

# Anomaly free quantum dynamics for Euclidean LQG

MADHAVAN VARADARAJAN

Raman Research Institute  
Bangalore-560 080, India

November 28, 2022

## Abstract

Classical gravitational evolution admits an elegant and compact re-expression in terms of gauge covariant generalizations of Lie derivatives with respect to a spatial phase space dependent  $su(2)$  valued vector field called the Electric Shift [1]. A quantum dynamics for Euclidean Loop Quantum Gravity which ascribes a central role to the Electric Shift operator is derived in [2]. *Here we show that this quantum dynamics is non-trivially anomaly free.* Specifically, we show that on a suitable space of off shell states (a) the (non-vanishing) commutator between a pair of Hamiltonian constraint operators mirrors the Poisson bracket between their classical correspondents, (b) the group of finite spatial diffeomorphisms is faithfully represented and (c) the action of the Hamiltonian constraint operator is diffeomorphism covariant with respect to the action of spatial diffeomorphisms.

## 1 Introduction

The constraints of classical General Relativity in its Hamiltonian formulation admit a dramatic simplification when expressed in terms of the variables discovered by Ashtekar [3]. These variables comprise of a self dual  $su(2)$  connection  $A_a^i$  and its conjugate electric field  $E_i^a$  with  $i \in su(2)$  and  $a$  being a tangent space index on the spatial slice  $\Sigma$ . While the connection  $A_a^i$  corresponds to the pull back to  $\Sigma$  of the self dual part of the spacetime spin connection, the electric field bears the interpretation of a densitized spatial triad and hence determines the spatial geometry. Recently [1] it was shown that not only do the gravitational constraints simplify, but that the evolution equations also admit a simple and geometrically intriguing form in the Ashtekar variables. Specifically the evolution equations can be expressed in terms of certain gauge covariant generalizations of Lie derivatives with respect to an  $su(2)$  valued spatial vector field constructed from  $E_i^a$  and the lapse. This phase space dependent object is called the Electric Shift. While the considerations of [3, 1] apply to both Lorentzian and Riemannian General Relativity, for Lorentzian spacetime metrics the Ashtekar variables are complex and subject to certain ‘reality’ conditions which are difficult to impose directly at the quantum level. In contrast, for Riemannian spacetime metrics (herein referred to as ‘Euclidean’) the Ashtekar variables are real and can be directly employed in quantum theory. In [2], motivated by the structure of the classical theory elucidated in [1], we derived an action of the quantum Hamiltonian constraint for Euclidean Loop Quantum Gravity which accords a central role to the quantum operator correspondent of the Electric Shift.<sup>1</sup> Here we show that the

---

Email: madhavan@rri.res.in

<sup>1</sup>For a first stab at the problem, see [4].

action so derived is consistent with a non-trivial anomaly free algebra of quantum constraints. Our interest in Euclidean LQG in [2] and in this work stems from the fact that progress in Lorentzian LQG is contingent on a thorough understanding of Euclidean LQG [5, 6, 7, 8].

In what follows, we shall assume familiarity with the contents of Reference [2], which are summarized in Section 2.1 for the convenience of the reader. Our starting point is the ‘Mixed Action’ of section 3 of Reference [2] and its generalization in Appendix B of that work. This Mixed Action version of the regulated Hamiltonian constraint at regulator value  $\epsilon$  acts on spin network states at their vertices and deforms the graph structure in a neighborhood of coordinate size  $\epsilon$  of each such vertex. For our purposes it is necessary to modify these deformations slightly on scales much smaller than  $\epsilon$ . As we shall see these minor modifications on the one hand still yield valid regulated constraint operators and on the other, play a key simplifying role in our demonstration of an anomaly free constraint algebra. The tools and techniques we use in this work have been developed over the last decade in a series of papers [9, 10], and most importantly, [11], in the context of a toy model for Euclidean gravity which can be seen to arise as a novel weak coupling limit of Euclidean gravity [12]. While familiarity with these works would be helpful, we shall endeavour to make our presentation self contained except for (as mentioned above) an assumed familiarity with the contents of [2]. For readers familiar with [11], an important simplification in this work concerns the use of Riemann Normal Coordinates as regulating structures instead of the complicated network of coordinate patches used in [11].

We now provide a rough summary of our considerations and results and then go on to a detailed technical description of the layout of the paper. The intent of the rough summary is to convey only a qualitative feel for the way in which our calculations work and the reader should not worry if certain details are not clear. Indeed, we urge the reader to peruse this summary a second time after going through the technical aspects of the calculation described in subsequent sections of this work. The mixed action of [2] of the Hamiltonian constraint, at regulator value  $\epsilon$ , on a spin network is non trivial only at vertices of the spin network which have non-zero volume. This action at each such vertex is a sum of two types of actions, each of which deforms the spin network graph and its labels in a small ‘ $\epsilon$  size’vicinity of the vertex. The first type closely resembles the action of a diffeomorphism on the spin network which displaces the vertex and the structure around it by an amount  $\epsilon$ . We shall refer to the deformed spin nets created by this action as “electric diffeomorphism” type ‘children’ of the ‘parent’ spin net being acted upon.<sup>2</sup> In contrast the second type does not result in a displaced vertex structure; rather, it generates spin network deformations which resemble the ‘QSD’ type deformations [5] in that an ‘extraordinary edge’ is placed in turn between each pair of existing edges emanating from the parent vertex. Similar to the QSD case [13], this second set of terms is responsible for the propagation of quantum gravitational perturbations and we refer to these terms as ‘propagation’ type children. Both the electric diffeomorphism and the propagation type actions also generate a set of kinks in each child in an  $\epsilon$  vicinity of the parental vertex being acted upon.

The off shell states we construct are linear combinations of ‘basis’ off shell states. Each such basis state is a distributional state labelled by a complex function  $f$  on the Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$  and a 3d Riemannian metric  $h$  on  $\Sigma$ . Such a basis off shell state can be thought of as an infinite non-normalizable sum over spin network ‘bra states’, these bra states being of a specific type, with the coefficients in this sum being determined by  $f, h$ . The coefficient of a spin network bra summand is a product of an  $h$  dependent coefficient and an  $f$  dependent one. The  $f$  dependent coefficient is simply the product of the evaluations of  $f$  on each vertex of the spin network. The  $h$  dependent

---

<sup>2</sup>The reason for the nomenclature ‘electric diffeomorphisms’ is that this deformation is a more singular version of a diffeomorphism and corresponds to the finite transformation at parameter  $\epsilon$  generated by the quantum counterpart of the electric shift [2].

coefficient is a specific combination of the distances between the kinks on the spin network graph. We are interested in the evaluation of the (dual) action of the Hamiltonian constraint on such an off shell state in the ‘continuum’ limit of  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

The (dual) action of the Hamiltonian constraint on such an off shell state has a diffeomorphism part and a propagation part as described above. Each of these has the effect of altering the coefficients in the sum over spin network bras. The diffeomorphism part in the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  continuum limit, at each vertex (of nonzero volume) of a bra, alters both the  $f$  dependent part as well as the  $h$  dependent part of the coefficient because as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  the displaced vertex as well as the kinks in the ‘children’ bras shrink to a single point corresponding to the ‘parental’ vertex. The net result is that this action replaces, in the coefficient of a parent ‘bra’, the evaluation of  $f$  at a vertex of this parent by a sum of its derivatives along edges emanating from that vertex, multiplied by the evaluation of the lapse at that vertex. The propagation part primarily affects the  $h$  dependent part of the coefficient through the shrinking of kinks and the result is to reduce the coefficient of the parent bra to zero. To summarise: the dual action of the Hamiltonian constraint on an off shell state is the sum of an electric diffeomorphism part and a propagation part. In the continuum limit action on an off shell state, the propagation contribution vanishes and we are left only with the electric diffeomorphism contribution. As a result the commutator between a pair of Hamiltonian constraint actions acts in a manner very similar to a (sum over infinitesimal) diffeomorphisms and matches exactly with a quantization of the Poisson bracket between two Hamiltonian constraints, this Poisson bracket itself being, classically, proportional to the diffeomorphism constraint.

As remarked above the electric diffeomorphism part of the action resembles a diffeomorphism; indeed, it is not exactly a diffeomorphism but a more singular structure which falls into the class of ‘extended’ diffeomorphisms defined in [14]. A crucial ingredient in our calculation is an assumed volume non-triviality of a child vertex created by this action from a parent vertex with non-zero volume. A volume operator which satisfies this assumption is that defined by Rovelli and Smolin [15] and we shall use their volume operator in this work.<sup>3</sup>

The layout of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we start with a review of the form of the mixed action of [2]. Next, we specify this action in more detail than in [2] through (a) a detailed specification of regulating coordinate patches, (b) a precise specification of the positions of the displaced vertex and kinks created by this action and, (c) a specification of ‘upward conical’ vertex structure at the displaced vertex. As we shall see, these specifications are crucial (and in some sense, even sufficient) for the working out of the calculation. The choice in (a) of Riemann Normal Coordinates which are tied to the metric label  $h$  of the off shell state being acted upon, leads to diffeomorphism covariance of the Hamiltonian constraint action through a mechanism very similar to that encountered in [11]. The specification in (b) leads to the desired ‘derivative’ term from the electric diffeomorphism part of the constraint action as well as the trivialization of the propagation term described above in the evaluation of the constraint action on the off shell state. The specification in (c) plays a key role in obtaining the correct combination of terms which allow the definition of a second constraint action and its (anomaly free) commutator.

In section 3, we construct the space of off shell states. As mentioned above this is achieved through a specification of the set of spin network ‘bra’ summands associated with an off shell state and a specification of the coefficient of each such summand in terms of evaluations of a vertex smooth function  $f$  and a specific combination of distances between kinks in the spin network bra graph as computed by a Riemmanian metric  $h$ . If we call the set of summands as the Bra Set  $B$ , we denote such an off shell state by  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ . In section 4, on this space of off shell states, we

---

<sup>3</sup>A preliminary analysis of physical states in the kernel of the constraint hints at an effective removal of ‘moduli’ parameters [16] by virtue of the singular nature of electric diffeomorphisms alluded to here. We shall comment further on this in our concluding section.

compute the (dual) action of a single Hamiltonian constraint as well as the action of a product of Hamiltonian constraints and, thereby, their commutator. In section 5, we construct a quantization of the Poisson bracket between a pair of Hamiltonian constraints whose action is a sum of infinitesimal diffeomorphisms (as opposed to electric diffeomorphisms) so that the resulting operator kills diffeomorphism invariant states. We evaluate the (dual) action of this operator on the space of off shell states. We show that on this space of off shell states, this action equals  $i\hbar$  times the action of the constraint commutator computed in section 4. This establishes a non-trivial anomaly free representation of the commutator between a pair of Hamiltonian constraints. In section 6, we show that the action of spatial diffeomorphisms is anomaly free on the space of off shell states. We also demonstrate consistency of the Hamiltonian constraint action with diffeomorphism covariance if a certain condition of linear independence on the space of off shell states holds. In section 7 we prove this condition of linear independence. In section 8 we discuss an assortment of technicalities some of which touch on the consistency of the detailed specifications (a)- (c) described in section 2 with the interpretation of the resulting constraint action as a valid approximant to the Hamiltonian constraint. In section 9 we comment on the issue of regulator (in)dependence of physical states, then turn to an account of possible (anomaly free) generalizations of the specific anomaly free constraint action discussed hitherto together with the effect of these generalizations on the nature of physical states and conclude with a discussion of open problems and future directions of research.

Before we start our exposition, we introduce a useful notation to distinguish between the notions of ‘term of leading *non-trivial* order in  $\epsilon$ ’ and ‘term of order  $\epsilon$ ’:

*Notation for term of order  $\epsilon$ :* A term of  $f$  of order  $\epsilon$  will be denoted as  $O(\epsilon)$  by which we mean that there exist non-zero positive numbers  $M, \epsilon_0$  such that for all  $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ ,  $|f| \leq M\epsilon$ .

*Notation for term of leading non-trivial order in  $\epsilon$ :* A term  $f$  of leading *non-trivial* order in  $\epsilon$  will be denoted as  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  by which we mean there exist non-zero positive numbers  $M_1, M_2, \epsilon_0$  such that for all  $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ , we have that  $M_1\epsilon \leq |f| \leq M_2\epsilon$ . Note that a term of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  is also of  $O(\epsilon)$  but a term of  $O(\epsilon)$  may not be of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$ .

