

Comparing Quantum Gravity Models: String Theory, Loop Quantum Gravity, and Entanglement gravity versus $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

Houri Ziaeeepour^{a,b1}

^aInstitut UTINAM, CNRS UMR 6213, Observatoire de Besançon, Université de Franche Comté, 41 bis ave. de l'Observatoire, BP 1615, 25010 Besançon, France

^bMullard Space Science Laboratory, University College London, Holmbury St. Mary, GU5 6NT, Dorking, UK

Abstract

In a previous work [1] we proposed a new model for Quantum Gravity(QGR) and cosmology, dubbed $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, because it is assumed that Hilbert spaces of the Universe and its subsystems represent $SU(\infty)$ symmetry group. The classical spacetime is interpreted as the parameter space of their representations and it is demonstrated that its dimension is 3+1. Here we compare $SU(\infty)$ -QGR with several QGR proposals, including: string theory, background independent models such as loop quantum gravity, and models inspired by holographic principle and quantum entanglement. The purpose is to find their common and analogous features, even if they apparently have different roles and interpretations. The hope is that such exercise gives a better understanding of gravity as a universal force in a quantum Universe and clarify the physical nature of spacetime. We identify several common features: Importance of 2D surfaces; Algebraic decomposition to tensor products; $SU(2)$ symmetry group; Necessity of a quantum time as a relational observable. We discuss how these features can be considered as analogous in different models. All these properties arise naturally in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR from its initial axioms without fine-tuning, additional assumptions, or restrictions.

¹Email: houriziaeepour@gmail.com

Contents

1	Introduction and results	3
1.1	Summary of comparison results	5
2	A brief review of $SU(\infty)$-QGR	6
2.1	Axioms and algebra	6
2.1.1	$SU(2)$ in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR	7
2.2	Subsystems of the Universe	7
2.2.1	Parameter space of subsystems	8
2.3	Relation to classical geometry and Einstein equation	8
2.3.1	Lorentz invariance of parameter space	9
2.4	Evolution of quantum subsystems	9
2.4.1	Projection of quantum evolution into its parameter space	10
3	Comparison with other quantum gravity proposals	10
3.1	Background independent models	11
3.1.1	Regge discrete geometry	11
3.1.2	Ponzano-Regge 3D QGR	11
3.1.3	Ashtekar variable and Loop Quantum Gravity	11
3.1.4	$SU(2)$ symmetry, degeneracies and observables in LQG	12
3.1.5	Analogies between foundations of LQG and related models with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR	12
3.1.6	Hilbert spaces of LQG and related models	12
3.1.7	Kinematical and physical Hilbert spaces and reality conditions	13
3.1.8	Time and matter in LQG	13
3.1.9	Non-perturbative characteristic of LQG and related models	14
3.1.10	Outline of comparison between background independent models and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR	14
3.2	Quantum approaches to QGR	14
3.2.1	Modified quantum mechanics and locality	15
3.2.2	QGR from locality and causality	15
3.2.3	Comparison of LQFT-QGR with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR	16
3.2.4	QGR and emergent spacetime from entropy and holography	17
3.2.5	Entanglement-Based Models (EBM) of quantum gravity	17
3.2.6	Comparison of EBM with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR	18
3.3	String theory and AdS/CFT duality in 3 and higher dimensions	20
3.3.1	Comparison with string theories	20

1 Introduction and results

Several questions about gravity and spacetime remain unanswered by general relativity or by various attempts to find a consistent quantum description for gravitational interaction. The most daunting of these issues are the dimension of spacetime, which is usually considered to be the observed (3+1) value without any explanation for its origin. Moreover, general relativity and Einstein gravity do not specify what is the nature of spacetime, except that it is curved in presence of matter and energy. Most QGR models treat spacetime as a physical entity, which despite being coupled to matter, has an independent existence. Indeed, often quantization of gravitational interaction, which is necessary in a Universe with quantum matter [2], is interpreted as inevitability of a quantized spacetime. There are, however, multiple evidence in both classical and quantum physics against this conclusion:

- In general relativity the only frame independent measurable is the Ricci scalar curvature. All other quantities related to the geometry of spacetime depend on the choice of coordinates and metric, which due to the diffeomorphism symmetry are frame and gauge dependent. For example, a distance cannot be attributed to a point, unless an origin is specified.
- It is demonstrated [3] that Einstein equation can be obtained from the second law of thermodynamics and holographic principle - proportionality of entropy inside a null (light-like) surface to its area rather than volume [4, 5, 6, 7]. Holographic behaviour has been also observed in many-body systems with negligible gravity [8, 9]. These observations confirm the conclusion of [3] that Einstein equation should be considered as equation of state. This interpretation and universality of gravitational interaction imply that what is perceived as *space* and its geometrical properties, such as distance and curvature, represent the state of its matter content. Thus, it seems that spacetime and matter are inseparable aspects of the same physical reality/entity.
- Even without holograph principle, the fact that energy-momentum tensor of matter - the source of gravitational interaction - depends on the spacetime metric means that spacetime and matter are more intertwined than, for instance, bosonic gauge fields and their matter source in Yang-Mills models.
- In Quantum Field Theory (QFT) spacetime or its dual energy-momentum mode space (but not both at the same time) are used as *indices* to keep trace of the continuum of matter and radiation *particles*. Giving the fact that in a quantum realm the classical vacuum - the apparently empty space between particles - can be described as a sea of virtual - off-shell - quantum particles, means that we could completely neglect the *physical space* - the perceived 3-dimensional space. This were possible if we could identify, tag, and order all real and virtual particles, for instance by using the strength of their mutual quantum entanglement [10, 11, 12, 13, 21] or interaction strength [17]. In this view, the classical Einstein equation could be interpreted as an equation of state, which dynamically modifies parameter (index) space according to variation of interaction and entanglement between particles, and with respect to a relational quantum clock [14].
- It is useful to remind that in most QGR models the dimension of spacetime is considered as a parameter and little attempt is made to explain why it has the observed value.

In the last decade or so progress in quantum information theory has motivated construction of QGR models which are not based on the quantization of a classical theory. They are sometimes called *Quantum First* models in the literature [16]. In [1, 15] we proposed a model for a quantum Universe

which can be classified in this category. Here we call it $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. A brief review of this model is given in Sec. 2. It is a fundamentally quantum model, in the sense that its axioms come from quantum physics and its formulation is not a quantized version of a classical model. It does not include in its foundation, neither explicitly nor implicitly, a background spacetime or ingredients from Einstein general relativity, such as entropy-area relation. It is shown that both spacetime and Einstein equation emerge from quantum properties. The physical space is identified with the space of indices parameterizing Hilbert and Fock spaces of the Universe and its subsystems. Einstein equation presents the projection of relational evolution of subsystems on the parameter space.

In other Quantum First proposals usually a background spacetime is implicitly present in their axioms. Examples of such models are those described in [12, 17]. There is also implicit assumption of a physical space in models based on the holographic principle - a hypothesis inspired from semi-classical general relativity [18, 19] - such as [13, 21]. Indeed, it is obvious that holography without a geometrical space is meaningless. By contrast, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR physical space and time genuinely emerge from quantum structure of the model and the assumption that any physical entity must be inside the Universe.

Quantum First QGRs and other modern approaches to QGR at first sight seem very different from each others. However, history of science is full of cases where seemingly different theories and interpretations were finally turned up to present the same physical concept viewed in different perspectives. The best example is Schrödinger's wave mechanics and Heisenberg's matrix mechanics approaches to quantum mechanics, which were later proved to be equivalent. For this reason, any new theory should look for what it has in common with other relevant models, and what new concept or interpretation it is proposing. Such verification is particularly necessary for new QGR proposals, because it has been under intensive investigation for close to a century. Moreover, giving the fact that at present none of the proposals is fully satisfactory or has observational support, a better understanding of common aspects of different candidates may provide a direction and path to further developments, and eventually to the true model, unless all the proposals are completely irrelevant.

In this work we compare $SU(\infty)$ -QGR with some of popular approaches to QGR, namely: symplectic models, including Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) and related models; string theory and the closely related Anti-de Sitter-Conformal Field Theory (AdS/CFT) duality - more generally gauge-gravity duality; and models based on the holographic principle and quantum entanglement. We do not consider more traditional approaches such as canonical quantization [44, 45, 24] (see e.g. [46, 26] for a review) and ADM 3+1 method [27]. After decades of research, it is now clear that they do not lead to a consistent and renormalizable theory. Although our purpose is to find similarities and analogous features of these models, this investigation also clarify their principle differences, which may be equally useful for further theoretical development, and eventually discriminating or constraining these models in experiments and observations.

We begin by presenting a summary of the results of this work in the following subsection. In Sec. 2 and its subsections we briefly review $SU(\infty)$ -QGR and show that the common features of QGR models arise naturally and without fine tuning or addition of new assumptions to the initial axioms. Details of the comparison between models are discussed in Sec. 3. For each model we first briefly remind its main features, then compare them with those of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. It is obvious that detailed and technical description of models and their variants, about which in some cases thousands of papers and numerous text books are written, is out of the scope of the present work. The aim of short reminds here is to introduce features and notations used for the comparison with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. Sec. 3.1 reviews several background independent QGR models, including Ponzano-Regge model and Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG). Quantum First models are reviewed and compared with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR in Sec. 3.2. We compare string theory and gauge-gravity duality conjecture with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR in Sec. 3.3. A short outline is given in Sec. 4

1.1 Summary of comparison results

Form comparison of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR proposal with some of other approaches to QGR we recognize a series of similar aspects, symmetries and structures, which despite their different roles and interpretations in different models, can be considered as analogous and common. If these candidates of QGR contain at least some of features and properties of the true theory, they should be most probably reflected in these shared properties. The common features that we found in the models investigated in Sec. 3 can be summarized as the followings:

- Presence of 2-dimensional spaces or structures in the construction of models;

In some models 2D spaces are used to construct a quantized space, either as a symplectic geometry or as an extended object embedded in a multi-dimensional space. They are usually postulated and considered as a physical entity, except in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, in which the 2D space emerges from axioms and symmetries, and can be considered as a property rather than being a physical object. Notice that the issue of what makes an abstract entity a *physical* object is rather philosophical. In practice in mathematical formulations of physical phenomena all entities are abstract, but related to what can be measured. Thus, in this sense they can be considered as *physical*.

