Accelerated Universe from Gravity Leaking to Extra Dimensions”, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, (2002) 044023, [[arXiv:astro-ph/0105068](#)].
78. Buettner, D.J., Morley, P.D., Schmidt, I., “Review of Spectroscopic Determination of Extra Spatial Dimensions in the Early Universe”, in “Recent Research Developments in Astronomy and Astrophysics”, Ed. Pandalai, S. G., (2003), [[arXiv:astro-ph/0312425](#)].
79. Alcaniz, J.S., Zhu, Z-H, “Complementary Constraints on Brane Cosmology”, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, (2005) 083513, [[arXiv:astro-ph/0411604](#)].
80. Lazkoz, R., Maartens, R., Majerotto, E., “Observational constraints on phantom-like braneworld cosmologies”, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, (2006) 083510, [[arXiv:astro-ph/0605701](#)].
81. Dubovsky, S.L., Rubakov, V.A., Tinyakov, P.G., “Brane world: disappearing massive matter”, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, (2000) 105011 [[arXiv:hep-th/0006046](#)].
82. Dubovsky, S.L., Rubakov, V.A., Tinyakov, P.G., “Is the electric charge conserved in brane world?”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **0008**, (2000) 041, [[arXiv:hep-ph/0007179](#)].
83. Dubovsky, S.L., Rubakov, V.A., “On models of gauge field localization on a brane”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **16**, (2001) 4331, [[arXiv:hep-th/0105243](#)].
84. Dvali, G., Gabadadze, G., Shifman, M., “(Quasi)Localized Gauge Field on a Brane: Dissipating Cosmic Radiation to Extra Dimensions?”, *Phys. Lett. B* **497**, (2001) 271, [[arXiv:hep-th/0010071](#)].
85. Ziaepour, H., “Color Glass Condensate in Brane Models or Don’t Ultra High Energy Cosmic Rays Probe 1015eV Scale?”, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **20**, (2005) 419, [[arXiv:hep-ph/0407046](#)].
86. Ziaepour, H., “QCD Color Glass Condensate Model in Warped Brane Models”, *Grav.Cosmol.Suppl.* **11**, (2005) 189, [[arXiv:hep-ph/0412314](#)].
87. Hong, D-K., Hsu, S.D.H., “Holography, Entropy and Extra Dimensions”, *Phys. Lett. B* **591**, (2004) 208, [[arXiv:hep-ph/0308290](#)].

88. Creek, S., Gregory, R., Kanti, P., Mistry, B., “Braneworld stars and black holes”, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **23**, (2006) 6633, [[arXiv:hep-th/0606006](#)].
89. CMS Collaboration, “Search for microscopic black hole signatures at the Large Hadron Collider”, *Phys. Lett. B* **697**, (2011) 434, [[arXiv:1012.3375](#)].
90. Dvali, G., Gomez, C., Mukhanov, S., “Probing Quantum Geometry at LHC”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **1102**, (2011) 012, [[arXiv:1006.2466](#)].
91. Dvali, G., Folkerts, S., Germani, C., “Physics of Trans-Planckian Gravity”, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, (2011) 024039, [[arXiv:1006.0984](#)].
92. Dvali, G., Giudice, G.F., Gomez, C., Kehagias, A., “UV-Completion by Classicalization”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **08**, (2011) 108, [[arXiv:1010.1415](#)].
93. Padmanabhan, T., “Gravity and the Thermodynamics of Horizons”, *Phys. Rep.* **406**, (2005) 49, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0311036](#)].
94. Verlinde, E.P., “On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton”, *J. High Ener. Phys.* **1104**, (2011) 029, [[arXiv:1001.0785](#)].
95. Hu, B.L., “Can Spacetime be a Condensate?”, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **44**, (2005) 1785, [[arXiv:gr-qc/0503067](#)].
96. Sindoni, L., “Emergent gravitational dynamics from multi-BEC hydrodynamics?”, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, (2011) 024022, [[arXiv:1011.4411](#)].
97. ’t Hooft, G., “Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity”, [[arXiv:gr-qc/9310026](#)].
98. Van Raamsdonk, M., “Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement”, *Gen. Rel. Grav* **42**, (2010) 2323, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **19**, (2020) 2429, [[arXiv:1005.3035](#)].
99. Jacobson, T., “Gravitation and vacuum entanglement entropy”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **21**, (2012) 1242006, [[arXiv:1204.6349](#)].
100. Cao, C., Carroll, S.M., Michalakis, S., “Space from Hilbert Space: Recovering Geometry from Bulk Entanglement”, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, (2017) 024031, [[arXiv:1606.08444](#)].
101. Piazza, F., “Glimmers of a pre-geometric perspective”, *Found. Phys.* **40**, (2010) 239, [[arXiv:hep-th/0506124](#)].
102. Eichhorn, A., Koslowski, T., Lumma, J., Pereira, A.D., “Towards background independent quantum gravity with tensor models”, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **36**, (2019) 15, [[arXiv:1811.00814](#)].
103. Maldacena, J.M., “The Large N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity”, *Adv.Theor.Math.Phys* **2**, (1998) 231, [[arXiv:hep-th/9711200](#)].
104. Donnelly, W., Giddings, S.B., “Diffeomorphism-invariant observables and their nonlocal algebra”, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, (2016) 024030, [[arXiv:1507.07921](#)].
105. Giddings, S.B., “Quantum-first gravity”, *Found. Phys.* **49**, (2019) 177, [[arXiv:1803.04973](#)].
106. Dirac, P.A.M., “The Principles of Quantum Mechanics”, Oxford University Press (1958).
107. Von Neumann, J., “Mathematical Foundation of Quantum Theory”, Princeton University Press, (1955).
108. Kiefer, C., “On the interpretation of quantum theory - from Copenhagen to the present day”, [[arXiv:quant-ph/0210152](#)].
109. Su, Z-Y, “A Scheme of Cartan Decomposition for $su(N)$ ”, [[arXiv:quant-ph/0603190](#)].