In what follows, we choose units in which  $\hbar = G = c = 1$ .

## 2 The action of the Hamiltonian constraint operator

Section 2.1 provides a review of essential material from Reference [2]. Its main purpose is to set notation. Details may be found in Reference [2]. Section 2.1.1 is devoted to a review of classical aspects of Euclidean gravity. Section 2.1.2 reviews the action of the regulated Hamiltonian constraint operator at regulation parameter  $\epsilon$  constructed in [2]. The operator acts non-trivially only at vertices of spin network states. The construction requires a choice of regulating coordinate patches at these vertices of the spin network being acted upon. In [2] we constructed this action in detail for a special class of vertices called ‘GR’ vertices without a detailed specification of these regulating coordinates. In section 2.2 we provide such a detailed specification. In section 2.3 we modify the action derived in [2] at scales much smaller than  $\epsilon$ . As we shall see in subsequent sections, these modifications ensure that the constraint action is anomaly free. In section 2.4 we detail the constraint action on non-GR vertices.

## 2.1 Review

In section 2.1.1 we review key aspects of the classical phase space description of Euclidean gravity in terms of  $SU(2)$  connections and electric fields. In section 2.1.2 we review key aspects of the action of the quantum Hamiltonian constraint constructed in [2].

### 2.1.1 Classical Theory

The canonically conjugate phase space variables are an  $SU(2)$  connection  $A_a^i$  and a densitised electric field  $E_i^a$  with  $\{A_a^i(x), E_j^b(y)\} = \delta_j^i \delta_a^b \delta(x, y)$  where  $i, \in su(2)$  and  $a, b$  are tangent space indices on the 3d Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$ . The electric field defines a 3- metric  $q_{ab}$  through

$$E_i^a E^{ai} = q q^{ab} \quad (2.1)$$

with  $q$  being the determinant of  $q_{ab}$ . The phase space functions:

$$G[\Lambda] = \int d^3x \Lambda^i \mathcal{D}_a E_i^a \quad (2.2)$$

$$D[\vec{N}] = \int d^3x N^a \left( E_i^b F_{ab}^i - A_a^i \mathcal{D}_b E_i^b \right) \quad (2.3)$$

$$H[N] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x N q^{-1/3} \epsilon^{ijk} E_i^a E_j^b F_{ab}^k, \quad (2.4)$$

are the Gauss law, diffeomorphism, and Hamiltonian constraints of Euclidean gravity. The Hamiltonian constraint (2.4) is chosen to be of density weight  $\frac{4}{3}$  with the lapse  $N$  carrying a density weight of  $-\frac{1}{3}$ . The Poisson brackets between the constraints are:

$$\{G[\Lambda], G[\Lambda']\} = G[\Lambda, \Lambda'] \quad \{G[\Lambda], H[N]\} = 0 \quad (2.5)$$

$$\{D[\vec{N}], G[\Lambda]\} = G[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} \Lambda] \quad (2.6)$$

$$\{D[\vec{N}], D[\vec{M}]\} = D[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} \vec{M}] \quad (2.7)$$

$$\{D[\vec{N}], H[N]\} = H[\mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} N] \quad (2.8)$$

$$\{H[N], H[M]\} = D[\vec{L}] + G[A \cdot \vec{L}], \quad L^a := q^{-2/3} E_i^a E_i^b (M \partial_b N - N \partial_b M) \quad (2.9)$$

where in the first line  $G[\Lambda, \Lambda']$  denotes the Gauss Law constraint smeared with the  $su(2)$  Lie algebra commutator between  $\Lambda, \Lambda'$ . Note that the last Poisson bracket (between the Hamiltonian constraints) exhibits structure functions just as in Lorentzian gravity albeit with a different overall sign.

The Electric Shift  $N_i^a$  at point  $p$  is defined by

$$N_i^a(p) = N(p) E_i^a(p) q^{-1/3}(p) \quad (2.10)$$

As can be checked  $N_i^a(p)$  transforms like a Lie algebra valued vector field. Segregating an ‘Electric Shift’ part in brackets, we write (2.4) as:

$$H(N) = \frac{1}{2} \int \epsilon^{ijk} \left( \frac{N E_i^a}{q^{1/3}} \right) F_{abk} E_j^b. \quad (2.11)$$

On the constraint surface, the equations of motion generated by  $H(N)$  can be rewritten in a geometrically intriguing and compact form in terms of generalizations of Lie derivatives with respect to the Electric Shift [1]. Corresponding to this, in the quantum theory [2], the action of the Hamiltonian constraint operator on a spin network state generates deformations of the underlying spin network graph, these deformations being associated with the quantum Electric Shift operator. We review this action in the next section.

### 2.1.2 Hamiltonian Constraint Operator action on GR vertices

The Electric Shift operator at point  $p$  is constructed through a quantization of a regulated version of (2.10) followed by the removal of the regulator. The regulation employs a regulating coordinate patch  $\{x\}$  around the point  $p$ . The regulated quantum correspondent  $\hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}$  of  $q^{-\frac{1}{3}}$  at regulator value  $\tau$  is ordered right most. Standard regularizations of this operator using either a Thiemann like trick [5] or a Tychonoff trick (see for e.g. [17]) result in an action which is non-trivial only when  $p$  coincides with a vertex  $v$  of the gauge invariant spin network function  $S(A)$  being acted upon. This action changes the intertwiner at  $v$ . The final result is

$$\hat{N}_j^a(v)S(A) = \frac{3i}{4\pi}N(x(v)) \sum_{I=1}^N \hat{e}_I^a \hat{X}_{jI} S_\lambda(A) \quad (2.12)$$

Here  $N(x(v))$  is the evaluation of the density weight  $-\frac{1}{3}$  lapse  $N$  at  $v$  in the regulating coordinate patch.  $\hat{e}_I^a$  denotes the unit coordinate (outward pointing)  $I$ th edge tangent of  $S$  at  $v$ ,  $\hat{X}_{jI}$  is the left invariant  $SU(2)$  vector field action at  $v$  on the group element associated with the (outward pointing)  $I$ th edge of  $S$ .  $S_\lambda(A)$  denotes a spin network identical to  $S(A)$  except for the change of intertwiner at  $v$  rendered by the operator  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v)$  with  $\hat{q}_\tau^{-1/3}$  defined either through Thiemann like identities [5, 18] involving the Volume operator or through the Tikhonov regularization.<sup>4</sup>

In the Hamiltonian constraint operator, the Electric Shift is ordered right most. In this work we shall use the *Tikhonov regularization* together with the *Rovelli-Smolin Volume Operator* [15]. The reason for these choices will become clear as we go along. With these choices it follows from Footnote 4 that the Hamiltonian constraint operator has non-trivial action only at vertices of non-trivial volume. In section 5 of [2] we derived an action of the Hamiltonian constraint operator  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)$  at regulator value  $\epsilon$  on spin network vertices which had a specific vertex structure which we call a Grot-Rovelli or ‘GR’ vertex structure. A GR vertex structure is one for which any triple of edge tangent vectors is linearly independent. The action at a GR vertex  $v$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi}N(x(v)) \left( \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{j_I(j_I + 1)(S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon} - S_\lambda)}{\epsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(\sum_{J \neq I} \sum_{K \neq I,J} S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}) + (\sum_{J \neq I} S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}) - j_I(j_I + 1)(N - 1)S_\lambda}{\epsilon} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Here  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  is obtained by deforming the entire vertex structure of  $S_\lambda$  in an  $\epsilon$  vicinity of  $v$  along the  $I$ th edge in a specific way so that the vertex  $v$  is itself displaced by an amount  $\epsilon$  to the point  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . This deformation, denoted by  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  abruptly ‘pulls’ the remaining edges along the  $I$ th one and results in a kink at each of the  $J \neq I$  edges. Thus if the vertex  $v$  is  $N$  valent  $N - 1$  kinks  $\{\tilde{v}_J\}$  are created as depicted in Figures 1a,1b.

In contrast the graph underlying the states  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}$ ,  $S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  is obtained by considering the action of  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  on one edge at a time rather than on the entire vertex structure. The deformed graph underlying each of these states then consists of the original graph together with this one deformed edge (the  $K$ th one in  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}$  and the  $J$ th one in  $S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ . As a result, instead of point  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  being a new  $N$  valent vertex, it is now a kink and instead of the  $N - 1$  kinks only a single kink is created (at  $\tilde{v}_J$  in  $S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  and at  $\tilde{v}_K$  in  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}$ ). Here by a kink we mean either a bivalent

<sup>4</sup> The regularization [17] defines the action of the inverse of a positive operator  $\hat{O}$  on a state  $\psi$  as  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} (\hat{O} + \epsilon)^{-2} \hat{O} \psi$  where  $(\hat{O} + \epsilon)^{-1}$  is defined through spectral analysis. The result is an operator which annihilates the zero eigenvalue states of  $\hat{O}$ .




FIGURE (1): Fig 1a shows the undeformed vertex structure at  $v$ .  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  is visualised to act on this vertex structure by deforming it along its  $I$ th edge as shown in Fig 1b wherein the displaced vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and intersection point  $\tilde{v}_J$  between the  $J$ th edge and its deformed image are labelled. Fig 1c shows the loop  $l_{I,J,\epsilon}$  which starts from  $v$ , runs along the  $I$ th edge to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ , moves along the  $J$ th displaced edge to  $\tilde{v}_J$  and then back to  $v$  along (and in the opposite direction to)  $e_J$ .

vertex with linearly independent edge tangents or a trivalent vertex located in the interior of one semianalytic edge from which a second semianalytic edge emanates with edge tangent linearly independent with respect to the edge tangent of the first edge at this vertex. The deformed states  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  are denoted in Figures 2a, 2b.




FIGURE (2): Figures 2a, 2b depict the deformed vertex structure of  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  respectively. The box represents the intertwiner  $C_\lambda$  located at the position of the undisplaced vertex  $v$  of  $S$  (see Figure 1a). Insertions of  $\tau_j$  are represented by circles. The touching of an object with the intertwiner box indicates an index contraction between an index of the object and that of the intertwiner so that whereas both the  $\tau_j$ 's have index contractions with  $C_\lambda$  in Figure 2a, in Figure 2b only the one on the  $I$ th edge has such an index contraction.

These states in general are not spin networks themselves but can be expanded in a spin network basis and the ‘one edge at a time’ deformed graph is the (not necessarily coarsest) graph underlying each of these spin networks. In each of these spin networks the single deformed edge carries the same spin as its undeformed counterpart and the only two edges which have altered spin labels are the ones which connect  $v$  to each of the two kinks. Besides the generation of two extra kinks in each of these spin networks, it is useful for future purposes to understand how the point  $v$  presents itself in these spin networks. More in detail, the point  $v$  is a non-degenerate GR vertex in  $S$ . Non-degeneracy implies that its valence is greater than 3. The question of interest is the nature of  $v$  in the spin networks generated by the ‘propagation’ part of the constraint action on  $S$  at  $v$ . Does  $v$  remain a GR vertex of the same valence or does its valence decrease? Is it possible for  $v$

to present itself as a kink? We turn to an account of the various possible presentations of  $v$  in the spin network decompositions of  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  below.

Let the valence of  $v$  in  $S$  be  $N$  so that  $N > 3$  for non-degeneracy. First consider the spin networks in the decomposition of  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}$ . In each of these spin networks the kink  $\tilde{v}_K$  is a bivalent kink (so that the part of  $e_K$  between  $v$  and  $\tilde{v}_K$  in  $S$  is absent). However, the nature of the kink at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and the presentation of  $v$  depends on details of the decomposition as follows. Let the  $I$ th and  $K$ th edge labels be  $j_I, j_K$  in  $S$ . Then the spin label  $j$  of the edge between  $v$  and  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in a spin network in the decomposition must arise as one of the representation labels in the product of the  $j_I$  and  $j_K$  representations. If it so happens that  $S$  is such that  $j_I = j_K$ , then depending on the intertwiner at  $v$  in  $S$ , it is possible that  $j = 0$  in one of the spin networks in the decomposition, in which case  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  presents itself in this spin network as a bivalent kink and  $v$  reduces its valence by 2. If  $N = 4$ ,  $v$  presents itself as a bivalent kink and for  $N > 4$  as an  $N - 2$  valent GR vertex. For the case that  $j \neq 0$ ,  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is a trivalent kink and  $v$  is an  $N - 1$  valent GR vertex.