- Decomposition to an algebraic tensor product;

By definition, the Hilbert space of composite quantum systems is decomposed to tensor product of the Hilbert spaces of their subsystems [28]. Therefore, it is normal that an algebraic tensor product structure emerges, in one way or another, in the construction of QGR models of the Universe. However, the most crucial tensor product structures in most QGR models are related to a symplectic geometry and quantization of space. For this reason, they have to be considered together and cannot be interpreted as separable subsystems. Such models do not have a proper perturbative description. By contrast, in some models, for instance in string theory, tensor products emerge in separation of compactified and non-compactified fields. The former generates the spacetime and the latter internal symmetries of low energy effective fields. This can be interpreted as regarding spacetime and particles/matter fields as separate subsystems. However, such formulation is only valid perturbatively and a non-perturbative description for the model is not known for sure. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the tensor product of $SU(\infty)$ and a finite rank group presents separation of *internal* symmetry, which according to [28] allows to distinguish subsystems, from symmetry due to the similarity and indistinguishability of infinite number of subsystem with similar internal properties. The tensor product grants the existence of a perturbative expansion. On the other hand, as $SU(\infty) \times G \cong SU(\infty)$, the model has also a non-perturbative limit.

- $SU(2)$ group and spin network;

$SU(2)$ symmetry and/or its representations have a special role in most QGR models. In particular, they intervene in the construction of quantized geometry, because $SU(2) \cong SO(3)$ is the coordinate symmetry of the physical space.. Exceptions are string theory and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. Although $SU(2)$ group and its representations are extensively used in the formulation of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, it remains a purely mathematical utility without prior connection to the structure of classical spacetime.

- A hidden or explicit $SU(\infty)$ symmetry;

In models based on the symplectic construction of space, the number of cells - usually tetrahedra - has to be considered to go to infinity to obtain a continuum at large distance scales - low energies. As these cells are indistinguishable from each others, the Hilbert space and dynamics of these models is invariant under $SU(\infty)$ group defined on \mathbb{R} , rather than \mathbb{C}

considered in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR . String-gauge duality conjecture [29, 30, 31] identifies Yang-Mills models with large number of colors N_c with string states. For $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ the symmetry of the Yang-Mills theory is $SU(\infty)$. Decomposition of $SU(\infty)$ to tensor products of $SU(2)$ explains why this symmetry plays a crucial role in many QGR models (and also in classical physics). On the other hand, the symmetry between fundamental (*atomic*) structures in these models means that another symmetry is necessary for being able to define subsystems.

- Emergence of time and evolution as relative and relational phenomena.

A relational clock and associated time parameter is necessary in the most QGR approaches except in string theory, in which time, space and matter are treated in a same manner and are included in the foundation of the models.

These common properties demonstrate that despite their apparent differences QGR candidates are more similar than probably expected. Giving the fact that these features are all present in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR may be the evidence that this model has the potential to be the enveloping theory of QGR proposals considered here. Of course, it is a new theory and much more must be done and understood about it before such a claim can be taken seriously. In particular, its predictions for the puzzle of black hole information loss and for future gravitational quantum decoherence experiments should be investigated.

2 A brief review of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

In this section we briefly summarize axioms, structure, and constituents of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR . Only mathematical formulations necessary for the comparison with other QGR models are presented here.

2.1 Axioms and algebra

The $SU(\infty)$ -QGR is based on 3 well motivated assumptions:

1. Quantum mechanics is valid at all scales and applies to every entity, including the Universe as a whole;
2. Any quantum system is described by its symmetries and its Hilbert space represents them;
3. The Universe has infinite number of independent degrees of freedom, that is mutually commuting observables.

The last assumption means that the Hilbert space of the Universe \mathcal{H}_U is infinite dimensional and represents $SU(\infty)$ symmetry group, that is $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_u] \cong SU(\infty)$, where the sign \cong means homomorphism and $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_u]$ is the space of bounded linear operators acting on \mathcal{H}_U . Generators \hat{L}_{lm} , $l \geq 0$, $|m| \leq l$ of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_u]$ satisfy the Lie algebra:

$$[\hat{L}_{lm}, \hat{L}_{l'm'}] = f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''} \hat{L}_{l''m''} \quad (1)$$

where structure coefficients $f_{lm,l'm'}^{l''m''}$ can be determined using properties of spherical harmonic functions, see e.g. [32] for more details. The reason for this property is that $SU(\infty)$ can be decomposed to tensor products of $SU(2)$:

$$\hat{L}_{lm} = \mathcal{R} \sum_{i_\alpha=1, 2, 3, \alpha=1, \dots, l} a_{i_1, \dots, i_l}^{(m)} \sigma_{i_1} \cdots \sigma_{i_l}, \quad (l, m) \mid l = 0, \dots, \infty; -l \leq m \leq +l \quad (2)$$

where σ_{i_α} 's are $N \rightarrow \infty$ representations of Pauli matrices [32] and \mathcal{R} is a normalization constant. Coefficients $a^{(m)}$ are determined from expansion of spherical harmonic functions with respect to spherical description of Cartesian coordinates [32].

The model is quantized using dual of its Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_U^* and its space of bounded linear operators $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U^*]$:

$$[\hat{L}_a, \hat{J}_b] = -i\delta_{ab}\hbar, \quad \hat{J}_a \in \mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U^*] \quad (3)$$

\hbar is the Planck constant.

It is known that $SU(\infty)$ is homomorphic to area preserving diffeomorphism of compact 2D surfaces [32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. From now on we use the shorthand name *diffeo-surface* for the surfaces which their area preserving diffeomorphism is homomorphic to $SU(\infty)$ of interest. Diffeo-surfaces with different genus correspond to non-equivalent (non-isometric) representations of $SU(\infty)$ [35, 36]. These surfaces, and thereby $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U] \cong SU(\infty)$ are parameterized by two angular parameters (θ, ϕ) . On the other hand, $su(\infty)$ algebra is homomorphic to Poisson bracket of spherical harmonic functions, which for $\hbar = 1$ and dimensionless operators can be written as:

$$\hat{L}_{lm} = i \left(\frac{\partial Y_{lm}}{\partial \cos \theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} - \frac{\partial Y_{lm}}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \cos \theta} \right) = i \sqrt{|g^{(2)}|} \epsilon^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu Y_{lm}) \partial_\nu, \quad \mu, \nu \in \{\theta, \phi\} \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{L}_{lm} Y_{l'm'} = -i \{Y_{lm}, Y_{l'm'}\} = -i f_{lm, l'm'}^{l'' m''} Y_{l'' m''} \quad (5)$$

$$\{f, g\} \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial \cos \theta} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \phi} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \cos \theta}, \quad \forall f, g \quad (6)$$

In this representation of $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_U]$ vectors of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_U are complex functions of (θ, ϕ) . If \hat{L}_{lm} (or equivalently \hat{J}_{lm}) operators are normalized by a constant factor proportional to $\frac{i\hbar}{cM_P}$, where M_P is a mass scale - presumably Planck mass - the r.h.s. commutation relation (1) becomes zero for $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ or $M_P \rightarrow \infty$ and the algebra of observables becomes Abelian, as in the classical mechanics. Thus, only when $\hbar \neq 0$ and $M_P < \infty$ the model presents a quantum system. This property establishes an inherent relationship between gravity and quantumness, as suggested in [37].

2.1.1 $SU(2)$ in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

The symmetry group $SU(2)$ has a special place in many QGR models, including in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR where it is used for Cartan decomposition of $SU(\infty)$ and description of its representations [32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. In particular, it allows to expand members of $SU(\infty)$ as a linear function of spherical harmonic functions, analogous to an infinite spin chain. Consequently, generators of $SU(\infty)$ are described by spin quantum numbers (l, m) . This representation is more suitable for practical applications than abstract complex functions of two angular parameters (θ, ϕ) . Nonetheless, one can easily transform one representation to the other, see e.g. appendices in [1].

We should emphasize that despite the importance of $SU(2)$ for $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, it is not anything more than a mathematical tool. In fact, using the relation:

$$SU(N) \supseteq SU(N - K) \otimes SU(K) \quad (7)$$

the group $SU(\infty)$ can be decomposed to tensor products of any $SU(N)$, $N < \infty$ by repeated application of (7). Decomposition (2) corresponds to the case of $K = 2$. It is the smallest non-Abelian special unitary group which can be used in the Cartan decomposition of $SU(\infty)$.

2.2 Subsystems of the Universe

In [1] it is shown that the quantum Universe as defined in the previous section is static and trivial. This is not a surprise, because there is no time parameter or a subsystem which plays the role of a quantum clock. On the other hand, according to a corollary in a description of quantum mechanics in which symmetry is considered to be foundational [39], this quantum system must inevitably be decomposable to subsystem. To this end, the Hilbert space must be factorized such that subsystems satisfy conditions

defined in [28]. They include, among other things, factorization of the system's symmetry group and its representations. Using properties of $SU(\infty)$ [15], in particular its multiplication [36]:

$$(SU(\infty))^n \cong SU(\infty) \quad \forall n > 0 \quad (8)$$

in [1, 15] it is demonstrated that Hilbert spaces of subsystems have the general form of:

$$\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_s] \cong SU(\infty) \times G \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{H}_s indicates the Hilbert space of a subsystem and G is a finite rank symmetry group. The presence of internal symmetries in the Standard model of particle physics is the main motivation for existence of G . Other motivations are discussed in [1].

2.2.1 Parameter space of subsystems

In addition to the emergence of an *internal* symmetry, the division of this quantum Universe induces a size or more precisely an area scale. Indeed, although the preserved area of one diffeo-surface is irrelevant for its diffeomorphism as representation of $SU(\infty)$ group, it becomes important when parameter spaces of multiple systems with this symmetry, including the Universe as a whole, are compared. This is analogous to comparing finite intervals on a line with each others. An infinite line alone is scale invariant. But lengths of finite intervals can be compared with each others. This operation induces a length scale for the finite intervals and thereby for the whole line. Therefore, after division to subsystems the parameter space of $SU(\infty)$ part of the Hilbert spaces of subsystems will depend on a third dimensionful parameter that we call r . It is measured with respect to a reference subsystem. Diffeo-surfaces of subsystems can be considered to be embedded in this 3D space. Notice that quantum state of a subsystem does not necessarily have a fixed r , and can be a superposition of pointer states with fixed r .

Finally, to make the above setup dynamical, a relational dynamics and evolution à la Page & Woottter [14] or similar methods, see e.g. [40] for a review, can be introduced by selecting one of the subsystems as a quantum clock. Variation of states of other subsystems are compared with the variation of state of the clock and is parameterized by a time parameter t . We interpret this 4D parameter space, which is homomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{(4)}$ as the classical spacetime shared by all subsystems of the Universe. Of course the Hilbert space of every subsystem also has a factor representing its internal symmetry G . As $SU(\infty)$ and G are considered to be orthogonal, their actions are separable and the model after division to subsystems is similar to a Yang-Mills gauge model on the space of parameters, which we identify with the perceived classical spacetime.