Next, consider  $S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ . It follows from [2], that for every spin network in the decomposition of  $S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ , the spin label of the edge between  $v, \tilde{v}_J$  is equal to 1 so that the kink at  $\tilde{v}_J$  is necessarily trivalent. On the other hand the spin label  $j$  of the edge between  $v, v_{I,\epsilon}$  depends on the spin labels  $j_I$  and  $j_J$  of the  $I$ th and  $J$ th edges in  $S$ , and arises as one of the representation labels in the product of the  $j_I$  and  $j_J$  representations. If a spin network with  $j = 0$  manifests in the decomposition, then  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is a bivalent kink and  $v$  an  $N - 1$  valent GR vertex else  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  presents as a trivalent kink and  $v$  as an  $N$  valent GR vertex. This concludes our discussion of possible kink and vertex structures of spin networks generated by the constraint action (2.13) on a GR vertex.

Using the nomenclature developed in section 1, we refer to the states  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  as ‘diffeomorphism type children’ and to the states  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  as ‘propagation type children’. Equation (2.13) may be seen to arise through a regularization of the components of  $F_{ab}^i$  in the constraint in terms of small loop holonomies (depicted in Figure 1c) with the constraint action (2.13) emerging as the leading order term in an expansion in small loop areas, these areas being measured by the regulating coordinates. By independently changing the size of these small loops for the propagation terms and the diffeomorphism terms one can further modify the action (2.13) along the lines of Appendix C of [2]. More in detail, an application of the methods of section 5 of [2] to the final expression derived in Appendix C of [2] results in the modified ‘mixed’ action:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi}N(x(v))\left(\sum_{I=1}^N \frac{j_I(j_I+1)(S_{\lambda,I,a_I,\epsilon} - S_\lambda)}{a_I\epsilon}\right. \\ &\quad \left.- \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(\sum_{J \neq I} \sum_{K \neq I,J} S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,b_I,\epsilon}) + (\sum_{J \neq I} S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,b_I,\epsilon}) - j_I(j_I+1)(N-1)S_\lambda}{b_I\epsilon}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Here the small loops underlying the diffeomorphism type child  $S_{\lambda,I,a_I,\epsilon}$  have (coordinate) areas which are  $a_I$  times that of the corresponding small loops underlying  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  in (2.13) and those underlying the propagation type children  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,b_I,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,b_I,\epsilon}$  have (coordinate) areas which are  $b_I$  times that of the corresponding small loops underlying in  $S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  in (2.13). The construction of these small loops of prescribed area is described in section 2.3.1. *In this work we shall choose  $a_I = j_I(j_I + 1)$ ,  $b_I = \frac{4}{3}a_I(N - 1)$  so that the action of  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)$  at a GR vertex  $v$  of the*

spin network state  $S(A)$  which will be used in this work is:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi}N(x(v))\left(\sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon} - \frac{1}{4}S_\lambda)}{\epsilon}\right) \\ &- \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(\sum_{J \neq I} \sum_{K \neq I, J} \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}) + (\sum_{J \neq I} \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon})}{\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where we have set

$$S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon} := S_{\lambda,I,a_I=j_I(j_I+1),\epsilon}, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon} := \frac{3}{4(N-1)j_I(j_I+1)} S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,b_I=\frac{4}{3}(N-1)a_I,\epsilon}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon} := \frac{3}{4(N-1)j_I(j_I+1)} S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,b_I=\frac{4}{3}(N-1)a_I,\epsilon}, \quad (2.18)$$

Beyond the factors multiplying the propagation and diffeomorphism type children above, certain features of these deformed children will play a central role in our considerations. These features are: (a) the location of the displaced vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$ , (b) the edge tangent structure at this displaced vertex in  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$ , and (c) the number and placement of the kinks in  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, S_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ . While the feature (a) in this work is almost identical to that in [2], we shall modify/further specify the features (b) and (c) relative to [2]. The modifications will alter the structure of the deformed states on scales much smaller than  $\epsilon$  and hence (as discussed in section 8), the modified action will continue to be seen as arising from the quantization of a regulated approximant constraint. We discuss these modifications/specifications in section 2.3.

## 2.2 Choice of Regulating Coordinates

Since the Hamiltonian constraint action on a spin net state is only non-trivial at vertices of non-degenerate volume, the lapse function is evaluated only at such vertices (2.15). Since we work with a higher than unit density Hamiltonian constraint, the lapse is non-trivially density weighted and its evaluation at such a spin net vertex requires a coordinate patch around that vertex. From [2] this coordinate patch serves as a regulating coordinate patch to define the action of the constraint operator at that vertex of the spin net state. As remarked in section 1, we are interested in the *dual* action of the constraint operator on a basis off shell states, each such basis state  $\Psi_{f,h}$  being labelled by a function  $f$  and a Riemannian metric  $h$ . Since any such state resides in the algebraic dual space<sup>5</sup> to the finite span of spin network states, this dual action is specified through the evaluation of the amplitude  $\Psi_{f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)|s)$  for every spin net  $|s)$ .

Following [11], we *tailor the choice of the regulating coordinates to the metric label  $h$  of the basis state  $\Psi_{f,h}$* . As detailed in [11] and shown in section 6 of this work, such a choice ensures a transparent and simple implementation of spatial diffeomorphism covariance. Our specific choice of regulating coordinates at a vertex  $v$  is that of Riemann Normal Coordinates (RNCs) centered at  $v$  and defined by  $h$ . This is in contrast to the complicated network of coordinate patches used in [11] and simplifies the exposition considerably with respect to that of [11].

<sup>5</sup>Elements of the algebraic dual are complex linear mappings on the finite span of spin network states. Each such element (denoted by  $\Psi$ ) can be thought of as a (in general, formal) sum over spin network ‘bra’ states. The action of the complex linear map  $\Psi$  on a spin net state  $|s)$  is written as the ‘amplitude’  $\Psi(|s)$

Two key properties of RNCs are as follows. First, the coordinate edge tangent vector  $\hat{e}_I^a$  along the  $I$ th edge at the vertex  $v$ , when evaluated with respect to the RNCs at  $v$  defined by the metric  $h$ , is exactly the edge tangent vector with unit norm with respect to  $h$  at  $v$  i.e.

$$h_{ab}\hat{e}_I^a\hat{e}_I^b|_v = 1. \quad (2.19)$$

This follows directly from the definition of RNCs. Next let a point  $p_\epsilon$  be located at a geodesic distance  $\epsilon$  away from the point  $p$  for small enough  $\epsilon$  that  $p_\epsilon$  is in a convex normal neighborhood of  $p$ . Note that from the definition of the RNCs at  $p$  this distance is the same as the coordinate distance of  $p_\epsilon$  from  $p$ . Let the RNCs centered at  $p$  be  $\{x\}$  and at  $p_\epsilon$  be  $\{x\}_\epsilon$ . Let the Jacobian of the former with respect to the latter be  $J$  so that

$$J^i_j = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial x_\epsilon^j} \quad (2.20)$$

Then at  $p_\epsilon$  we have that

$$\det J|_{p_\epsilon} = 1 + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (2.21)$$

where  $\det J$  is the determinant of  $J$ . For a proof, see Appendix A.

### 2.3 Modified Action on GR vertices

From [2], the constraint action (2.15) at a spin net vertex depends on the specification of the action of the ‘electric diffeomorphisms’ defined by the quantum shift at that vertex, this action being non-trivial in a small vicinity of the vertex. The specification of the action of these electric diffeomorphisms turns out to be simple and straightforward for GR vertices (recall that these are vertices at which any triple of edge tangents are linearly independent). Similar to the QSD case [5], we would like the resultant deformation of the vertex structure to be such that the deformed edges and their undeformed counterparts have simple and intuitively reasonable intersection structure. Whereas this is straightforward to achieve for GR vertex structures, for Non-GR (NGR) vertices, it is quite an intricate affair to define a deformation and the consequent routing of the deformed edges so that no undesired intersections occur. In [2] we focussed on the GR case. Here we find it necessary to modify the deformations of GR vertices specified in [2] on scales much smaller than the regulating parameter scale  $\epsilon$  for reasons described in section 1. Since the modifications are small scale they do not alter the validity of the derivation of the resulting action when viewed through the lense of approximants to leading order in  $\epsilon$ . More in detail, recall that the small loop holonomies discussed in section 2.1.2 play a key role in the action of the constraint and each of them provide a leading order contribution proportional to their area, this area being of order  $\epsilon^2$ . The modifications described in this section can be thought of as very small scale deformations of these small loops. Since (as can be seen explicitly in Appendices B, D) these deformations can be made arbitrarily small, they change the small loop area only by terms of higher order than  $\epsilon^2$ . This is why they are called ‘small scale’ and this is why they do not change the validity of the derivation of the resulting constraint action.

In section 2.3.1 we describe the deformations of a GR vertex  $v$  as constructed in [2]. Our description will be slightly qualitative in the interest of pedagogy. A technically complete construction suitable for our purposes (with a slightly altered placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in accordance with the latter part of section 2.3.1) may be found in Appendix B.1. In sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 we detail the small scale modifications of these deformations. We relegate attendant technicalities to Appendices B.2, B.3 and D.

### 2.3.1 Deformation of a GR Vertex in Reference [2]

From section 2.2 the regulating coordinates are RNCs centered at  $v$  and associated with the metric  $h$ . From the discussion in section 2.2 and as depicted in Figure 1b, the deformation associated with the  $I$ th edge tangent contribution to the Electric shift displaces the original vertex  $v$  along the edge  $e_I$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . In [2]  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is located a coordinate distance  $\epsilon$  along the  $I$ th edge from the vertex  $v$  i.e. the length of the part of the  $I$ th edge between the points  $v$  and  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  as measured by the regulating coordinates is  $\epsilon$ .

The  $J$ th deformed edge meets its undeformed counterpart  $e_J$  at the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$  and joins this kink to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . In the tangent space  $T_v$  at  $v$  consider the  $N - 1$  planes  $P_{IJ}, J \neq I$  formed by the  $I$ th and the  $J$ th edge tangents. Since  $v$  is GR, these planes are distinct. It follows that for small enough  $\epsilon$ , we can confine the  $J$ th deformed edge to within a small vicinity of the  $IJ$  coordinate plane and in this way, other than the intersection structure at  $\tilde{v}_J, v_{I,\epsilon}$  described above, avoid any further intersections between the undeformed and deformed edges as well between the deformed edges themselves. It also follows that the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  remains GR.

The small loops  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  alluded to in section 2.2 and depicted in Figure 1c run from  $v$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  along  $e_I$ , from  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  to  $\tilde{v}_J$  along the  $J$ th deformed edge and then back from  $\tilde{v}_J$  to  $v$  along the undeformed  $J$ th edge. As discussed in section 2.2, the areas of these loops are adjusted so as to obtain the expression (2.15). From the discussion in [2] these loops have areas of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$  so that  $\tilde{v}_J$  are located at distances of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  from  $v$ . The desired loop areas may then be obtained by adjusting the locations of the kinks  $\tilde{v}_J$ . This concludes our brief (and slightly more precise) description of the deformation of the graph structure around a GR vertex as defined in [2].

In what follows we shall change the placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  by an amount  $O(\epsilon^2)$ . This, by itself, does not change the small loop areas to  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$ . We shall also ‘smoothen’ all but 3 of the kinks and, further, change the placement of these remaining kinks. These modifications in the kink structure and placement are implemented in such a way that the loop areas are unchanged to  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$ . As a consequence the resulting constraint action retains its validity as a leading order in  $\epsilon$  approximant. Moreover the modifications can be seen to be on scales much smaller than  $\epsilon$ .

### 2.3.2 Modified placement of $v_{I,\epsilon}$ and modified choice and placement of kinks

We modify the placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  as follows. Recall that in [2]  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is placed such that the coordinate length of the  $I$ th edge between  $v$  and  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is  $\epsilon$ . Since this edge is not necessarily a coordinate straight line this edge length can differ from the coordinate distance between the two points  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and  $v$ . However, since the edge is  $C^r, r \gg 1$ , this difference is of  $O(\epsilon^2)$ . We modify the placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  by a coordinate distance  $O(\epsilon^2)$  so that the coordinate distance between the new position of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and  $v$  is  $\epsilon$ . Thus,  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is now placed on  $e_I$  in such a way that the coordinate length of the coordinate straight line connecting  $v$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is  $\epsilon$ . Since the coordinates are RNCs centered at  $v$ , this coordinate straight line distance is also the geodesic distance between  $v$  and  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ .

While the modified placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is implemented for the ‘diffeomorphism’ and the ‘propagation’ type deformations, we shall modify the ‘diffeomorphism’ deformations in a slightly different manner from the ‘propagation’ deformations with regard to their  $\tilde{v}_J$  kink structure. Accordingly first consider the ‘diffeomorphism’ deformation along the edge  $e_I$  depicted in Fig 1b with  $N - 1$  kinks  $\{\tilde{v}_J, J \neq I\}$ . As depicted in Fig 3, it is possible to alter the deformed edge emanating from the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$  in an arbitrary small vicinity of  $\tilde{v}_J$  so as to make it meet its undeformed counterpart ‘smoothly’. At a technical level, by ‘smoothly’ we mean in a manner which preserves the first  $r$  derivatives. In this regard, recall that the edges are  $C^r$  semianalytic. This smoothening can then be achieved by suitable ‘polynomial’ fits discussed in, for example, [18]. For a detailed account see

Appendix B of this paper.




FIGURE (3): The kink  $\tilde{v}_L$  between the pair of edges on the left is smoothed to give the single semianalytic edge on the right

In this manner we smoothen all but 3 of the kinks. Let the remaining kinks be  $\tilde{v}_{J_i}, i = 1, 2, 3$ . As depicted in Figure 4, we can then move each of these kinks along  $e_{J_i}$  as close to  $v$  as we desire with an arbitrarily small area change of the loop  $l_{IJ_i,\epsilon}$ . In the modified loop, the deformed edge emanates from the new kink position and runs ‘almost’ along  $e_{J_i}$  till it reaches the vicinity of the old position of the kink, and, subsequently moves towards  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  as before. In detail this can be achieved in one of two ways: either by polynomial  $C^r$  joins or by the action of appropriate semianalytic diffeomorphisms of compact support (see Appendices B and D).




FIGURE (4)

FIGURE (5): The first figure depicts the movement of the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$  towards  $v$  through the procedure outlined in Appendices B and D. The second figure shows the modification in the small loop  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  required to achieve this movement. The lower strand of the modified loop on the right curves in the vicinity of the original position of the kink and connects to the displaced kink. The closer this strand is to the undeformed edge  $e_J$ , the smaller is the change in area of the modified loop relative to the original one on the left.

We shall place these 3 kinks as follows. Let  $\epsilon$  be small enough that the 3 kinks are in a single Convex Normal Neighborhood (with respect to the metric  $h$ ) of  $v$ . We shall place the 3 kinks, such that two of them are at a distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^q), q \geq 2$  from  $v$  with the third at a distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^p), p \gg q$ , in such a way that the 3 interkink geodesic distances (with respect to  $h$ ) are unequal, with the ratio of the smallest interkink distance to the largest being equal to  $1/2$  to order  $\epsilon^q$  i.e.

$$\frac{d_{min}}{d_{max}} = \frac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon^q), \quad d_{min} := \min_{i \neq j} d(\tilde{v}_{J_i}, \tilde{v}_{J_j}) \quad d_{max} := \max_{i,j} d(\tilde{v}_{J_i}, \tilde{v}_{J_j}) \quad (2.22)$$

with

$$d(\tilde{v}_{J_i}, \tilde{v}_{J_j}) \sim \mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{q \geq 2}) \quad , i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \quad (2.23)$$

where  $d(p_1, p_2)$  denotes the geodesic distance between the points  $p_1, p_2$  (see Appendix C for a demonstration that such a placement exists). Recall that the state obtained by an electric diffeomorphism of  $S_\lambda$  was denoted by  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  in (2.16), section 2.1. We shall denote its modification (with

only 3 kinks placed as above and with the modified placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  described above) by

$$S_{\lambda,I,\vec{J},\epsilon} \quad (2.24)$$

where  $\vec{J} := (\hat{J}_1, \hat{J}_2, \hat{J}_3)$  denotes the 3 chosen edges on which the kinks are placed. In addition, the notation will also be assumed to encode the placement of each of the kinks as follows. The kink closest to  $v$  is denoted by  $\tilde{v}_{\hat{J}_3}$ . Of the two remaining kinks, the kink closer to  $v$  is chosen to be  $\tilde{v}_{\hat{J}_2}$  (this corresponds to  $v_1$  in Appendix C) The third (remaining) kink, corresponding to  $v_2$  in Appendix C is then at  $\tilde{v}_{\hat{J}_1}$ .

Next, consider the ‘propagation’ deformations associated with the  $I$ th component of the electric shift as depicted in Fig 2. Each such deformation creates a pair of kinks, one at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and the other at  $\tilde{v}_J$ . While the location of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  has been described above and is the same as for the diffeomorphism deformation, we move the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$  to a coordinate distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^q)$ ,  $q \geq 2$  from  $v$ , where we remind the reader that these coordinates are RNC’s centered at  $v$ . As for the ‘diffeomorphism’ type deformation this can be done with an arbitrarily small change in the coordinate area of the loop  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$ . Since the metric is  $C^{r-1}$ ,  $r \gg 1$ , it is straightforward to conclude that the geodesic distance of this kink from  $v$  is of the same order as its coordinate distance from  $v$ . Since  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is at a geodesic distance  $\epsilon$  from  $v$ , it then follows that for the propagation deformation with a kink at  $\tilde{v}_J$  and for small enough  $\epsilon$  that

$$d(\tilde{v}_J, v_{I,\epsilon}) = \epsilon + O(\epsilon^{q \geq 2}). \quad (2.25)$$

From here on the states (2.17), (2.18) will be assumed to have kink placements as detailed in (2.25).

### 2.3.3 Modified edge tangent structure at displaced vertex

From section 2.3.1 and Appendix B.1, the ‘diffeomorphism’ type deformation of a GR vertex  $v$  along the edge  $e_I$  preserves the GR property so that  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is also GR. We shall modify this deformation in an arbitrarily small vicinity of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in a manner which preserves the GR property as well as the location of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ , and endows the edge tangent configuration with a stiff ‘upward’ conical structure around the edge  $e_I$ . By a ‘stiff upward cone’ we mean that the component of the  $J$ th edge tangent at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  orthogonal to  $\hat{e}_I^a$  is much smaller than the component along  $e_I$ . The small orthogonal contribution to each of the  $N - 1$  edge tangents is required to be such that the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  remains GR. More precisely, we require that for small enough  $\epsilon$ :

$$\hat{e}'^a_J|_{v_{I,\epsilon}} = \hat{e}^a_I|_{v_{I,\epsilon}} + O(\epsilon^2)v^a_J. \quad (2.26)$$

where  $O(\epsilon^2)v^a_J$  is non-vanishing for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $v^a_J$  is of metric norm  $\mathbf{O}(1)$  and the set of vectors  $\{\hat{e}^a_I|_{v_{I,\epsilon}}, v^a_J, J \neq I\}$  is such that no triple is linearly dependent. We depict the desired modification of the edge tangent structure in Fig 6.




FIGURE (6): The edge tangent configuration at the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  on the left is modified to the upward pointing configuration shown on the right.

As shown in Appendices B, D this modification can be implemented both by using exclusively polynomial  $C^r$  joins as well as through the use of such joins in conjunction with semianalytic diffeomorphisms of compact support.

### 2.3.4 Modified constraint action on GR vertices

The ‘upward conical’ modification of edge tangent structure described in the previous section is applied to the vicinity of the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  of the 3-kink modified state  $S_{\lambda,I,\vec{J}\epsilon}$  (2.24). To summarise: The modification of the ‘diffeomorphism child’  $S_{I,\epsilon}$  is three fold: the first modification is the  $O(\epsilon^2)$  adjustment of section 2.3.2 to the placement of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ , the second is to the kink structure as described in section 2.3.2 and the third modification is the upward conical modification described above. The modification of each of the ‘propagation’ children is two fold  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ : first, we have the modified placement of the kink  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ , identical to that for the diffeomorphism child and second, the kinks (at  $\tilde{v}_K$ , respectively  $\tilde{v}_J$ ) are placed as described in section 2.3.2. We shall abuse notation slightly and continue to denote the resulting ‘vertex placement, upward conical, 3-kink’ modification of  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  by  $S_{\lambda,I,\vec{J}\epsilon}$  and also continue to denote the ‘kink placement’ modifications of the propagation children by  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ .

The modified version of the constraint action is then:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi}N(x(v))\left(\sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(S_{\lambda,I,\vec{J}\epsilon} - \frac{1}{4}S_\lambda)}{\epsilon}\right) \\ &- \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(\sum_{J \neq I} \sum_{K \neq I,J} \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}) + (\sum_{J \neq I} \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon})}{\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

In the above expression, the diffeomorphism type deformation depends on an arbitrary choice of kink triples specified through  $\vec{J}$ . Since there is no natural choice for  $\vec{J}$  we sum over all such choices. For fixed  $I$  there are  ${}^{N-1}P_3$  choices of  $\vec{J}$  for a GR vertex of valence  $N$ . Each such choice yields a legitimate constraint action (2.27). Hence we sum over such actions and divide by the factor  ${}^{N-1}P_3$  to obtain our final expression for the constraint action on a GR vertex  $v$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi}N(x(v))\left(\sum_{I=1}^N \frac{([\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{\vec{J}} S_{\lambda,I,\vec{J}\epsilon}] - \frac{1}{4}S_\lambda)}{\epsilon}\right) \\ &- \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{(\sum_{J \neq I} \sum_{K \neq I,J} \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}) + (\sum_{J \neq I} \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon})}{\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

## 2.4 Form of assumed action on non-GR vertices

We assume the following form for the constraint action on an  $N$  valent non GR vertex  $v$ :

$$\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) = \frac{N(x(v))}{\epsilon} \left( \left( \sum_{I=1}^N A_I S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon} \right) + B S_\lambda + \left( \sum_{I=1}^N \sum_{J \neq I} \sum_{\alpha_{IJ}} P_{\alpha_{IJ}} S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon} \right) \right) \quad (2.29)$$

Here  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  is a diffeomorphism type deformation of  $S_\lambda$  which displaces the vertex  $v$  along  $e_I$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  by a coordinate distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$ . We shall assume that this deformation preserves the NGR nature of the vertex so that  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is also an NGR vertex. In addition we make a further assumption which we state using certain nomenclature defined in section 3.1 and which we justify through a

construction described in Appendices D.2 and B.3. We assume that, similar to the GR case, three of the deformed edges of  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$  meet their undeformed counterparts at kinks. Such a deformation may be obtained by the action on  $S_\lambda$  of a semianalytic diffeomorphism of the type constructed in section D.2 to yield a state  $S_{diff}$  followed by the introduction of the desired kinks. Since the diffeomorphism is identity outside a small neighborhood  $U$  of the vertex, we may place kinks  $k$  at the chosen edges in  $S_{diff}$  at the intersection of these edges with the boundary of this neighborhood through the following procedure. Choose a small neighborhood of  $k$  such that no other edge than the edge of interest intersects this neighborhood and fix a semianalytic coordinate patch thereon. Remove part of the edge connecting  $k$  to a point  $p$  in this neighborhood and join  $k$  to  $p$  by a pair of coordinate straight lines one from  $k$  to a suitable point  $q$  in this neighborhood and then from  $q$  to  $p$  so that these lines do not intersect the edge of interest except at  $k, p$  and such that  $k, q, p$  are kinks. Finally, smoothen the kinks at  $q, p$  using the techniques of Appendix B.3 thereby leaving a kink at  $k$ . This concludes our account of the state  $S_{\lambda,I,\epsilon}$ .