2.3 Relation to classical geometry and Einstein equation

Using Mandalestam-Tam uncertainty relation [41], a quantity proportional to quantum fidelity of two close states ρ and $\rho_1 = \rho + d\rho$ of subsystems (except reference and clock) can be defined [1]:

$$ds^2 \equiv Q(\hat{H}, \rho) dt^2 = \text{tr}(\sqrt{d\rho} \sqrt{d\rho}^\dagger), \quad Q(\rho, \hat{H}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} |\text{tr}([\sqrt{\rho}, \hat{H}]^2)| \quad (10)$$

where \hat{H} is a Hamiltonian operator that generates the evolution of subsystems for the selected quantum clock associated to the time parameter t . Notice that here we have assumed that internal symmetry parts of ρ and ρ_1 are the same. We also remind that integrating out reference and clock subsystems makes state of other subsystem mixed and they should be treated as open quantum systems [42].

The infinitesimal quantity ds is a scalar of both the Hilbert space of subsystems and its parameter space. Due to the similarity of ds to affine separation in Riemann geometry in the rest frame of

subsystems, we can identify the two quantities up to an irrelevant normalization constant. Then, in an arbitrary reference frame of the parameter space ds can be expanded as:

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu \quad (11)$$

where x^μ is a point in the parameter space and $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the local metric. Using Mandalestam-Tam inequality, in [1] it is proved that signature of the metric of parameter space - spacetime - must be negative. Notice that the presence of a trace operator in the r.h.s. of (10) means that its l.h.s. is independent of the reference frame of the parameter space. This can be proved by expanding operators ρ and $d\rho$ in an arbitrary basis $|t, r, \theta, \phi\rangle$ of the Hilbert space and calculating the trace in (10). Tracing amounts to integration over parameters (t, r, θ, ϕ) . Thus, ds is independent of spacetime parametrization and coordinates x^μ in (11) should be considered as representative or average parameters of the quantum state ρ .

In general relativity integration over the affine displacement ds generates the world line of the system in the spacetime. Quantum systems do not follow a path. Nonetheless, the world line generated by integration of ds defined in (10) or (11) for the quantum subsystem can be interpreted as projection of the average or maximum probability path of the state in the Hilbert space into the parameter space - the spacetime.

2.3.1 Lorentz invariance of parameter space

A remark about Lorentz invariance of the parameter space is in order. In (11) this property is manifest. But, given the different origins of time, distance, and angular coordinates in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, and their interpretation as classical spacetime, the question arises whether their $\mathbb{R}^{(3+1)}$ space is Lorentz invariant. The answer to this question is positive for following reasons:

- Choices of a quantum clock and a reference subsystem for comparison between diffeo-surfaces are arbitrary. Change of these choices amount to changing corresponding parameters.
- Division to subsystems is not rigid and may change with change of clock and reference subsystem such that they respect necessary conditions defined in [28].
- By definition the ensemble of subsystems must generate the static 2D Universe, which according to $SU(\infty)$ symmetry remains invariant under redefinition of angular parameters. This condition cannot be fulfilled if Lorentz and diffeomorphism invariance are violated.

2.4 Evolution of quantum subsystems

According to symmetry description of quantum mechanics foundation [39], the Universe as a whole is static and in a sort of equilibrium state. Therefore, when it is divided to subsystems, variational principle is applicable to the ensemble of its infinite degrees of freedom - observables/subsystems - to preserve the global equilibrium. Moreover, there must exist a symmetry invariant functional on $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{H}_{U_s}]$, where \mathcal{H}_{U_s} is the Hilbert space of subsystems except reference and clock, to play the role of an *action*. Consequently, the application of variational principle results to a dynamical equation in the Hilbert or Fock space analogous to field equation in QFT.

In [1, 15] we show that in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the action has a structure similar to Yang-Mills theory on a background spacetime for both $SU(\infty)$ and internal symmetry G . The integration on the curved parameter space in the action amounts to tracing on indices of the representation of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of subsystems. This type of models are already studied in the literature in some extend, see e.g. [33, 32] and references therein. In particular, we identify what is called *internal 2D space* by [33] with the diffeo-surfaces of individual subsystems.

A note is in order about the finding that in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR quantum gravity is a Yang-Mills model. This means that its mediator quantum field is a vector - in the parameter space - rather than the observed spin-2 graviton field of the classical Einstein gravity. This apparent contradiction is analogous to the predictions of early models of strong interaction, which due to the confinement of constituent partons, was considered to be similar to a nonlocal and geometrically extended string. We now know that this phenomenological interpretation, which seemed to have observational support, is wrong and the confusion is caused by non-perturbative nature of the QCD interaction at energy scales lower than Λ_{QCD} . In the same manner, as we will discuss in the next subsection, the deformation of spacetime, which in general relativity is interpreted as gravity, is generated by relative variation of quantum states of all constituents of the Universe, and the local metric and curvature of the parameter space - spacetime - present their *average* effect.

2.4.1 Projection of quantum evolution into its parameter space

The symmetry invariant action of the quantum Universe has its analogous in the parameter space, which in the same manner as in the case of affine parameter and the metric in (10), it can be interpreted as describing the dynamics of expectation value of parameters. Using this argument, in [15] we demonstrate that a scalar functional of density matrix $T[\rho]$ should be proportional to a scalar of the parameter space, depending only on its geometry. The only such quantity for a $\mathbb{R}^{(3+1)}$ space is the Ricci scalar R . Indeed, R and $T[\rho]$ are parameter space dual of terms in the Lagrangian of quantum subsystems and construct the classical Lagrangian of Einstein general relativity. The proof in [15] considers the fact that for the whole Universe and its 2D parameter space, any geometrical invariant with such properties must be proportional to the 2D Ricci scalar $R^{(2)}$, and that the integral of $R^{(2)}$ is topological.

This last step finalizes our demonstration that in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR Einstein equation is a property of the parameter space related to the underneath quantum state of the Universe and its matter content. It confirms that Einstein equation should be considered as an equation of state [3] and its quantization and quantization of spacetime are meaningless.

3 Comparison with other quantum gravity proposals

In this section we compare $SU(\infty)$ -QGR with LQG and related models, string theory, AdS/CFT conjecture, and several Quantum First models. This list is far from covering all the QGR models, so do the citations. In particular, noncommutative spacetime models are not discussed because of their significant differences from $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. For each model we remind its main assumptions and results only for the purpose of fixing notations necessary for the comparison with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. We should also remind that $SU(\infty)$ -QGR is a recent and under development proposal and its properties are not yet fully investigated. For this reason its comparison with other QGR models is limited to what is known about it.

As we discussed in the Introduction, due to the close relation between gravity and geometry of spacetime in the classical general relativity and Einstein gravity, finding a quantum model for gravitational interaction has been usually considered to be equivalent to quantization of spacetime as a physical entity. A notable difference between $SU(\infty)$ -QGR and other QGR models is the absence of a quantized background or quantized spacetime. This unique feature becomes fundamental when one tries to compare this model with other QGR proposals. Indeed, a direct comparison cannot be made. Thus, the purpose of this work is to investigate whether there are comparable or analogous features in these models. For instance, $SU(2)$ group is present in the construction of many QGR models, including $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. Our aim is to clarify the origin of these sort of similarities, and investigate whether they are superficial and unrelated, or they reflect deep relation among models, despite their apparent differences.

3.1 Background independent models

Following the failure of coordinate dependent canonical quantization of Einstein-Hilbert equation [43, 44, 45] (see e.g. [46] for a review) and ADM (3+1)D description of Einstein equation and its quantization [27], in 1961 Tullio Regge proposed a discrete but coordinate independent description of Einstein gravity [47]. This model is the basis of most background independent QGR models. For this reason we briefly review it here.

3.1.1 Regge discrete geometry

According to this model a curved two or higher dimensional space can be approximately considered as flat everywhere except on the triangulated 2D surfaces - 2-simplexes. In particular, 3D or (2+1)D curved spaces can be approximated by sticking together tetrahedra with Euclidean or Lorentzian geometry in their bulk. The deficit angle of a vertex in the bulk of space is $\varepsilon = 2\pi - \sum_f \theta_f$ where θ_f is the angle of triangle (face) f attached to vertex v , see e.g. [48] for a review of Regge calculus. For vertices sitting on the boundary of the symplectic surface the deficit angle is $\varepsilon = \pi - \sum_f \theta_f$. The discretized gravity Regge action is:

$$S_{Regge} = \sum_e l_e \varepsilon_e \quad (12)$$

where index e run over all edges, l_e is length of the edge e , and ε_e is the deficit angle of the vertex opposite to it. In Regge action tetrahedra edges can take any positive real value.

3.1.2 Ponzano-Regge 3D QGR

In 1968 Ponzano and Regge proposed a 3D discretized quantum geometry model [49] based on the Regge action S_{Regge} . They showed that if in (12) l_e 's are chosen to be quantized spin, that is $l_e = j_e$, $j_e \in \{0, 1/2, 1, 3/2, \dots\}$ and j_e 's of each face satisfy triangle rule:

$$|j_1 - j_2| \leq j_3 \leq j_1 + j_2 \quad (13)$$

their 6j symbol will be nonzero and approximately equal to the cosine of Regge action.

Partition function of the Ponzano-Regge QGR is constructed from multiplication of the positive exponent of the cosine of Regge action for all tetrahedra, weighted, and summed over all configurations of spins:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{PR} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \leq N} \Lambda^{N_0(N)} \prod_{e \in S_1} (-1)^{2j_e} (2j_e + 1) \prod_{t \in S_3} (-1)^{-\sum_{e=1, \dots, 6} j_e} \left\{ \begin{matrix} j_1 & j_2 & j_3 \\ j_4 & j_5 & j_6 \end{matrix} \right\} \quad (14)$$

Ponzano-Regge discrete quantum gravity was the first evidence of a close relation between gravity in 3D space or (2+1)D spacetime and representations of $SU(2)$ group. This relation was later confirmed by the introduction of Ashtekar variables [50] in the framework of (3+1)D ADM formulation for quantization of gravity. In fact, as we explain in the following sections, the concept of triangulation and associating spins to edges of triangles comes up in one way or another in other QGR models, as well.

3.1.3 Ashtekar variable and Loop Quantum Gravity

Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG) [52, 53] can be considered as continuum limit of symplectic QGR models [51]. It uses ADM (3+1)D formalism with background-independent Ashtekar variables [50]. They consist of a spin connection 2-form $\omega_i^a(x)$, defined on the product of a 3D Euclidean manifold and a $SU(2)$ group manifold - more precisely a $SU(2)$ bundle on a 3D Euclidean manifold - and

triads E_a^i such that $E_a^i E_j^b = \delta_j^i \delta_a^b$ where $i = 1, 2, 3$ is coordinate index of the Euclidean space and $a = 1, 2, 3$ indicates generators of $SU(2)$ symmetry group. They replace coordinates and metric as dynamical variables. In the quantized model their dual variables are respectively E_a^i and gauge field $A_i^a = \omega_i^a + \gamma K_i^a$, where $K_i^a \equiv K_{ij} E^{ja} / \sqrt{|h|}$, K_{ij} is extrinsic curvature tensor of the 3D space, h is determinant of the metric of physical 3D space, and γ is the Immirzi constant [54].