$S_\lambda$  is, as defined for the GR case, a spin net identical to  $S$  except for a different intertwiner at the NGR vertex  $v$ . The subscript  $\alpha_{IJ}$  denotes a ‘propagation’ type deformation of the vertex structure at  $v$  in an  $\epsilon$  size vicinity of  $v$ . By ‘propagation’ type we mean that, similar to the GR case of propagation type deformations, the deformation structure is as follows. As in the GR case, the deformations which contribute to the constraint action are expected to arise from the nontriviality of the curvature components  $F_{ab}^i \hat{e}_I^a \hat{e}_J^b$ . Hence the  $IJ$  label ranges over pairs of edges with *linearly independent* tangents at  $v$ . Consider the points  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  along the  $I$ th edge  $e_I$  of  $S$  and  $\tilde{v}_J$  on the edge  $e_J$  of  $S$  with  $\tilde{v}_J$  at a coordinate distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{q \geq 2})$  from  $v$ .<sup>6</sup> Join these 2 points with a semianalytic edge  $e'_J$  which does not intersect the graph  $\gamma$  underlying  $S$  except at these two points and whose edge tangents at  $\tilde{v}_J, v_{I,\epsilon}$  are linearly independent with respect to the edge tangents along  $e_J, e_I$  at  $\tilde{v}_J, v_{I,\epsilon}$  respectively.<sup>7</sup> Then the graph underlying each of the deformed states  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  is

$$\gamma_{IJ} = \gamma \cup e'_J \quad (2.30)$$

Using the notation  $e(p, q)$  to denote the semianalytic edge containing  $p$  to  $q$ , consider the edges  $e(v, v_{I,\epsilon}), e(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J), e(\tilde{v}_J, v) \subset \gamma_{IJ}$ . These edges combine to form the loop  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$ . The colorings of  $\gamma_{IJ} - l_{IJ,\epsilon} \subset \gamma$  in each  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  are the same as for their counterparts in  $S$ . While the coloring of  $e(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J) \equiv e'_J$  in  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  is the same as that of  $e_J$  in  $S$ , the colorings of the remaining edges of  $l_{IJ,\epsilon} \subset \gamma_{IJ}$  are different from those in  $S$  and can include the trivial  $j = 0$  coloring,<sup>8</sup> in which case  $\gamma_{IJ}$  is not the coarsest graph underlying  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$ . The points  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  are kinks in  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  (for a precise definition of kinks see section 3.1) and depending on the edge colorings of  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  have uniquely defined intertwiners by virtue of their bivalent or trivalent nature. Finally, the intertwiner at  $v$  in  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  differs from that in  $S$ . Thus the label  $\alpha_{IJ,\epsilon}$  denotes a deformation which introduces the pair of kinks  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  together with the colored edge  $e(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J)$  and encodes the changes in colorings on the edges  $e(v, v_{I,\epsilon}), e(\tilde{v}_J, v)$  and the change in the intertwiner at  $v$  relative to  $S$ . If  $e(v, v_{I,\epsilon})$  is colored with  $j = 0$ ,  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is a bivalent kink. If  $e(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J)$  is colored with  $j = 0$ ,  $\tilde{v}_J$  is a bivalent kink. Clearly the presence of each such bivalent kink reduces the valence of  $v$  relative to its valence in  $S$  by 1.

Since the vertex  $v$  is nondegenerate in  $S$  it has a minimum valence of 4. Since it is NGR in  $S$ , it is straightforward to see that reduction of its valence by 1 or 2 can lead to its presentation in  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  as any of the following: a GR or NGR vertex, a  $C^{m < r}$  bivalent or trivalent kink, a  $C^r$

<sup>6</sup>Similar to the GR case, we assume that this kink positioning can be implemented without affecting the interpretation of the constraint action at parameter  $\epsilon$  as that of a leading order approximant to the constraint.

<sup>7</sup>This can be achieved, for example, through the procedure detailed in (ii) section 8.

<sup>8</sup>Since any edge with  $j = 0$  coloring is absent, it is possible that the removal of such an edge from the set of edges at  $v$  in  $S$  can convert  $v$  from an NGR vertex in  $S$  to a GR vertex in  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$ .

trivalent kink<sup>9</sup> or an interior point on a single semianalytic edge. Note that if both  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and  $\tilde{v}_J$  are trivalent there is no reduction in valence and  $v$  continues to be an NGR vertex with unchanged edge tangent structure relative to its presentation in  $S$ .

It follows from the positioning of  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  described above that the coordinate distance between  $\tilde{v}_J$  and  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$ . It also follows straightforwardly that the geodesic distances as measured by the metric  $h$  are:

$$d(v_{I,\epsilon}, v) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon) \quad (2.31)$$

$$d(\tilde{v}_J, v) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{q \geq 2}) \quad (2.32)$$

$$d(\tilde{v}_J, v_{I,\epsilon}) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon) \quad (2.33)$$

Note that, for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ , as  $\epsilon$  is decreased, the deformed spin network  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  has the same  $\epsilon$ -independent vertex intertwiner at  $v$  as well as the same  $\epsilon$  independent abstract colored graph structure (see section 3.1 for a definition of this abstract structure). This  $\epsilon$  independent abstract structure is encoded by the index  $\alpha_{IJ}$ . The extra label  $\epsilon$  in  $\alpha_{IJ}, \epsilon$  indicates that the deformation is confined in an  $\epsilon$  vicinity of  $v$  with the placements of the kinks at  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  as detailed above.<sup>10</sup>

$A_I, B, P_{\alpha_{IJ}}$  are (not necessarily non-vanishing) complex coefficients. While it is not necessary for our demonstration of anomaly free constraint action to specify the deformations and coefficients in (2.29) beyond our discussion above, we shall present one possible concrete and complete such specification and justify its validity in section 8.

**Note:** We note here that the deformed spin network states (in the spin network decomposition of the deformed states) which arise in the constraint action (2.15) on GR vertices are also of the type  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  so that (2.15) is of the type (2.29). We reiterate this observation in the first part of section 4.3.

## 2.5 Constraint action on any spin net

Equations (2.15) and (2.29) imply that the constraint action on any spin net  $|s\rangle$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(s)} N(x(v)) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{([\frac{1}{N_v-1} P_3 \sum_{\tilde{J}_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \tilde{J}_v, \epsilon}] - \frac{1}{4} S_{\lambda_v})}{\epsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{(\sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{K_v \neq I_v, J_v} \tilde{S}_{\lambda_v, (1)I_v, J_v, K_v, \epsilon}) + (\sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \tilde{S}_{\lambda_v, (2)I_v, J_v, \epsilon})}{\epsilon} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{v \in V_{NGR}(s)} \frac{N(x(v))}{\epsilon} \left( \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} A_{v I_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon} \right) + B_v S_{\lambda_v} + \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\alpha_{v I_v J_v}} P_{\alpha_{v I_v J_v}} S_{\alpha_{v I_v J_v}, \epsilon} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Here  $V_{GR}(s)$  is the set of volume non-degenerate GR vertices of  $s$  and  $V_{NGR}(s)$  is the set of volume non-degenerate NGR vertices of  $s$ . The  $v$  subscripts are used in obvious notation to denote dependence on the vertex  $v$ .

It is useful to denote the contribution from the GR vertices in the first two lines as  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A)|_{V_{GR}(s)}$  and that from the NGR vertices as  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A)|_{V_{NGR}(s)}$  so that

$$\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) = \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A)|_{V_{GR}(s)} + \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A)|_{V_{NGR}(s)}. \quad (2.35)$$

<sup>9</sup>See section 3.1 for the definition of a  $C^m$  kink.

<sup>10</sup>More precisely  $\alpha_{IJ}$  is a label for the embeddable abstract spin network whose embedding into  $S_{\alpha_{IJ},\epsilon}$  is specified by  $\alpha_{IJ}, \epsilon$  (see section 3.1 for the definition of an embeddable abstract spin network).

For future purposes it is important to emphasise certain features of the deformed states generated by the constraint action (2.34). These features follow directly from the discussion and analysis in sections 2.1.2, 2.3 and 2.4 :

- (i) In the first line of (2.34) the GR vertex  $v$  in  $S$  is replaced by one at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}$ .
- (ii) In the second line of (2.34), in the state  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda_v, (2)I_v, J_v, \epsilon}$  can be decomposed into spin networks. In each such spin network, there is a trivalent kink on the  $J_v$ th edge and either a trivalent or a bivalent kink at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  in which case the  $v$  remains GR and has either the same valence as in  $S$  or this valence reduces by 1. The state  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda_v, (1)I_v, J_v, K_v, \epsilon}$  can also be decomposed into spin networks. In each of these spin networks there are a pair of kinks, a bivalent one along the  $K_v$ th edge emanating from  $v$  and a bivalent or trivalent one at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . The point  $v$  is either a bivalent kink or a GR vertex of valence 3 or more.
- (iii) In the 3rd line of (2.34), the NGR vertex  $v$  in  $S$  is replaced by an NGR vertex at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$ .
- (iv) In the 3rd line of (2.34), the deformations  $\alpha_{vI_v J_v}$  create a pair of kinks one along the  $J_v$ th edge and another at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . Depending on the properties of  $\alpha_{vI_v J_v}$ , either or both of these kinks could be bivalent or trivalent. Consequently the valence of  $v$  in  $S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}$  could reduce by 0 or 1 or 2 relative to its valence in  $S$ . Depending on the original vertex structure at  $v$  in  $S$ , this could result in  $v$  presenting itself in  $S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}$  as a GR vertex of valence 3 or more, an NGR vertex of valence 3 or more, a trivalent kink or a bivalent kink or an interior point of a single semianalytic edge.

### 3 Off Shell Basis States $\Psi_{B,f,h}$

The off shell states are finite linear combinations of basis states. Each basis state is labelled by a  $C^{r-1}$  3d Riemannian metric  $h$  and a  $C^r$  function  $f$  on the semianalytic  $C^r$  Cauchy slice  $\Sigma$ . Permissible metric labels are elements of the set  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  of distinct diffeomorphic images of the metric  $h_0$  where  $h_0$  is a metric with no conformal isometries. An off shell basis state is an element of the algebraic dual to the finite span of spin net states and can be thought of as a (in general) non-normalizable formal sum over spin network bra states (see Footnote 5) . The set of these bra state summands  $B$  is referred to as the Bra Set and the Bra Set serves as an additional label for basis off shell states. Thus  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  denotes an off shell basis state labelled by a  $C^r$  function  $f$ , a metric  $h$  with  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  and a Bra Set  $B$ . The state is then specified by the coefficients of each bra in the Bra Set, each such coefficient being determined by  $f, h$  and the bra summand being multiplied by that coefficient. The coefficient of a bra  $\langle s | \in B$  is then simply the evaluation of the algebraic dual off shell basis state on the ket counterpart of  $\langle s |$  i.e. the coefficient of  $\langle s |$  is  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle)$ . While the  $f$  dependence of the coefficient is just the product of the evaluations of  $f$  on every GR vertex of  $\langle s |$ , the  $h$  dependence is more complicated and depends on the structure of the set of kinks in the graph underlying the spin net label  $s$ .

The layout of this section is as follows. Subsection 3.1 introduces nomenclature and definitions which play a key role in the articulation of the subsequent sections. In subsection 3.2 we specify the properties of permissible Bra Set labels. In subsection 3.3 we isolate a particular  $h$  dependent structural feature of the set of kinks on a graph which is of use in specifying the  $h$  dependence of the coefficient. In subsection 3.4 we specify  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  through a specification of the coefficients  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle)$  for every  $\langle s | \in B$ . In what follows we shall often refer to  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle)$  as the amplitude of the off shell state on  $|s\rangle$ .

#### 3.1 Preliminaries

In order to specify the off shell state it is necessary to define the following:

1. *Bivalent Kink*: A Bivalent  $C^m$  kink (with  $0 \leq m < r$ ) is an intersection  $k$  between two unoriented semianalytic edges <sup>11</sup>  $e_i, i = 1, 2$  such that  $k$  is a common endpoint for these edges and which has the following property. Orient one of the edges to be incoming and the other outgoing at  $k$ . Fix a semianalytic  $C^r$  coordinate patch around  $k$ . Then for the case  $m > 0$ 
  - (a) there exists a parameterization of each edge consistent with its orientation in which the first  $m$  derivatives at  $k$  satisfy  $\frac{d^m}{dt_1} e_1^\mu = \frac{d^m}{dt_2} e_2^\mu$  and in which at  $k$  the  $(m + 1)$ th derivatives are unequal i.e.  $\frac{d^{m+1}}{dt_1^{m+1}} e_1^\mu \neq \frac{d^{m+1}}{dt_2^{m+1}} e_2^\mu$ , and,
  - (b) there is no choice of parameterizations in which the first  $m + 1$  derivatives are equal at  $k$ . For  $m = 0$  a bivalent  $C^0$  kink is one at which the edge tangents at  $k$  are linearly independent. It is straightforward to see that these definitions are independent of the choice of coordinates and the choice of which edge is taken to be incoming. Consequently the notion of a  $C^{m < r}$  bivalent kink is diffeomorphism invariant with respect to  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphisms.
  
2. *Trivalent Kink*: A trivalent kink  $k$  is the intersection of an unoriented semianalytic edge  $e$  located in its interior, with a distinct unoriented semianalytic edge  $e'$  with an end point at  $k$ . Trivalent kinks can be of type  $C^m, 0 \leq m \leq r$ . These kink types are defined as follows:
  - 2.1 Choose an orientation for  $e, e'$ . If the edge tangents of  $e$  and  $e'$  are linearly independent at  $k$  the kink is defined to be a  $C^0$  kink. Clearly this notion is invariant under the action of  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphisms.
  - 2.2 The point  $k$  is defined to be a trivalent  $C^m$  kink for  $0 < m < r$  if there exists an orientation assignment for  $e$  with  $e'$  assigned an outgoing orientation such that the incoming part of  $e$  at  $k$  together with  $e'$  (which has been chosen to be outgoing at  $k$ ) form a  $C^m$  bivalent kink. Clearly the notion of such a  $C^m$  kink is invariant under the action of  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphisms.
  - 2.3 The point  $k$  is defined to be a trivalent  $C^r$  kink if
    - (i)  $e'$  is assigned an outgoing orientation, and
    - (ii) there exists an orientation assignment and parameterization  $t$  consistent with this assignment for  $e$  together a parameterization  $t'$  of  $e'$  consistent with its assigned outgoing orientation at  $k$  such that the first  $r$  derivatives,  $\frac{d^m}{dt^m} e'^\mu, m = 1, \dots, r$  along the outgoing part of  $e'$  agree with their counterparts,  $\frac{d^m}{dt^m} e^\mu, m = 1, \dots, r$  along the incoming part (as well as, by virtue of  $e$  being a single edge, the outgoing part) of  $e$  at  $k$ . A  $C^r$  kink  $k$  can also be seen as the intersection of 3 edges  $e_1, e_2, e_3$  in which two of the edges (say  $e_2, e_3$ ) merge into the remaining edge  $e_1$  in a  $C^r$  manner (i.e. with  $e_2, e_3$  incoming and  $e_1$  outgoing there exist parameterizations  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  of the three edges consistent with their orientations such that  $\frac{d^m}{dt_i^m} e_i^\mu, i = 1, 2, 3$  agree with each other for each  $m \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ ).
It can be checked that this definition is coordinate independent so that the notion of a  $C^r$  trivalent kink is invariant under the action of  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphisms.
  
3. *Vertex*: An  $N$  valent vertex  $v$  for  $N > 3$  is the intersection of  $N$  distinct semianalytic edges each with a single endpoint at  $v$  (thus a loop through  $v$  would contribute 2 distinct edges). A 3 valent vertex is the intersection of 3 distinct semianalytic edges which is not a trivalent kink. Note that the trivalent vertex can be NGR (i.e. have linearly dependent edge tangents) without being a kink.
  
4. *Embeddable Abstract Spin Network*: We develop the notion of an embeddable abstract spin network as an abstract labelled structure with the labels specifying the nature of realizations

---

<sup>11</sup>A semianalytic edge is defined [25] to be a 1d semianalytic manifold with 2 point boundary.

(i.e. embeddings) of this structure as an embedded spin network.

Our starting point is the abstract spin network defined by Baez [19]. We review that definition here, for details see section 2 of Reference [19]. An abstract (oriented) graph is specified by its edges, vertices and connectivity i.e. which edges meet at which vertices. More in detail an abstract graph  $\gamma$  comprises of a finite set  $E$  of edges, a finite set  $V$  of vertices, and functions  $s : E \rightarrow V$ ,  $t : E \rightarrow V$  where the vertex  $s(e)$  is called the source of the edge  $e$ , and the vertex  $t(e)$  the target of the  $e$ . An edge is outgoing at its source and incoming at its target. An abstract spin network consists of an abstract graph  $\gamma$ , a labelling of each its edges  $e_I$  by spin quantum numbers  $j_I$  (i.e. by representations of  $SU(2)$ ) and an assignation of invariant tensors called intertwiners  $\mathcal{I}_v$ , one for every vertex  $v$ , which map the product of incoming edge representations to that of outgoing edge representations. Note that there is a slight degeneracy in the set of labels as follows. Consider an abstract spin network state specified by  $\gamma, \{j_I, \}, \{\mathcal{I}_v\}$ . Change  $\gamma$  to  $\gamma'$  by flipping some or all of the orientations of the edges of  $\gamma$ . Retain the same spin labels for the edges in  $\gamma'$  as for their counterparts in  $\gamma$ . Then from standard  $SU(2)$  representation theory there exists a unique (at most upto rescaling by a constant  $c_v$  such that  $\prod_v c_v = 1$ ) choice of vertex intertwiners  $\{\mathcal{I}'_v\}$  such that the same spin network state is specified by the labels  $\gamma', \{j_I, \}, \{\mathcal{I}'_v\}$ . In what follows, we shall append the qualifier ‘abstract’ to any element of the abstract graph whenever there is a possibility of confusion between abstract and embedded structures. In particular for abstract vertices as defined above, we do not distinguish between vertices and kinks, whereas we do distinguish between embedded images of such vertices as kinks and vertices as defined above.

We now embellish the definition of an abstract spin network by augmenting the intertwiner specification with additional finitely specified information (called a ‘decoration’) at each of its vertices. To this end, given an abstract graph we define its decorated counterpart as follows.

First consider the case of bivalent vertices. We shall always work with a representative of the abstract spin network with orientation such that at any bivalent kink there is one incoming and one outgoing edge (it is straightforward to see that this is always possible by suitable orientation flips and intertwiner choices) with the intertwiner simply being the identity matrix. We tailor our definitions below in such a way that the only abstract vertices which are permitted to be bivalent are those which are embeddable as  $C^{m < r}$  kinks. Accordingly, for a bivalent vertex the decoration consists of a single integer valued between 0 and  $r - 1$ , the idea being that permissible embeddings would embed the two edges at this vertex (more, precisely, their unoriented counterparts) in such a way that the decorated vertex is embedded as a bivalent  $C^{m < r}$  kink.

Next consider trivalent vertices. For each trivalent vertex, we specify an intertwiner (note that for this 3 valent case the intertwiner choice is limited to rescaling of the standard Clebsch-Gordon coefficient appropriate to the edge colorings and orientations at such a vertex). The decoration of a trivalent vertex consists of the following labels. Let the 3 *unoriented* edges intersecting at the abstract vertex be  $e_{I_1}, e_{I_2}, e_{I_3}$ . The first label is an integer  $-2 \leq m_0 \leq r$ . If  $m_0 = -2$ , the vertex is to be embedded as an NGR vertex, if  $m_0 = -1$  the vertex is to be embedded as a GR vertex. If  $m_0 \neq -1, -2$ , the abstract vertex is to be embedded as a  $C^{m_0}$  kink. To complete the specification of this embedding, we append an additional label comprising of one of the edge labels  $e_{I_i}$ . If  $m_0 < r$  the abstract vertex is to be embedded as a trivalent  $C^{m_0 < r}$  kink such that 2.1 (for  $m_0 = 0$ ) or 2.2 (for  $r > m_0 > 0$ ) above is satisfied with  $e_{I_i} = e'$  and  $\cup_{j \neq i} e_{I_j} = e$  embedded as a single  $C^r$  edge (see 2.1, 2.2 above). If  $m_0 = r$  the vertex is to be embedded as a  $C^r$  trivalent kink, with 2.3 satisfied with  $e_{I_i} = e_1$  and the

two remaining edges merging in a  $C^r$  manner with this  $I_i$ th edge (see 2.3 above).

If the abstract vertex has valence greater than 3, we specify an intertwiner. In contrast to the trivalent case, there is a finite (and greater than one) dimensional vector space of such intertwiners. The decoration label consists of a single integer  $n$ ,  $n \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $n = 0$  the vertex is to be embedded as a GR vertex, else as an NGR vertex.

A decorated abstract spin network consists of a decorated graph, a labelling of its edges by spin quantum numbers (i.e. by representations of  $SU(2)$ ) and an assignation of intertwiners, one for every vertex of valence greater than 2, which maps the product of incoming edge representations to that of outgoing edge representations (modulo the degeneracy in this labelling through orientation and intertwiner change as discussed above).

We refer to the (usual) spin networks defined on graphs in  $\Sigma$  as embedded spin networks. Consider a representative of an embedded spin network defined on the coarsest graph underlying it (in which case the only remaining choice of representative is its edge orientation and the associated intertwiners, this choice being the exact counterpart of the one discussed above for abstract spin networks). Such a representative, through its label set, naturally defines an associated decorated abstract spin network. A decorated abstract spin network  $\mathbf{S}$  is defined to be an *embeddable abstract spin network* iff there exists an embedded spin network  $S$  with associated decorated abstract spin network  $\mathbf{S}$ . In such a case,  $S$  will be called an *embedding* of  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  will be said to embed into  $S$ . Thus an embeddable abstract spin network is a decorated abstract spin network which admits at least one embedding into  $\Sigma$  as an embedded spin network. Clearly, while an embeddable abstract spin network will have infinitely many distinct embeddings, two distinct (i.e. non-isomorphic<sup>12</sup> and inequivalent in the sense of the orientation-intertwiner label degeneracy described above) embeddable abstract spin networks cannot embed into the same embedded spin network.

5. *Asymmetric Colored Graph*: Consider the *unoriented colored graph*  $\alpha_c(\mathbf{S})$  of a decorated abstract spin network  $\mathbf{S}$  obtained by dropping the orientation, intertwiner and decoration information from  $\mathbf{S}$ . Thus  $\alpha_c(\mathbf{S})$  is specified by (a) the vertex set  $V(S)$ , (b) edge set  $E$ , (c) a map  $b$  from  $E$  to  $V \times V$  such that  $b(e \in E) = \{x, y\} = \{s(e), t(e)\}$  with  $x, y$  called the endpoints of  $e$  and (d) a labelling of elements  $e$  of  $E$  by spins  $j(e)$ . Let the number of edges with end points  $\{x, y\}$  be  $\mu(x, y)$ .

A *colored graph automorphism* of  $\alpha_c$  is a bijection of  $\alpha_c$  which is defined through a permutation  $\sigma$  on  $V(\mathbf{S})$  such that for each edge  $e$  with end points  $\{x, y\}$  there exists an edge  $e_\sigma$  with end points  $b(e_\sigma) = \{\sigma(x), \sigma(y)\}$  with  $j(e_\sigma) = j(e)$  and  $\mu(\sigma(x), \sigma(y)) = \mu(x, y)$ . An *asymmetric colored graph* is a colored graph which has no automorphisms apart from the identity.

6. *Asymmetric Spin Network Basis*: The Volume operator acts at vertices of spin networks as a self adjoint operator on vertex intertwiners [15, 20]. For fixed vertex valence and edge colorings and edge orientations, the intertwiner space is finite dimensional and the self adjoint operator preserves each such finite dimensional space and thereby restricts to a self adjoint operator on this finite dimensional vector space of intertwiners. The eigen states of the operator action in this finite dimensional space constitute an orthonormal basis of intertwiners for non-degenerate eigen values and for degenerate eigen values some orthonormal basis spanning

---

<sup>12</sup>An isomorphism  $\iota$  between two embeddable abstract spin networks  $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2$  is a bijection from the vertex set  $V_1$  of  $\mathbf{S}_1$  to the vertex set  $V_2$  of  $\mathbf{S}_2$  in such a way that (a)  $v_2 = \iota(v_1)$  has the same decorations as  $v_1$ , (b) for every incoming (outgoing) colored edge at  $v_1$  there is a corresponding identically colored and oriented edge at  $v_2$  and vice versa, and (c)  $v_2$  and  $v_1$  have identical intertwiners.

the eigen space can be chosen and fixed once and for all. By an orthonormal basis we mean the following. Consider an  $N$  valent vertex at which there are  $M$  outgoing edges with spins  $j_1, \dots, j_M$  and  $N - M$  incoming edges with spins  $j_{M+1}, \dots, j_N$  so that an intertwiner  $C$  at this vertex has the index structure  $C^{A_1 \dots A_M}_{A_{M+1} \dots A_N}$  with  $A_I$  being a spin  $j_I$  representation space label. Then an orthonormal basis  $\{C_{(\mu)}\}$  of intertwiners for this configuration of oriented colored edges satisfies:

$$\sum_{A_I, I=1, \dots, N} C_{(\mu)}^{A_1 \dots A_M}_{A_{M+1} \dots A_N} (C_{(\nu)}^{A_1 \dots A_M}_{A_{M+1} \dots A_N})^* = \left( \prod_{I=1}^N \sqrt{2j_I + 1} \right) \delta_{\mu, \nu} \quad (3.1)$$

We call this basis of intertwiners as a *volume intertwiner basis*. It is straightforward to check that the normalization condition (3.1) for  $\mu = \nu$  ensures that the embeddings of abstract spin networks with intertwiners so normalised are of unit norm with respect to the Ashtekar Lewandowski inner product on the kinematic Hilbert space of LQG.