3.1.4 $SU(2)$ symmetry, degeneracies and observables in LQG

Although metric, and thereby coordinates, are apparently present in the definition of Ashtekar variables, their choice do not affect geometry of space and its quantization. The reason is that space curvature is described by $SO(3) \cong SU(2)$ transformation of a rigid frame, rather than deformation of the metric. Specifically, the rigid frame rotates when it is transported across the curved space manifold. On the other hand, the freedom of choice of the rigid frame at each point of the 3D manifold means that its $SO(3) \cong SU(2)$ symmetry is a gauge symmetry. Thus, A_i^a and E_a^i include more degrees of freedom than $g_{\mu\nu}$ in the (3+1)D classical gravity. This is evident from counting the number of components of these fields.

To eliminate degeneracies observables of LQG and spin network (or foam) [55, 56, 57] - its discretized version - are quantized topological quantities generated by Wilson loops [58]. This is why the model is called *Loop* QGR, and one of its most remarkable prediction is the quantization of area [58]. This feature establishes the relation between LQG formulation using continuous Ashtekar variables, spin network as its approximation, and symplectic geometry of Ponzano-Regge: Quantized surfaces have non-trivial $SU(2)$ holonomy and triangulated 3D space à la Regge becomes a manageable approximation, including essential properties of a quantized curved space with meaningful continuum limit.

3.1.5 Analogies between foundations of LQG and related models with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR conserved areas of diffeo-surfaces and their comparison induce an area (length) scale in the model, without being quantized. Moreover, E_i^a fields are analogous to amplitudes $L_{l,m}$ in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. In fact, in [15] we show that in order to be invariant under coordinate transformations of the parameter space, these amplitudes must be differential operators in the parameter space. Indices (l, m) are analogous to the *internal* $SU(2)$ symmetry of triads. However, in contrast to Ashtekar variables, their values are obtained from ensemble of representations of $SU(2)$ factors in the decomposition of $SU(\infty)$ in equation (2). This property is similar to Ponzano-Regge and spin network where edges of tetrahedra are weighed by spins. However, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR both l , and m quantum numbers of $SU(2)$ representations are involved in the action of the model and they are not constrained. The reason is that in contrast to LQG and Ponzano-Regge models, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the Hilbert space does not represent a real space geometry.

3.1.6 Hilbert spaces of LQG and related models

6j symbols consist of summation over weighted multiplication of 4 Wigner 3j symbols. In turn 3j symbols are proportional to Clebsch-Gordan coefficients $\langle j_1, m_1; j_2, m_2 | j_3, m_3 \rangle$, where j_1, j_2, j_3 respect triangle condition (13). Therefore, each term in the partition function of Ponzano-Regge model (14) is proportional to the projection of a N -spin to a one-spin state constrained by the triangle relation (13) between *adjacent* spin states.

Considering the expansion (2) of $SU(\infty)$ group, it is clear that the Ponzano-Regge partition function Z_{PR} includes special configurations of a quantum system which its Hilbert space represents $SU(\infty)$ symmetry, namely states that can be arranged as tetrahedra in a 3D space. This observation can be extended to other models based on a symplectic representation of space such as LQG, spin network, and Group Field Theories (GFT). Indeed, [59] describes explicit construction of the Hilbert space of

a single tetrahedron in LQG/spin network by associating $SU(2)$ operators to edges of the tetrahedron. State of a unit cell of space - sometimes called *atom of space* - is generated by application of these operators to a vacuum state, such that the projection (amplitude) of the total spin of the tetrahedron is equal to its associated 6j symbol. This procedure can be extended to ensemble of $N \rightarrow \infty$ tetrahedra content of space [60]. Thus, we conclude that state generator operators, and thereby Hilbert spaces of Discrete QGR (DQGR) models such as Ponzano-Regge and LQG models, which we collectively call \mathcal{H}_{DQGR} , are subspaces of the Hilbert space of a quantum system with $SU(\infty)$ symmetry, such as $SU(\infty)$ -QGR .

3.1.7 Kinematical and physical Hilbert spaces and reality conditions

It is useful to remind that 3j, 6j, and fundamental representation of $SU(2)$ are in general defined on the field of complex numbers. By contrast, a partition function or path integral over geometries of the physical space or spacetime, which should approaches to Einstein gravity in the limit of $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ must be real valued [60, 61]. Moreover, due to the degeneracies discussed in Sec. 3.1.4, the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_{DQGR} of LQG and related models are not *physical*, but *Kinematical* [60]. The Hilbert space of physical states \mathcal{H}_{phys} containing quantized background independent geometries is a subspace of \mathcal{H}_{DQGR} , that is $\mathcal{H}_{DQGR} \supset \mathcal{H}_{phys}$. However, it is in general difficult to construct \mathcal{H}_{phys} explicitly [60]. In addition, demonstration of diffeomorphism and Lorentz invariance of physical states is not straightforward and one might expect violation of Lorentz invariance in QGR models with discretized space [62]. Indeed, diffeomorphism invariance of DQGR is explicitly shown only for special cases [63, 64].

Even in DQGR/LQG models that preserve Lorentz invariance dispersion relation of gravitational waves [65] and electromagnetic radiation [66] may deviate from general relativity. However, both of these deviations are stringently constrained [67, 68, 69]. Moreover, Immirzi parameter may affect interaction of fermions [70], and thereby induces a *fifth force* type effect on matter. This effect is also constrained by various tests of gravity [71].

Complexities analogous to nonphysical states in the formulation of LQG and related models do not arise in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR . The parameters defining the Hilbert space, namely (t, r, θ, ϕ) are real, and by construction their redefinition - in other words diffeomorphism of the parameter space - corresponds to change of the Hilbert space's basis by application of a unitary transformation - a member of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry group of the subdivided quantum Universe. We also notice that although $SU(\infty)$ -QGR , Ponzano-Regge model, LQG, spin network, and their extension to GFT share $SU(2)$ symmetry in their construction, in practice all of them, except $SU(\infty)$ -QGR , use only the Casimir operator of $SU(2)$. The reason is that eigen states m of azimuthal projection of spin vector induce a preferred direction or in other words a frame, which these models want to avoid.

3.1.8 Time and matter in LQG

Similar to $SU(\infty)$ -QGR , in LQG and related models time must be considered as a relational observable. One way of making the model dynamic is to consider time as the classical affine parameter of histories [72] or path integrals in the quantized physical space [73]. Although in such setups Lorentz and diffeomorphism invariance is not trivial, it may be achievable [73, ?, 64].

Describing time by histories needs a *historian* - a reference subsystem with respect to which histories are defined. But, construction of background independent QGR models do not clarify how to satisfy necessary conditions for division of a quantum system [28]. In fact kinematical Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{DQGR} seems to be inseparable [60]. Specifically, division of the Hilbert space to orthogonal blocks, which could be considered as subsystems, needs an additional symmetry, because in these models $SU(2)$ is inherently related to gravity. We might consider tetrahedra as the most fundamental *atomic* subsystem [74]. However, to discriminate one tetrahedron as reference, there must be selection criterion, thus another symmetry - observable. This issue is directly related to the fact that LQG and related

models do not consider matter fields - a symmetry orthogonal to space - in their foundations. Although, a time parameter and matter fields can be easily added to the Einstein gravity Lagrangian described as a function of Ashtekar variables and their duals, see e.g. [78], the foundational issue of time definition in LQG and related models is not fully solved. Attempts to solve this problem, for instance through quantization of phase space [75, 76, 77], indeed include matter and/or symmetries orthogonal to diffeomorphism symmetry.

3.1.9 Non-perturbative characteristic of LQG and related models

The origin of subsystem definition issue in background independent models is their non-perturbative approach to QGR. Division to subsystems needs a criteria for breaking the Hilbert space or its parameter space to distinguishable sectors. Such operation implies the possibility of a perturbative description of the system at some scale. However, in LQG and related models, in absence of matter there is no natural covariant rule for a quantum gravitational perturbative expansion. This observation clarifies why there is no inherent way to include matter in these models. In fact, division to subsystems; emergence of a quantum clock, inclusion of matter in the foundation of the model, and existence of both perturbative and non-perturbative regimes are related. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR they are naturally implemented in the construction of the model through special form of its symmetries.

3.1.10 Outline of comparison between background independent models and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

In conclusion, although $SU(2)$ symmetry plays an essential role in the construction of background independent models and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, its role and *raison d'être* in these models are very different. Notably, in LQG, GFT, and other symplectic models it is strictly related to the assumption of a physical 3D quantum space. Nonetheless, spin network realization of LQG can be considered as a subspace of the Hilbert space of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, in which with additional relations - entanglement - between representations of $SU(2)$ components are considered. Both background independent models and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR rely on the definition of a relative time or histories, which need division of the Universe to subsystem. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR this concept is built in the construction of the model and provides the necessary ingredients for definition of a quantum subsystem as clock and inclusion of matter fields.

3.2 Quantum approaches to QGR

Inherently quantum approaches - called *Quantum First* by some authors [17] - are relatively recent arrivals into the jungle of QGR proposals and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR can be classified in this group. For this reason it is crucial to investigate its similarities and differences with other models in this category.

A shared characteristic of Quantum First models is the absence of a classical spacetime as a foundational concept in their axioms - or at least this is the claim. Consequently, it has to emerge down the road from more primary properties and structures of an abstract quantum system. It is useful to remind that the concept of an emergent spacetime is not limited to these models. The possibility that spacetime may not be a fundamental entity is also considered by other QGR candidates as well, see e.g. [79, 80, 81]. Specifically, it is suggested that a quantum Lorentz invariant spacetime orthogonal to internal gauge symmetries may emerge in QGR models based on the extension of the Poincaré group and gauge symmetries [97, 98, 99]. The idea of spacetime emergence is also explored by models in which, in one way or another, thermodynamics and quantum gravity are unified [85, 86, 87]. These models seem to have little common aspects with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR and we do not discuss them further here.

In absence of any hint about the quantum nature of gravity, for instance its Hilbert space, and its relationship with classical gravity and other interactions, Quantum First models usually use priors

inspired from semi-classical gravity, in particular from properties of semi-classical physics of black holes. Based on these priors two categories of Quantum First models other than $SU(\infty)$ -QGR can be distinguished:

- Models that consider locality and causality as indispensable for QGR: Some of these models need modification of standard quantum mechanics;
- Models inspired by black hole entropy and its relationship with holographic principle and AdS/CFT duality.

3.2.1 Modified quantum mechanics and locality

Locality is considered to be crucial for describing black holes, their thermodynamics [18, 4] and its puzzles [19, 20]. More generally, causality and observed finite speed of information propagation in both classical general relativity and QFT implies some degree of locality in any interaction, including QGR. For these reasons, locality and its close relationship with the definition of subsystems as *localized* entities in the Universe have been the motivation of authors of [88, 89, 17] for proposing a *generalized* quantum mechanics. Specifically, history description of quantum mechanics is generalized in [88] to define *coarse-grained* histories as a bundle of *fine-grained* histories (path integrals). They replace the Hilbert space of quantum mechanics, which in a QGR framework corresponds to a spacelike surface during an infinitesimal time interval, defined with respect to a reference clock. In addition, in this modified quantum mechanics projection operators to eigen states of position are time-dependent, and during each time interval they project states to a different set of histories. In turn, sets of histories present subspaces of the bundle. Presumably, in this model not only the state of a system, but also its whole Hilbert space changes with time.

Inspired by generalized quantum mechanics, [89] proposes an alternative way to implement locality in what is called *universal* quantum mechanics. In analogy with the bundle space of [88] it extends the space of physical states to provide additional labeling, such as *in and out* states in curved spacetimes [90]. In addition, labels can be interpreted as time or labels of states in a multiverse, as needed. Physical states can be considered as *local* in this extended state space.

These models have little common features with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, which is strictly based on the highly tested standard quantum mechanics. The reason for having reviewed them here is their role in the development of further models with some similarities with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. We review them in the following subsections.

3.2.2 QGR from locality and causality

Localization of quantum mechanics in [88] does not specify an explicit implementation procedure. Nonetheless, motivated by this model [17, 91, 16, 92] propose a road-map for realization of this concept in what they call Local Quantum Field Theories (LQFT). In these QFT models observables convey quantum information only locally. Here we call the corresponding QGR proposal LQFT-QGR.

In quantum systems with infinite degrees of freedom, such as in QFTs, spacetime sector of the Hilbert space cannot be factorized to disconnected (untangled) subspaces without violating causality. Such quantum systems are said to have Type III operator algebra in the classification of [93, 94]. For this reason, in LQFT-QGR the division to subsystems is performed algebraically. Specifically, it is assumed that for any region of spacetime U there is an extension U_e . Observables \hat{A} and $\bar{\hat{A}}$ are defined such that they have nonzero support respectively on U and \bar{U}_e , where \bar{U}_e is the complementary space of U_e . Under these conditions \hat{A} and $\bar{\hat{A}}$ are assumed to be disentangled in a specific vacuum:

$$\langle U_e | \hat{A} \bar{\hat{A}} | U_e \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{A} | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | \bar{\hat{A}} | 0 \rangle \quad (15)$$

The vacua $|U_e\rangle$ and $|0\rangle$ are related by a Bogoliubov transformation. This definition is considered to provide a sort of localization without factorization of the Hilbert space. However, it is evident that this algebraic structure is not in general diffeomorphism invariant and observable operators $\{\hat{A}\}$ and $\{\bar{\hat{A}}\}$ must satisfy specific conditions to retain their invariance and physical meaning [92]. Seeking such operators, [91, 92] find that in analogy with gauge invariant Wilson loops in Yang-Mills theories, diffeomorphism invariant operators $\Phi_\Gamma \in \{\hat{A}\}$ are nonlocal structures, which depend only on the spacetime connection [91]. Specifically:

$$\Phi_\Gamma(x) = \phi(x^\mu + V_\Gamma^\mu) \quad (16)$$

where Γ is a path running from point x of the spacetime to infinity, and V_Γ^μ is the integral of an expression depending on the metric of spacetime along the path Γ . An explicit expression for V_Γ^μ is obtained for the weak coupling limit of semi-classical gravity in [92].

3.2.3 Comparison of LQFT-QGR with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

In LQFT-QGR two essential concepts for QGR, namely division of the Universe to subsystems and carriers of quantum information are considered to be the same. In this respect, the model is similar to $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, that is carriers of information are matter/radiation fields and their internal symmetries, which is orthogonal to diffeomorphism of spacetime and a necessary criteria for division of the Universe to subsystems. However, the two models are conceptually very different. In LQFT-QGR subsystems are somehow localized in spacetime. By contrast, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR spacetime is not the quantum Universe and no locality condition is imposed on subsystems/particles. In fact, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR locality and causality are not postulated. As we discussed in Sec. 2.3, they arise from quantum uncertainties. Moreover, interpretation of coordinates in (11) as average or expectation values, shows that in agreement with quantum mechanics observations, locality in general is an approximation.

LQFT-QGR and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR share the absence of a classical dynamics in their foundation. Moreover, both models are a type of QFT on a curved spacetime, which plays the role of a parameter space. Their difference is in the definition of observable fields: LQFT-QGR constrains field operators to realize special algebraic structures and a sort of locality, whereas in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR both gravity and matter sectors are quantum fields similar to QFTs without gravity. In addition, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR spacetime genuinely emerges, whereas in LQFT-QGR it is implicitly postulated and present from the beginning. Although in contrast to many other QGR proposals spacetime per se is not quantized. the model offers no explanation for its origin, its dimension, or properties of its metric, or its relationship with other quantum fields.

Type III algebra in LQFT-QGR and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR Operators indexed or parameterized by \mathbb{R}^n cannot be divided to subsets associated to limited regions of the indices, if the whole algebra has to be invariant under diffeomorphism [93, 94]. It is why a symmetry orthogonal to diffeomorphism is necessary for *tagging* and fulfilling conditions for definition of quantum subsystem [28].

As QFTs, both LQFT-QGR and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR are Type III quantum systems. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the inseparability of continuous operators is reflected in the common $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of all subsystems, including the Universe as a whole, and the need for a factorized finite rank *internal* symmetry. By contrast LQFT-QGR considers strict locality as a foundational concept and tries to use nontrivial topological structures as a replacement for *tagging* and identifying subsystems. However, at present there is no evidence for the possibility of such algebraic structures in QFTs, except for the solutions obtained in the weak coupling regime of semi-classical gravity [92]. Moreover, although topological structures are observed in condensed matter, they are extremely fragile. By contrast, symmetry breaking or emergence, as requested in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, is wide spread in nature. We also notice that topological structures proposed by LQFT-QGR are different from those used in LQG as observables. In LQG Wilson loops do exist because of axioms and construction of the model. By contrast, the existence

of such operators LQFT-QGR are in large extend a conjecture. The model explored in [92] for such structures is semi-classical and includes perturbative Einstein equation, which is non-renormalizable and cannot be considered as a genuine QGR.

3.2.4 QGR and emergent spacetime from entropy and holography

Another set of conjectures used for getting insight into QGR without considering an underlying classical dynamics is the holographic principle [4, 5, 6] and gauge-gravity duality conjecture [95, 96], specially in the form of AdS/CFT duality, see Sec. 3.3.2 for more details. Notice that this conjecture should not be confused with models that try to quantize gravity by extending gauge group of the Standard Model, such that it includes Lorentz and Poincaré symmetries [97, 98, 99].

Motivation for the holography conjecture [4, 5, 6] is the proportionality of semi-classical black hole entropy to area of its horizon, rather than to its volume [18, 19]. According to holography conjecture there is an upper limit on the amount of quantum information contained inside the bulk of a region of spacetime [4]. It is proportional to the area of its boundary and is maximal for black holes [18, 19]. This conjecture is not limited to gravitational systems and similar behaviour is observed in other many-body quantum systems, if a suitable null (light-like) boundary surface can be defined [7]. In particular, entanglement entropy of some low dimensional many-body quantum systems at critical point, that is when the system is scale invariant and behaves conformally, is calculable analytically, and the results show that they follow holographic principle [100, 8, 9].

AdS/CFT duality conjecture [29, 101] posits that quantum properties of the boundary of a spacetime region in the limit that it can be approximated by a conformal QFT can be related to geometry and QGR of the bulk if its background geometry is AdS.

Inspired by these conjectures, [12] considers two quantum system with a quantum CFT living on their common boundary. An analogy is established between the reduction of entanglement entropy and exchanged quantum information between the two systems when their boundary is shrunk, and the reduction of gravitational interaction with increasing distance. To understand this analogy, imagine squeezing a rubber bar in the middle. More it is squeezed, more material is pushed to the two ends and smaller becomes the surface connecting them until the bridge breaks and the two parts separate. Of course, this analogy is very far from being a QGR model. Nonetheless, it has motivated construction of QGR models using entanglement entropy as the origin of what is classically perceived as geometrical distance.

3.2.5 Entanglement-Based Models (EBM) of quantum gravity

A more systematic approach to construction of a spacetime from entropy-area law is proposed in [13, 21], where spacetime metric and geometry emerge from tensor decomposition of the Hilbert space of the Universe to entangled subspaces. This model is based on several axioms, see [21] for the complete list. They include:

1. A preferred tensor decomposition of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} [of the Universe], where each factor \mathcal{H}_i presents Hilbert space of a point or a small space around a point of space;

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_i \mathcal{H}_i \tag{17}$$

2. There is what is called Redundancy Constrained (RC) states for each subset of the Hilbert space

$B \subset \mathcal{H}$, considered to be a subspace of physical space. Its entropy is assumed to be:

$$S(B) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in B, j \in \bar{B}} I(i : j) \quad (18)$$

$$I(i : j) \equiv S(i) + S(j) - S(i \cup j) \quad (19)$$

where $I(i : j)$ is the mutual information of subsystems i and j . This construction replaces area-law axiom considered in [12, 13].

3. It is assumed that the system is in an *entanglement equilibrium* state, when subsystems are in RC states. Under small perturbations the entropy of B is assumed to be conserved. This means that the total entropy is conserved. Moreover, when states deviate from RC, their entropy can be decomposed to entropy of a fiducial RC state and a subleading component, interpreted as an effective field theory. The two components cancel each other to preserve the total entropy.

It is clear that axiom 1 is constructed such that the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} presents physical space. Thus, we conclude that similar to LQFT-QGR in this model the space does not really emerge, but its existence is postulated. Moreover, we notice that the definition of subsystems is loose and does not explicitly respect necessary conditions [28]. It is why this axiom explicitly states that factorization is static and somehow is *preferred*. But it is not specified what is the criteria for its selection.

Axiom 3 replaces action and variation principle that in classical mechanics and QFT models lead to dynamics and field equations, respectively. In addition, according to this axiom RC states can be considered as a *background* around which a perturbation is performed. Indeed, the model does not consider highly non-RC states and applies only to weak gravity cases [21].

The structure described by above axioms can be considered as an information graph, which its vertices are factors of the Hilbert space and its edges are weighted by mutual information $I(i : j)$ of subsystems corresponding to factors of the Hilbert space. This graph is analogous to discrete geometry in Ponzano-Regge, spin network, and LQG.