Our aim is to construct a well defined basis for embedded spin network states. For future purposes we require the basis set to map into itself under the action of diffeomorphisms and electric diffeomorphisms. Even just for diffeomorphisms this does not seem possible for arbitrary states because of the possible existence of graph symmetries [21] which can map a spin network on a graph with such symmetries to a distinct spin network on the same graph. However for sufficiently asymmetric spin networks it turns out that we can construct the desired basis as follows.

Consider a colored unoriented graph  $\gamma_c$  underlying some embeddable abstract spin network. Restrict attention to  $\gamma_c$  with the following properties:

- (a)  $\gamma_c$  is an asymmetric colored graph.
- (b) If  $v$  is a bivalent vertex of  $\gamma_c$  then  $v$  is connected to itself by a single edge i.e. the only bivalent vertices in  $\gamma_c$  are the single vertices in loops with each loop corresponding to a single connected component of  $\gamma_c$ .
- (c)  $\gamma_c$  has no loops which start and end at vertices with valence greater than 2 i.e. there is no edge with identical endpoints such that this endpoint has valence greater than 2.

Note from (b) that  $\gamma_c$  consists of the disjoint union of one or more connected components which are not single loops with a set of zero or one or more single loops<sup>13</sup> i.e.  $\gamma_c = \gamma_{0c} \cup L$  where  $\gamma_{0c}$  has no bivalent vertices and  $L$  is the disjoint union of a set of loops or  $L$  is empty. If  $L$  is not empty, the asymmetry of  $\gamma_c$  implies the edge in each distinct loop must be of a distinct color. In order to accommodate the action of electric diffeomorphisms, we are interested in defining a basis for the space of embeddings of all possible abstract decorated spin networks living on the (by definition) undecorated graph  $\gamma_{0c}$  as well as on any graph  $\gamma'_{0c}$  obtained from  $\gamma_{0c}$  by the introduction of bivalent vertices in the ‘interior’ of its edges (we explain what we mean by this below). Since electric diffeomorphisms act non-trivially only on non-degenerate vertices, we shall treat the ‘loop’ sector separately. Accordingly we focus first on spin network labels associated with  $\gamma_{0c}$  and subsequently discuss the spin net labels associated with the loop sector.

We choose an orientation of the edges of  $\gamma_{0c}$  and *fix this choice once and for all*. As discussed in 4, intertwiners at trivalent vertices are then fixed by  $SU(2)$  representation theory upto

---

<sup>13</sup>Reference [25] defines a semianalytic edge as one with distinct endpoints; this necessitates a slightly involved definition of embedding of a loop. We refrain from commenting on this further as we will be interested in loops with multiple kinks, for which there is no tension between abstract and embedded notions.

a constant rescaling. The normalization (3.1) fixes this constant upto phase and we fix this phase once and for all by demanding that the intertwiners be real (see for e.g [22]). With this choice fixed, we omit explicit intertwiner specificaton for 3 valent vertices, it being understood implicitly that we use the above fixed choice. At every  $N > 3$  valent vertex  $v$  in the vertex set of  $\gamma_{0c}$  we fix an orthonormal volume intertwiner basis  $\{C_{v(\mu_v)}\}$  with appropriate index structure and choose the intertwiner at  $v$  to be one of the volume intertwiner basis intertwiners.

Next, introduce bivalent vertices in the ‘interior’ of each edge i.e. in an edge  $e$  with color  $j(e)$  and end points  $v, \bar{v}$  introduce bivalent vertices  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n, n \geq 1$  such that  $k_j$  is connected to  $k_{j-1}, k_{j+1}$  by an edge with color  $j(e)$  with  $k_0 := v, k_{n+1} := \bar{v}$ . Let the orientation of the edges be consistent with that of  $e$  and fix the intertwiners in accordance with 4 above. It is straightforward to check that the ‘identity’ intertwiner so fixed satisfies (3.1). Decorate the vertices of the resulting spin nets and for simplicity restrict the decorations of the bivalent vertices to correspond to their embedding as  $C^0$  bivalent kinks. Note that the above introduction of bivalent vertices changes the colored graph  $\gamma_{0c}$ . It is straightforward to see that the new colored graph  $\gamma'_{0c}$  so obtained is also asymmetric and hence satisfies (a), (c) above. <sup>14</sup> As implied by Footnote 14 and discussed further below every  $N \geq 3$  valent vertex of  $\gamma'_{0c}$  can be identified uniquely with a vertex in  $\gamma_{0c}$  and as we shall see below, this identification allows us to choose the same orthonormal volume intertwiner basis at the  $N > 3$  valent vertices so identified. Varying over all possible basis intertwiners consistent with this choice, and all possible decorations, we obtain a set of abstract decorated spin network states living on the colored graph  $\gamma_{0c}$  and colored graphs obtained from it through the introduction of bivalent  $C^0$  kinks in the manner detailed above. Let the subset of embeddable elements of this set be  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$ . <sup>15</sup> Since the embellishment of an abstract spin network with decorations does not, by definition, change its underlying colored graph, the graphs underlying the set  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  of abstract decorated spin networks also satisfy (a),(c).

We briefly digress here to explain the role of property (c). Let  $\gamma_{0c}$  be endowed with an orientation as above. This orientation naturally induces an orientation on the graphs  $\gamma'_{0c}$  in the manner described above. Since the only automorphism of  $\gamma_{0c}, \gamma'_{0c}$  is the identity and since, by virtue of (c), every edge has distinct vertices, the identity automorphism is orientation preserving. In contrast if property (c) did not hold, the identity automorphism of any loop could still be consistent with orientation reversal of its embedding and this could change the embedded spin network function while leaving its underlying embedded colored graph untouched. This ends the digression and we return to the consideration of the set  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  of decorated abstract spin networks on  $\gamma_{0c}, \gamma'_{0c}$  and turn to a discussion of their embeddings.

Accordingly, let the set of embedded spin networks obtained as all possible embeddings of elements of  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  be  $E_{\gamma_{0c}}$ . Consider  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  which happens to have colored graph  $\gamma_{0c}$ . Let  $\mathbf{s}$  embed to  $s \in E_{\gamma_{0c}}$  via the embedding map  $F : \mathbf{s} \rightarrow s$  and call the colored graph

---

<sup>14</sup>If not there exists an automorphism  $\sigma$  which sends the sequence of vertices  $v, k_1, \dots, k_n, \bar{v} \neq v$  connected to each other by single edges to another such sequence. By virtue of (b),(c) above this sequence must start at  $\sigma(v) \in \gamma_{0c}$  and end at  $\sigma(\bar{v}) \neq \sigma(v) \in \gamma_{0c}$  with identical connectivity so that this sequence must arise through the introduction of bivalent kinks on some edge  $\sigma(e)$ . Restricting the automorphism to the vertex set of  $\gamma_{0c}$  (so that no bivalent kinks are involved) yields an automorphism of  $\gamma_{0c}$  which must be the identity so that  $\sigma(v) = v, \sigma(\bar{v}) = \bar{v}, \sigma(e) = e$ , which in turn implies that the sequence  $\{\sigma(k_i) | i = 0, \dots, n\}$  is associated with the edge  $e$ . This implies that  $\sigma(k_1) = k_1, \sigma(k_n) = k_n$ , which implies  $\sigma(k_2) = k_2, \sigma(k_{n-1}) = k_{n-1}$  and so on, so that the automorphism  $\sigma$  is necessarily the identity, and the new graph is necessarily asymmetric.

<sup>15</sup>It seems straightforward to argue that all members of the set are embeddable but this is not necessary for our purposes.

underlying  $s$  as  $\gamma_{0c}(s)$ . It follows that  $s$  is the unique embedding of  $\mathbf{s}$  on  $\gamma_{0c}(s)$  i.e. there exists no  $\bar{s} \in E_{\gamma_{0c}}, \bar{s} \neq s$  such that  $\gamma_{0c}(\bar{s}) = \gamma_{0c}(s)$ . To see this, proceed as follows. Let there exist  $\bar{s} = \bar{F}(\mathbf{s})$  for some embedding  $\bar{F} \neq F$  with  $\gamma_{0c}(\bar{s}) = \gamma_{0c}(s)$  and  $\bar{s} \neq s$ . The absence of nontrivial automorphisms of  $\gamma_{0c}$  implies that  $\bar{F}^{-1}F\gamma_{0c} = \gamma_{0c}$  so that if  $V$  is the vertex set and  $E$  the set of edges of  $\gamma_{0c}$ , we have that  $F(v) = \bar{F}(v)\forall v \in V, F(e) = \bar{F}(e)\forall e \in E$ . By virtue of our digression above  $F(e), \bar{F}(e)$  have the same orientations. Since  $F, \bar{F}$  yield the same embedded oriented colored graph and map the intertwiner on every vertex  $v$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  to  $F(v) = \bar{F}(v)$ , it must be the case that  $s = \bar{s}$ . Similar comments apply to embeddable abstract spin nets with colored graphs of type  $\gamma'_{0c}$  by virtue of their asymmetry. Moreover, since any  $\gamma'_{0c}$  is obtained by the introduction of bivalent vertices in the ‘interior’ of edges of  $\gamma_{0c}$ , there is a natural 1-1 mapping of those vertices of  $\gamma'_{0c}$  which are of valence greater than 2 to the vertex set of  $\gamma_{0c}$  so that we may label these vertices of  $\gamma'_{0c}$  with elements of the vertex set  $V$  of  $\gamma_{0c}$ . As indicated in Footnote 14, with this labeling of such vertices there is a unique association of edge connected sequences of bivalent vertices between end points  $v, \bar{v}$  in  $\gamma'_{0c}$  with an edge with these end points in  $\gamma_{0c}$ . It follows that at any such vertex  $v$ , one can uniquely identify incoming and outgoing edges on the colored graph  $\gamma'_{0c}$  with the chosen fixed orientation above with their counterparts in  $\gamma_{0c}$  with the chosen fixed orientation. If the embeddable abstract spin networks  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'$  with colored graphs  $\gamma_{0c}, \gamma'_{0c}$  both have intertwiner  $C_v$  at vertex  $v$ , we shall say that  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'$  have the *same* intertwiner at  $v$  and it is in this sense that our choice of orthonormal volume intertwiner basis is the same for  $v \in \gamma_{0c}, \gamma'_{0c}$ . It follows that these identifications are also induced onto their embedded images. In particular if these spin networks are embedded through embeddings  $F, F'$ , we say that  $F(\mathbf{s}), F(\mathbf{s}')$  have the same intertwiners at  $F(v), F'(v)$ .