To complete the geometrical interpretation, the area of information graph or its subgraphs must be related to entanglement information. In [12, 13] this connection is established by assuming holographic principle. However, when RC structure is assumed [21], according to one of the axioms of the model (axiom 3 in [21]), the area associated to a subspace B of the space is:

$$\mathcal{A}(B, \bar{B}) = \frac{G_N}{2} I(B : \bar{B}) \quad (20)$$

where G_N is the Newton constant (for $\hbar = 1$ and $c = 1$) and \bar{B} is the complementary of B . Although the area \mathcal{A} associated to a subspace of the Hilbert space is not the boundary of a bulk space, the inspiration from holographic principle is evident. This axiom and Radon transform is used to describe area as a function of the entropy of factors $\hat{H}_i \forall i$ of the Hilbert space and define a background metric. Perturbation of this metric are interpreted as the perturbation of quantum state of the physical space.

Additionally, variation of the entanglement graph geometry is used as a *clock* to which a Hamiltonian and an operator analogous to energy-momentum can be associated. The latter can be considered as an effective field theory generating subleading entropy of states, which are perturbatively deviated from RC states. Finally, by comparing this formulation with general relativity and using Radon transform, [21] argues that Einstein equation can be concluded.

3.2.6 Comparison of EBM with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR

We find that EBM is more similar to $SU(\infty)$ -QGR - in spirit rather than construction - than other models. Here we briefly highlight their common features.

Factorization of the Hilbert space and division to subsystems The importance of division of the Hilbert space to factors presenting subsystems is crucial in both models. However, as remarked earlier, in EBM the division is considered to be rigid and *preferred*. This is in strict opposition to the approach of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. The reason behind the special factorization is again the absence of a concrete criteria to discriminate between factors - subsystems.

We notice that the issue of how to divide the Universe and its Hilbert space to quantum subsystems generally arises in quantum approach to QGR due to foundational requirements [39], and in some other QGR models for various reasons. Model makers use different schemes to deal with this crucial matter. For instance, they introduce topological structures - as in LQG and LQFT-QGR; or simply consider a fixed decomposition without addressing its origin, as in EBM. $SU(\infty)$ -QGR assumes an orthogonal finite rank symmetry - presumably from symmetry breaking or emerging - to fulfill general conditions for division of a quantum system to subsystems according to the criteria defined by [28]. Although the nature and origin of this symmetry is not specified in the construction of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, properties of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry, notably equations (7, 8) facilitate the interpretation of the Universe as a many-body quantum system, in which based on our knowledge from condensed matter, a symmetry of the form (9) can arise relatively easily. More importantly, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the finite rank symmetry is associated to matter. In this way, matter and space become intertwined and inseparable. This is not the case in EBM, LQFT-QGR or LQG and related models.

Geometry and classical gravity Another common aspect between EBM and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR is the explicit dependence of the space geometry on the quantum state - through entanglement entropy in EBM and through fidelity in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR. However, emergence, construction, and physical meaning of the space in the two models are very different. In EBM of [13, 21] factors of the Hilbert space are considered to present points or regions of the physical space and the information graph is interpreted as a symplectic geometry, which in the continuum limit can be considered as a quantized space. Therefore, although the existence of a physical space is not explicitly mentioned in the axioms, it is implicitly behind the factorization of the Hilbert space. By contrast, in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR space genuinely emerges as parameter space of $SU(\infty)$ representations.

A consequence of these differences is that $SU(\infty)$ -QGR has an explicit explanation for the dimension of spacetime, where as in EBM dimension of the space(time) is not fixed. In fact, the information graph can be embedded in any space with dimension $d \geq 2$. Notice that the relation between area of a subgraph (subsystem) and its entanglement entropy with its complementary in (20) does not restrict the graph to be planar - not even locally. A priori every vertex - that is every factorized subsystem of the Hilbert space - can be entangled to all other subsystems. In [13] it is assumed that the number of entangled subsystems to a vertex - corresponding to the number of edges attached to it - is limited. Nonetheless, their number can be large and the graph rules do not constrain their mutual angle. Thus, in contrast to Ponzano-Regge and LQG, in which spins associated to edges of the symplectic space must satisfy triangle constraint at each vertex, the information graph in EBM can be embedded in a multi-dimensional space. For these reasons, d is considered as a stochastic parameter determined from averaging over geometries of many information graphs [13]. On the other hand, spacetime dimension is a fundamental quantity which affects many observables in particle physics and cosmology at all energy scales. So far no evidence of an extra/intra or stochastic dimension is detected.

In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the relationship between affine parameter, metric, and quantum fidelity in equation (10) naturally relates ensemble of parameters (not just distance or area) to quantum states of the subsystems. In both EBM and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR Einstein equation remains classical and is obtained from relationship between quantities with underlying quantum origin.

Analogy between distance and entanglement In both models an area quantity emerges and it has a crucial role for their interpretation as QGR. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR it emerges from comparison of the preserved areas of diffeo-surfaces of subsystems with an arbitrary reference subsystem. In EBM it is

postulated in (20), where a dimensionful area/distance parameter is mandatory. Although, the way a scale emerges in these models is very different, in both cases it is related to the division of Universe to subsystems. Indeed, in EBM entanglement and its associated entropy are meaningful only when multiple quantum systems are present. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR division to subsystems is necessary to make the conserved area of diffeo-surfaces relevant and measurable.

In addition to difference in the manner that a dimensionful scale arises in these models, there is another important difference. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR the area is related to geometry of the compact parameter space of representations of $SU(\infty)$ symmetry of subsystems. Thus, it is a well defined and unique measurable for each subsystem relative to a reference. By contrast, quantification of entanglement and relative quantum information is not unique and various definitions, e.g. von Neumann or Rényi entropy can be used, and each of them has its own merit and applications. EBM models of [12, 13, 21] do not specify which one of these entropies should be used or what is rationale for preferring one to others, or whether different definitions should be interpreted as different choices of coordinates.

3.3 String theory and AdS/CFT duality in 3 and higher dimensions

Although some of Quantum First models are inspired by string/superstring theories and AdS/CFT duality conjecture, these models are not properly speaking Quantum First. String theories are quantized 2D sigma model field theories, originally proposed for describing strong nuclear interaction [103]. AdS/CFT duality [29, 102] is the simplest case of gauge-gravity conjecture [104, 30, 31] and closely related to string theories.

Unfortunately, due to the large variety of string theories and their vast landscape of vacua after compactification [105], they do not have specific predictions for cosmology, particle physics or decoherence tests of gravity. The gauge-string duality and AdS/CFT conjectures do not help to make string theory more predictive, either. Nonetheless, both these models are among the most popular contenders of QGR. For this reason, in this section we briefly compare some of their features with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR .

3.3.1 Comparison with string theories

In this section we review and compare some of well established properties of string theories with those of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR without going through enormous mathematical details of string models. They can be found in many text books and reviews, e.g. [103, 106].

2D surfaces in string theory and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR Overlooking all the complexities of string and superstring theories, they can be summarized as 2D quantum gravity of conformal quantum sigma models. In this view, their most evident common feature with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR is the crucial role of 2D surfaces and their diffeomorphism. However, their properties, role and interpretation in the construction of the two models are profoundly different. In string theory the 2D worldsheet of strings is quantized and summation over geometries (metrics) makes the model a 2D quantum gravity. In contrast to the worldsheet, diffeo-surface in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR is not an independent physical entity, neither it is quantized. It is associated to quantum states of the ensemble of the content of the Universe. Its deformation does not correspond to different (quantum)-gravitational states, but rather represents symmetry operators of quantum subsystems of the Universe.

String sigma model As a sigma model both bosonic and fermionic quantum fields live on the strings and superstrings. They are interpreted as coordinates of a curved n -dimensional quantum spacetime (before compactification) and their supersymmetric counterpart in superstring models. Therefore, one can equally interpret the worldsheet of a string as a 2D extended object embedded or emerged in an n -dimensional spacetime. Additionally, string theories are in general conformal, both with respect

to the worldsheet 2D coordinates and as a 2D field theory. This double conformality is a necessary condition for eliminating central charge and anomalies, which arise when these models are quantized. Cancellation of these unwanted elements limits the spacetime dimension to $n = 26$ for bosonic string or $n = 10$ for superstring. More generally, the sigma model can be any CFT with Kac-Moody algebra having the same number of degrees of freedom as bosonic and supersymmetric models. Interestingly, $n = 1$ model is also a consistent quantum model [103]. But, such a model does not make physical sense, because a 2D object cannot be embedded in a 1D space.

In the framework of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, the string setup - without quantization of surface - can be considered as a special state for a quantum system with $SU(\infty)$ symmetry. The multi-field case - without constraints arising from conformal symmetry and quantization - can be interpreted as special states for subsystems with an internal symmetry G , which provides *internal* indices for the fields. This shows how more or less the same mathematical structure can be interpreted differently in a physical context. In fact, Virasoro algebra is a subalgebra of surface preserving diffeomorphism of torus $SDiff(T^2)$, which is a representation of $SU(\infty)$ group [107, 108, 34].

One of the main advantages of string theory to canonical QGR is its renormalizability and absence of UV singularity, owed to the extended nature of string. Although details are not yet worked out, we expect that as a Yang-Mills theory $SU(\infty)$ -QGR be renormalizable. Moreover, UV singularity should not arise, because the distance between subsystems is defined as the ratio of area of their diffeosurfaces. By definition the diffeo-surface cannot shrink to a point, corresponding to zero distance. This feature should play the role of a build-in ultra-violet cut-off and prevent UV singularities.

Curved spacetime and gravity in string theory In string theories proper quantization of the spacetime is only possible for a flat Minkowski geometry. For this reason only metric perturbation around the Minkowski background can be quantized and compactification of extra-dimensions to obtain the observed (3+1) dimensional spacetime should be considered as effective quantum field theories. Consequently, in this respect the model is indistinguishable from a usual QFT, except for internal symmetries, which are determined by compactified dimensions of the spacetime, rather than being postulated. Although in the framework of perturbative string theories a string *gas* has been considered - specially for the purpose of describing cosmological perturbations [109] - the inherently intertwined nature of spacetime and strings may make it impossible to consider them as separately evolving entities. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, the perturbative string theory in a n -dimensional curved spacetime cannot be properly quantized, because similar to canonical approaches to QGR it would not be renormalizable. For these reasons, in the present formulations only perturbative string models are consistent. Other issues of string theories, such as huge volume of vacua landscape [105], are expected to be solved in a non-perturbative formulation. However, such a formalism in its whole extend is not known. M-theory [95, 96] and its closely related large N matrix quantum mechanics models [110] are candidates of such non-perturbative string formulation.

M-theory and matrix theories In M-theory and matrix models of QGR large N matrices are postulated to present $U(N)$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories and describe quantum states of type IIA strings and D0-branes attached to them [95, 111]. The matrices have in addition indices of 10D superstring spacetime. We notice that this setup is very similar to the action of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR after division of the Universe to subsystems. The main difference is that in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR Yang-Mills group presents internal symmetries, and in contrast to M-theory the symmetry is not restricted. Moreover, matrices are not directly identified with points of the spacetime. Nonetheless, despite differences in interpretation of contents and many details, analogy between M-theory and $SU(\infty)$ -QGR is remarkable.

The question that arises here is whether quantitative predictions of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR and matrix models are similar. The answer to this question needs better understanding of both models. Specifically, in what concerns description of a quantum gravitational force, M-theories suffer from not being unique, or

at least it is not straightforward to prove that they are unique. In $SU(\infty)$ -QGR despite close relation between matter and gravity, gravitational sector has a unique definition, which is independent of the matter content and their symmetries. In other words, equivalence principle is strictly respected.

3.3.2 Anti-de Sitter - Conformal Field Theory (AdS-CFT) duality

According to AdS-CFT duality [29] and more generally gauge-gravity duality conjectures [30, 31] there is a one to one correspondence between quantum states of a suitable quantum CFT living on the boundary of a region of the spacetime, and supergravity (string theory) in its bulk, if it has an AdS background geometry.

This conjecture is closely related to holographic principle, but there is not yet a general proof for it except in $(2 + 1)$ D spaces [101]. Specifically, consider a conformal field theory on the $(1+1)$ D space $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$ boundary of a AdS_3 spacetime. Define two complementary subsystems A and B divided along \mathbb{R} axis of the bulk (see figure 1 of [101]). The Hilbert space of the quantum CFT is factorized to $\hat{H}_A \otimes \hat{H}_B$ and entanglement entropy between A and B is defined as $S(A) \equiv -\text{tr}(\rho_A \ln \rho_A)$, where ρ_A is the density matrix of A when state of B is traced out.

It is proved [101] that the static entanglement entropy, that is at $t = \text{constant}$, between the two subsystems is proportional to the length of the geodesic (null) curve passing inside the AdS_3 and joining the 2-point cross-section on the $t = \text{constant}$ S^1 boundary. More generally, for an AdS_{d+2} spacetime the entanglement entropy is conjectured to be:

$$S(A) = \frac{\text{Area of } \gamma_A}{4G_N^{d+2}} \quad (21)$$

where γ_A is the d -dimensional minimal (geodesic) boundary surface and G_N is Newton constant. Additionally, it is shown that $S(A) \rightarrow 0$ only when the size of the system goes to infinity [8, 9]. This case corresponds to when the two subsystems are infinitely separate from each others.

We notice that the definition of subsystems in [29, 101] is geometric. This is an important point, because as we discussed in Sec. 3.2.3, QFTs have Type III algebra and Lorentz invariant quantum subsystems cannot be defined by division of their support spacetime. Thus, A and B are not properly speaking subsystems and diffeomorphism invariant. It is not clear whether and how this issue affects the AdS/CFT duality conjecture, specially in higher dimensional spaces for which a proof is not available.

For $d = 2$ the $AdS \cong R \times R \times S^d$ geometry is homomorphic to the simplest geometry of parameter space in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR after division of the Universe to subsystems. For this case, relation with a CFT on the boundary in the framework of $SU(\infty)$ -QGR can be understood as the following: For the whole Universe or an approximately isolated subsystem the size of diffeo-surface of its $SU(\infty)$ symmetry is approximately irrelevant for its observables. This property can be interpreted as an approximate conformal symmetry, that is scaling invariance of the parameter space of the system and its pull-back into the Hilbert space. Considering an external quantum clock, at a given time parameter space of such an isolated subsystem is approximately 2D and its quantum dynamics is approximately a 2D CFT. Its operators generate a Virasoro algebra, which is a subalgebra of $Diff(T^{(2)} \cong SU(\infty)$ [107, 108, 34].

4 Outline

Comparison of several popular QGR models with $SU(\infty)$ -QGR proposal finds a number of common or analogous features between these models. We discussed the origin of these properties and showed that they arise in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR either from its axioms or can be concluded from them. Moreover, giving systematic and natural emergence of these features in $SU(\infty)$ -QGR, this model may clarify some of puzzling properties of other QGR models.

References

- [1] Ziaeeepour, H. Making a Quantum Universe: Symmetry and Gravity *MDPI Universe J.*, (2021) -, Special Issue 80 Years of Professor Wigner’s Seminal Work ”On Unitary Representations of the Inhomog [arXiv:2009.03428].
- [2] Eppley, K.; Hanna, E. The Necessity of Quantizing the Gravitational Field. *Found. Phys.* **7**, (1977) 51.
- [3] Jacobson, T. Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, (1995) 1260, [arXiv:gr-qc/9504004].
- [4] Bekenstein, J.D. Statistical black-hole thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev. D* **12**, (1975) 3077.
- [5] t’Hooft, G. Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity. (1993), [arXiv:gr-qc/9310026].
- [6] Susskin, L. The World as a Hologram. *JMP* **36**, (1995) 6377, [arXiv:hep-th/9409089].
- [7] Bousso, R. The holographic principle. *Rep. Mod. Phys.* **74**, (2002) 825, [arXiv:hep-th/020310].
- [8] Holzhey, C.; Larsen, F.; Wilczek, F. Geometric and Renormalized Entropy in Conformal Field Theory. *Nucl. Phys. B* **424**, (1994) 443, [arXiv:hep-th/9403108].
- [9] Calabrese, P.; Cardy, J. Entanglement Entropy and Quantum Field Theory. *J. Stat. Mech.* **0406**, (2004) P06002, arXiv:hep-th/0405152
- [10] Rovelli, C. Quantum mechanics without time: A model. *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, (1990) 2638.
- [11] Markopoulou, F. Space does not exist, so time can. (2009), [arXiv:0909.1861].
- [12] Van Raamsdonk, M. Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement. *Gen. Rel. Grav* **42**, (2010) 2323, *Gen. Rel. Grav* **42**, (2010) 2323; *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **19**, (2010) 2429, [arXiv:1005.3035].
- [13] 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].
- [14] Page, D.N.; Wootters, W.K. Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables. *Phys. Rev. D* **27**, (1983) 2885.
- [15] In preparation (2021).
- [16] Giddings, S.B. Quantum-first gravity. *Found. Phys.* **49**, (2019) 177, [arXiv:1803.04973].
- [17] Giddings, S.B. Hilbert space structure in quantum gravity: an algebraic perspective. *J. High Energy Phys.* **2015**, (2015) 1, [arXiv:1503.08207]
- [18] Bekenstein, J.D. Black Holes and Entropy. *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, (1973) 2333.
- [19] Hawking, S. Break of predictability in gravitational collapse. *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, (1976) 246.
- [20] Zurek, W.H. Entropy Evaporated by a Black Hole. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, (1982) 1683.
- [21] Cao, C.; Carroll, S.M. Bulk Entanglement Gravity without a Boundary: Towards Finding Einstein’s Equation in Hilbert Space. *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, (2018) 086003, [arXiv:1712.02803].
- [22] Dewitt, B. Quantum Theory of Gravity. I. The Canonical Theory. *Phys. Rev.* **160**, (1967) 1113.
- [23] Hartle, J.B.; Hawking, S.W. Wave function of the Universe. *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, (1983) 2960.

- [24] Wheeler, J.A. On the nature of quantum geometrodynamics. *Annals Phys.* **2**, (1957) 604.
- [25] Rocci, A. On first attempts to reconcile quantum principles with gravity. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **470**, (2013) 012004, [arXiv:1309.7336]..
- [26] Kiefer, C. Quantum geometrodynamics: Whence, whither? *Gen. Rel. Grav* **41**, (2009) 877, [arXiv:0812.0295].
- [27] Arnowitt, R.; Deser, S.; Misner, C. Dynamical Structure and Definition of Energy in General Relativity. *Phys. Rev.* **116**, (1959) 1322, [arXiv:gr-qc/0405109]
- [28] Zanardi, P.; Lidar, D.; Lloyd, S. Quantum tensor product structures are observable-induced. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, (2004) 060402, [arXiv:quant-ph/0308043].
- [29] Maldacena, J.M. The Large N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys* **2**, (1998) 231, [arXiv:hep-th/9711200].
- [30] Witten, E. Anti De Sitter Space And Holography. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys* **2**, (1998) 253, [arXiv:hep-th/9802150].
- [31] Aharony, O.; Gubser, S.S.; Maldacena, J.; Ooguri, H.; Oz, Y. Large N Field Theories, String Theory and Gravity. *Phys. Rep.* **323**, (2000) 183, [arXiv:hep-th/9905111].
- [32] Hoppe, J. Quantum Theory of a Massless Relativistic Surface and a Two-dimensional Bound State Problem. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA, (1982).
- [33] Floratos, E.G.; Iliopoulos, J.; Tiktopoulos, G. A note on $SU(\infty)$ classical Yang-Mills theories. *Phys. Lett. B* **217**, (1989) 285.
- [34] Hoppe, J. Diffeomorphism Groups, Quantization, and $SU(\infty)$. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **4**, (1989) 5235.
- [35] Hoppe, J.; Schaller, P. Infinitely Many Versions of $SU(\infty)$. *Phys. Lett. B* **237**, (1990) 407.
- [36] Zunger, Y. Why Matrix theory works for oddly shaped membranes. *Phys. Rev. D* **64** , (2001) 086003, [arXiv:hep-th/0106030].
- [37] Ziaepour, H. And what if gravity is intrinsically quantic ? *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **174**, (2009) 012027 arXiv:0901.4634.
- [38] Su, Z-Y. A Scheme of Cartan Decomposition for $su(N)$. (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0603190.
- [39] Ziaepour, H. Symmetry as a foundational concept in Quantum Mechanics. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **626**, (2015) 012074, [arXiv:1502.05339].
- [40] Hoehn, P.A.; Smith, A.R.H.; Lock, M.P.E. The Trinity of Relational Quantum Dynamics. (2019), arXiv:1912.00033.
- [41] Mandelstam, L.; Tamm, I. The Uncertainty Relation Between Energy and Time in Non-relativistic Quantum Mechanics. *J. Phys. (USSR)* **9**, (1945) 249.
- [42] Hoehn, Ph; Lock, M.P.E.; Ali Ahmad, S.; Smith, A.R.H.; Galley, T.D. Quantum Relativity of Subsystems. (2021), [arXiv:2103.01232].
- [43] Rosenfeld, L. Zur Quantelung der Wellenfelder. *Annal der Physik* **397**, (1930) 113.
- [44] Dewitt, B. Quantum Theory of Gravity. I. The Canonical Theory. *Phys. Rev.* **160**, (1967) 1113.
- [45] Hartle, J.B.; Hawking, S.W. Wave function of the Universe. *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, (1983) 2960.

- [46] Rocci, A. On first attempts to reconcile quantum principles with gravity. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **470**, (2013) 012004, [arXiv:1309.7336].
- [47] Regge, T. General Relativity without Coordinates. *Nuovo Cimento* **19**, (1961) 558.
- [48] Gambini, R.; Pullin, J. Consistent discretization and canonical classical and quantum Regge calculus. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, (2006) 1699, [arXiv:gr-qc/0511096].
- [49] Ponzano, G.; Regge, T. Semiclassical limit of Racah coefficients. p1-58; in Spectroscopic and group theoretical methods in physics, ed. F. Bloch, North-Holland Publ. Co. Amsterdam, (1968).
- [50] Ashtekar, A. New Variables for Classical and Quantum Gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, (1986) 2244.
- [51] Immirzi, G. Quantum Gravity and Regge Calculus. *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl* **57**, (1997) 65, [arXiv:gr-qc/9701052].
- [52] Rovelli, C. *Quantum Gravity*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, (2004).
- [53] Ashtekar, A.; Lewandowski, J. Background Independent Quantum Gravity: A Status Report. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, (2004) R53, [arXiv:gr-qc/0404018].
- [54] Immirzi, G. Real and complex connections for canonical gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14**, (1997) L177, [arXiv:gr-qc/9612030].
- [55] Barrett, J.W.; Crane, L. Relativistic spin networks and quantum gravity. *J. Math. Phys.* **39**, (1998) 3296, [arXiv:gr-qc/9709028].
- [56] Barrett, J.W.; Crane, L. A Lorentzian Signature Model for Quantum General Relativity. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17**, (2000) 3101, [arXiv:gr-qc/9904025].
- [57] 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].
- [58] Ashtekar, A.; Rovelli, C.; Smolin, L. Weaving a Classical Metric with Quantum Threads. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, (1992) 237.
- [59] Rovelli, C.; Colosi, D.; Doplicher, L.; Fairbairn, W.; Modesto, L.; Noui, Karim Background independence in a nutshell. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, (2005) 2971, [arXiv:gr-qc/0408079].
- [60] Smolin, L. An invitation to loop quantum gravity. in Quantum Theory and Symmetries. Ed. P.C.Argyres, *et al.*, World Scientific (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0408048].
- [61] Maran, S.K. Reality Conditions for Spin Foams. (2005), [arXiv:gr-qc/0511014].
- [62] 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].
- [63] Gambini, R.; Pullin, J. Emergent diffeomorphism invariance in a discrete loop quantum gravity model. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26**, (2009) 035002, [arXiv:0807.2808].
- [64] Ashtekar, A. Some surprising implications of background independence in canonical quantum gravity. *Gen. Rel. Grav* **41**, (2009) 1927, [arXiv:0904.0184].
- [65] Bojowald, M.; Mortuza Hossain, G. Loop quantum gravity corrections to gravitational wave dispersion. *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, (2008) 023508, [arXiv:0709.2365].
- [66] Girelli, F.; Hinterleitner, F.; Major, S.A. Loop Quantum Gravity Phenomenology: Linking Loops to Observational Physics. *SIGMA* **8**, (2012) 098, [arXiv:1210.1485].

- [67] Abdo, A.A.; Ackermann, M.; Ajello, M.;Asano, K.; Atwood, W.B.; Axelsson, M.; Baldini, L.; Ballet, J.; Barbiellini, G.; Baring, M.G.; *et al.* A limit on the variation of the speed of light arising from quantum gravity effects. *Nature* **462**, (2009) 331, [arXiv:0908.1832].
- [68] The LIGO Scientific Collaboration Tests of General Relativity with GW170817. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, (2019) 011102, [arXiv:1811.00364].
- [69] The LIGO Scientific Collaboration Tests of General Relativity with the Binary Black Hole Signals from the LIGO-Virgo Catalog GWTC-1. *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, (2019) 104036, [arXiv:1903.04467].
- [70] Perez,, A.Rovelli, C. Physical effects of the Immirzi parameter. *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, (2006) 044013, [arXiv:gr-qc/0505081].
- [71] Bergé, J.; Pernot-Borràs, M.; Uzan, J.-P.; Brax, P.; Chhun, R.; Métris, G.; Rodrigues, M.; Touboul, P. MICROSCOPE’s constraint on a short-range fifth force. (2021), [arXiv:2102.00022].
- [72] Gaul, M.; Rovelli, C. Loop Quantum Gravity and the Meaning of Diffeomorphism Invariance. *Lect. Notes Phys.* **541**, (2000) 277, [arXiv:gr-qc/9910079].
- [73] Reisenberger, M.; Rovelli, C. Spacetime states and covariant quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, (2002) 125016, [arXiv:gr-qc/0111016].
- [74] Terno, D.R. Quantum information in loop quantum gravity. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **33**, (2006) 469, [arXiv:gr-qc/0512072].
- [75] Giesel, K.; Thiemann, T. Algebraic Quantum Gravity (AQG) IV. Reduced Phase Space Quantisation of Loop Quantum Gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, (2010) 175009, [arXiv:0711.0119].
- [76] Husain, V.; Pawłowski, T. Time and a physical Hamiltonian for quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, (2012) 141301, [arXiv:1108.1145].
- [77] Giesel, K.; Vetter, A. Reduced Loop Quantization with four Klein-Gordon Scalar Fields as Reference Matter. (2016), [arXiv:1610.07422].
- [78] Gielen, S.; Oriti, D. Cosmological perturbations from full quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, (2018) 106019, [arXiv:1709.01095].
- [79] Wilczek, F. Riemann-Einstein Structure from Volume and Gauge Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, (1998) 4851, [arXiv:hep-th/9801184].
- [80] Seiberg, N. Emergent Spacetime. in The Quantum Structure of Space and Time. Ed: J. Harvey, p. 163 World Scientific (2007), [arXiv:hep-th/0601234].
- [81] Westman, H.; Sonogo, S. Coordinates, observables and symmetry in relativity. *Annals Phys.* **324**, (2009) 1585 [arXiv:0711.2651].
- [82] Wilczek, F. Riemann-Einstein Structure from Volume and Gauge Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, (1998) 4851, [arXiv:hep-th/9801184].
- [83] Torres-Gomez, A.; Krasnov, K. Gravity-Yang-Mills-Higgs unification by enlarging the gauge group. *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, (2010) 085003, [arXiv:0911.3793].
- [84] Barrett, J.W.; Kerr, S. Gauge gravity and discrete quantum models. (2013), [arXiv:1309.1660].
- [85] Padmanabhan, T. Gravity and the Thermodynamics of Horizons. *Phys. Rep.* **406**, (2005) 49, [arXiv:gr-qc/0311036].
- [86] Padmanabhan, T. Gravity as an emergent phenomenon: A conceptual description. *AIP Conf. Proc.* **939**, (2007) 114, [arXiv:0706.1654].

- [87] Verlinde, E.P. On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton. *J. High Energy Phys.* **1104**, (2011) 029, [1001.0785].
- [88] Hartle, J.B. Generalizing Quantum Mechanics for Quantum Spacetime. in *The Quantum Structure of Space and Time*: ed. by D. Gross, M. Henneaux, A. Sevrin, World Scientific, Singapore, (2007), [arXiv:gr-qc/0602013].
- [89] Giddings, S.B. Universal quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, (2008) 084004, [arXiv:0711.0757].
- [90] Birrell, N.D.; Davies, P.C.W. *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, (1982).
- [91] Donnelly, W.; Giddings, S.B. How is quantum information localized in gravity? *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, (2017) 086013, [arXiv:1706.03104].
- [92] Donnelly, W.; Giddings, S.B. Gravitational splitting at first order: Quantum information localization in gravity. *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, (2018) 086006, [arXiv:1805.11095].
- [93] von Neumann, J. *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*, Springer, Berlin (1932).
- [94] Yngvason, J. The Role of Type III Factors in Quantum Field Theory. *Rept.Math.Phys.* **55**, (2005) 135, [math-ph/0411058].
- [95] Banks, T.; Fischler, W.; Shenker, S.H.; Susskind, L. M Theory As A Matrix Model: A Conjecture. *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, (1997) 5112, [arXiv:hep-th/9610043].
- [96] Aharony, O.; Gubser, S.S.; Maldacena, J.; Ooguri, H.; Oz, Y. Large N Field Theories, String Theory and Gravity. *Phys. Rep.* **323**, (2000) 183, [hep-th/9905111].
- [97] Wilczek, F. Riemann-Einstein Structure from Volume and Gauge Symmetry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, (1998) 4851, [arXiv:hep-th/9801184].
- [98] Torres-Gomez, A.; Krasnov, K. Gravity-Yang-Mills-Higgs unification by enlarging the gauge group. *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, (2010) 085003, [arXiv:0911.3793].
- [99] Barrett, J.W.; Kerr, S. Gauge gravity and discrete quantum models. *arXiv* **2013**, arXiv:1309.1660.
- [100] 't Hooft, G. Dimensional Reduction in Quantum Gravity. (1993), arXiv:gr-qc/9310026.
- [101] Ryu, S.; Takayanagi, T. Holographic Derivation of Entanglement Entropy from AdS/CFT. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, (2006) 181602, [arXiv:hep-th/0603001].
- [102] Maldacena, J. The gauge/gravity duality. in *Black Holes in Higher Dimensions* Ed. G. Horowitz, Cambridge University Press, (2012) [arXiv:1106.6073].
- [103] Green, M.B.; Schwarz, J.H.; Witten, E. *Superstring Theory I & II*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, (1987).
- [104] Gubser, S.S.; Klebanov, I.R.; Polyakov, A.M. Gauge Theory Correlators from Non-Critical String Theory. *Phys. Lett. B* **428**, (1998) 105, [arXiv:hep-th/9802109].
- [105] Kumar, J. A Review of Distributions on the String Landscape. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **21**, (2006) 3441, arXiv:hep-th/0601053.
- [106] Polchinski, J. *String Theory I & II*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2005.
- [107] Floratos, E.F.; Iliopoulos, J. A Note on the Classical Symmetries of the Closed Bosonic Membranes. *Phys. Lett. B* **201**, (1988) 237.

- [108] Antoniadis, I.; Ditsas, P.; Floratos, E.F.; Iliopoulos, J. New Realizations of the Virasoro Algebra as Membrane Symmetries. *Nucl. Phys. B* **300**, (1988) 549.
- [109] Nayeri, A.; Brandenberger, R.H.; Vafa, C. Producing a Scale-Invariant Spectrum of Perturbations in a Hagedorn Phase of String Cosmology. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, (2006) 021302, [arXiv:hep-th/0511140].
- [110] Steinacker, H. Emergent Geometry and Gravity from Matrix Models: an Introduction. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, (2010) 133001, [arXiv:1003.4134].
- [111] Dijkgraaf, R.; Verlinde, E.; Verlinde, H. Matrix String Theory. *Nucl. Phys. B* **500**, (1997) 43, arXiv:hep-th/9703030.