Let us now consider the loop component  $L$  of  $\gamma_c$  (when non-empty) and color each loop  $l_j$  with spin  $j$  so that  $l_1$  is colored with  $j = 1, l_2$  with  $j = 2$  and so on. Let us denote  $L$  by  $L_m$  when  $L$  has  $m$  such loops with  $L_0$  being the empty set. We restrict attention to the case in which the bivalent vertex  $v$  is to be decorated with a  $C^0$  kink decoration. Next we introduce a pair of bivalent vertices on each  $l_j$ , decorate one of them as a  $C^1$  kink and the second as a  $C^2$  kink. We call  $l_j$  embellished with these two kinks as  $l_j^{(3)}$ . We call the collection  $\{l_j^{(3)}\}$  so obtained as  $L_m^{(3)}$ . Clearly  $L_m^{(3)}$  has no decoration preserving colored graph automorphisms except the identity. We fix an orientation of each  $l_j^{(3)}$  once and for all corresponding to a traversal from the  $C^0$  kink  $v$  to the  $C^1$  kink and thence to the  $C^2$  kink and finally back to  $v$ . Next consider any embedding  $F$  of  $l_j^{(3)}$  into  $F(l_j^{(3)})$ . Note that  $F(l_j^{(3)})$  is a continuous oriented loop with orientation acquired from the fixed orientation chosen for  $l_j^{(3)}$ . With  $F(l_j^{(3)})$  associate the spin network function  $\text{Tr} h_{F(l_j^{(3)})}(F(v), F(v))$  where  $h_{F(l_j^{(3)})}$  is the holonomy, in the spin  $j$  representation, around the loop  $F(l_j^{(3)})$  from its starting point  $F(v)$  to its end point which is also  $F(v)$  with  $\text{Tr}$  denoting the trace in the spin  $j$  representation. Since  $l_j^{(3)}$  has no nontrivial decoration preserving colored graph automorphisms, similar to  $\gamma_{0c}$  it admits a unique embedding to any of its embedded images. Finally, with the embedding  $F(L_m^{(3)})$  associate the spin network function  $\prod_{j=1}^m \text{Tr} h_{F(l_j^{(3)})}(F(v), F(v))$ .

Let  $\mathbf{E}_{L_m^{(3)}}, m > 0$  be the set containing  $L_m^{(3)}$  and let the set of embedded spin networks obtained as above through holonomy traces from this single element of  $\mathbf{E}_{L_m}$  be  $E_{L_m}$ . Define  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}} := \mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{L_m^{(3)}}$  so that  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_c}$  is the set of ordered pairs  $(\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{E}_{L_m^{(3)}})$  with

$\mathbf{l} = L_m^{(3)}$ . Such an ordered pair naturally defines an abstract spin network on the union of some decoration  $d$  of  $\gamma_{0c}$  (resp.  $\gamma'_{0c}$ ) with  $L_m^{(3)}$ . Let us call the  $\gamma_{0c}, \gamma'_{0c}$  so decorated as  $\gamma_{0c,d}, \gamma'_{0c,d}$ <sup>16</sup> and define the decorated colored graphs  $\gamma_{m,c,d} = \gamma_{0c,d} \cup L_m^{(3)}$ ,  $\gamma'_{m,c,d} = \gamma'_{0c,d} \cup L_m^{(3)}$ . Given such an element of  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  and an embedding  $F$  of  $\gamma_{m,c,d}$  (resp.  $\gamma'_{m,c,d}$ ), we define the embedding of this element  $(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{l})$  by  $F$  as the embedded spin network function obtained as a product of the embedded spin network function  $s = F(\mathbf{s})$  with the embedded spin network function defined by  $F(\mathbf{l})$ . The set of all distinct embedded spin network functions obtained for all possible embeddings of elements of  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  is denoted as  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  where we have set  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0,c}} = \mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$ . Finally, note that embedded spin networks whose underlying embedded colored graphs do not coincide in  $\Sigma$ , are orthogonal.

From the discussion above it is straightforward to see that the following statements hold:

(i) The elements of  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  provide a well defined basis of states on spin networks living on all possible embeddings of (a) decorations  $\gamma_{0c,d}$  of the undecorated colored graph  $\gamma_{0c}$  together with  $L_m^{(3)}$  as well as of (b) any decorated graph  $\gamma'_{0c,d}$  obtained from  $\gamma_{0c,d}$  by the introduction of bivalent ‘ $C^0$  kink’ vertices in the ‘interior’ of its edges together with  $L_m^{(3)}$ .

(ii) Since the image of any embedding by a diffeomorphism is also an embedding, the set  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  is stable under the action of diffeomorphisms. Moreover vertices, oriented edges and intertwiners are naturally identified between any of these images. In particular we may identify, in obvious notation  $F(v), F(e), F(\mathcal{I}_v) \in F(\mathbf{s})$  with  $F_\phi(v), F_\phi(e), F_\phi(\mathcal{I}_v) \in F_\phi(\mathbf{s})$  for  $v, e \in \gamma_{0c}$  where the embedding  $F_\phi$  is defined as  $\phi \circ F$  for some diffeomorphism  $\phi$ .

(iii) Let  $S \in E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  have a non-degenerate vertex  $v$  (so that  $v$  lies in the non-loop component of  $S$ ). Let  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  be an electric diffeomorphism deformation of  $S_{\lambda_v}$  at  $v$ . Then  $S_{\lambda_v}$  and  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  have the same intertwiner at  $v, v_{I_v, \epsilon}$ . Moreover, since the intertwiners are volume eigenstates, it follows that modulo the same factor,  $S_{\lambda_v}, S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  are elements of  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ . Accordingly, the abstract correspondent of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  (upto an overall factor) is in  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  so that any electric diffeomorphism child of  $S$ , in the sense of 7 below is in  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ .

Finally, any possible parent (in the sense of 8 below) of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  must be an element of  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ . To see this, consider a state  $\bar{S}$  which when acted upon by the constraint yields an electric diffeomorphism child  $C$  with abstract colored graph isomorphic to that underlying  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$ . Since these graphs are asymmetric this isomorphism is unique and we may identify these graphs using this isomorphism. Note that the embedded colored graph underlying  $\bar{S}$  is obtained by the removal of a triplet of kinks from the non-loop part of the colored graph underlying  $C$  so that the abstract colored graph obtained from removing the corresponding set of bivalent vertices from the abstract colored graph which embeds to the colored graph underlying  $C$ ,  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  must embed to the embedded colored graph underlying  $\bar{S}$  which implies that  $\bar{S} \in E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ .

Thus, given a state in  $S$  all its children by electric diffeomorphism in the sense of 7, and all its possible parents by electric diffeomorphism in the sense of 8, are in  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ . We refer to this property as the *stability* of the set  $E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  under the action of electric diffeomorphisms.

<sup>16</sup>Note that the bivalent vertices on  $\gamma'_{0c}$  are restricted to be decorated so as to embed to  $C^0$  kinks. Hence the only freedom left is the decoration of the vertices of  $\gamma'_{0c}$  which are also vertices of  $\gamma_{0c}$  and the notation indicates that these vertices are decorated exactly as in  $\gamma_{0c}$ .

By considering all distinct (i.e. non-isomorphic) choices of  $\gamma_{0c}$ , all choices of decorations  $d$  thereof and all values of  $m \geq 0$ , we obtain a basis on the space of all embeddings of embeddable abstract spin networks living on all corresponding choices of  $\gamma_{m,c,d}, \gamma'_{m,c,d}$ . This basis is stable under the action of diffeomorphisms and electric diffeomorphisms. We call this basis as the *Asymmetric Spin Network Basis*. An embeddable abstract spin network which embeds into any element of this basis will be called an *abstract asymmetric basis spin network*.

7. *Electric diffeomorphism Child of an Asymmetric Spin Network Basis element:* Let  $S$  be an asymmetric spin network basis element and let its abstract asymmetric counterpart be  $\mathbf{S}$ . The action of the electric diffeomorphism part of the constraint (2.34) at sufficiently small  $\epsilon$  on  $S$  yields, besides  $S_\lambda$  states  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}$  which are related to  $S$  through the action of electric diffeomorphisms at nondegenerate vertices of  $S$ . Since each of these children have a decorated abstract colored graph structure which is obtained by the embellishment of some of the edges of  $S$  with bivalent  $C^0$  kinks, the discussion in 6 above implies that each of these children (up to overall factors) are also asymmetric spin network basis elements. Clearly for all sufficiently small  $\epsilon$  the states  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}$  for fixed  $I_v, \vec{J}_v$  (upto overall factors) are embeddings of the same abstract asymmetric spin network  $\mathbf{C}(I_v, \vec{J}_v)$ . We shall refer to any embedding of any  $\mathbf{C}(I_v, \vec{J}_v)$  as a *child* of  $S$  (note that  $\mathbf{C}(I_v, \vec{J}_v)$  for distinct  $(I_v, \vec{J}_v)$  need not be distinct).
8. *Possible parent by electric diffeomorphism of an Asymmetric Spin Network Basis element:* Let  $S$  be an asymmetric spin network basis element with abstract asymmetric counterpart  $\mathbf{S}$ .  $P$  is called a *possible parent* of  $S$  if all embeddings of  $\mathbf{S}$  are children of  $P$  in the sense of 7 above. Since the abstract colored graph structure of  $P$  is obtained by removal of a triple of bivalent  $C^0$  kinks from the non loop component of  $\mathbf{S}$ , the discussion in 6 above shows that  $P$  is also an asymmetric spin network basis element.
9. *Useful Notation:* For the purposes of the next section and section 7 it is useful to define the following notation which builds on that introduced in 6 above. Accordingly, within the set  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  defined above consider those elements which correspond to a fix decoration  $d$  of the vertices of  $\gamma_{0c}$ . Call this subset of  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  as  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c,d}}$ . Let the set of embeddings of elements of this set be  $E_{\gamma_{m,c,d}}$ .

Define the union of the sets  $\mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$  for all finite  $m$  to be  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  and the set of embeddings of elements of this union to be  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  so that  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}} = \cup_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}} = \cup_{m=0}^{\infty} E_{\gamma_{m,c}}$ , where we recall from 6 above that we have set  $\gamma_{(0)c} \equiv \gamma_{0c}$ .

Similarly define  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}}, \mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}}$  as the fixed decoration (with decoration  $d$  of  $\gamma_{0c}$ ) elements of  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}, \mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}}$  so that  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}} = \cup_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma_{m,c,d}}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}} = \cup_{m=0}^{\infty} E_{\gamma_{m,c,d}}$ .

### 3.2 The Bra Set $B$

Recall that the Bra Set label  $B$  of an off shell state contains all the bra summands which when summed over with appropriate coefficients yield a formal sum which represents the off shell state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ . The dual action of the constraint  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)$  on this off shell state is defined through its ‘amplitude’,  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S)$ , for any spin net state  $S$ . The  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit of these amplitudes defines the continuum limit constraint action. Clearly only those spin net states generated by the constraint action  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S$  which have non-trivial inner product with one or more elements of  $B$  contribute to the amplitude for  $S$ . The spin net states which do contribute in this way will be said to have overlap in  $B$ . In order to have adequate control on the calculations of these amplitudes it suffices, that for any  $S$  with nondegenerate vertices, either all the spin nets generated by the electric diffeomorphism

part of the constraint action on nondegenerate vertices of  $S$ , together with  $S$  have overlap in  $B$  or that none of them do (in which case the amplitudes will be seen to vanish in the continuum limit).<sup>17</sup> Further, it is reasonable to anticipate that this feature of overlap or lack thereof should persist in an  $\epsilon$ -independent way for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$  so that the continuum limit amplitudes exist. The properties (i)- (iii) below of permissible Bra Sets are motivated by the discussion above. In their articulation, we use the definitions of the previous section. In particular we distinguish between vertices and kinks.

We require that the Bra Set label  $B$  of an off shell basis state have the following properties:

(i) Each element  $S$  of  $B$  is an *asymmetric spin network basis element* whose vertices are all GR and which has at least one such vertex. If  $S \in B$  then we can replace the volume intertwiner basis element at each vertex of valence greater than 3 by a distinct such basis element to get a state  $S'$ . (Recall that the volume intertwiner basis is associated with abstract asymmetric basis spin networks which embed to their (embedded) asymmetric spin network basis counterparts). We require that any  $S'$  obtained by such a replacement is also in  $B$ .

(ii) If  $S \in B$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  is the embeddable abstract spin net which embeds as  $S$ , then  $B$  contains *all* embeddings of  $\mathbf{S}$ .

(iii) Let  $C$  be an electric diffeomorphism type child of  $S \in B$  as defined in 7 (Clearly, all vertices of  $C$  are GR and  $C$  has at least one such vertex). Then  $C \in B$ . If  $P$  is a possible parent of  $S \in B$  with parentage via electric diffeomorphism as defined in 8 then  $P \in B$  (Clearly, all vertices of  $P$  are GR and  $P$  has at least one such vertex).

The asymmetry requirement in (i) in conjunction with the role of abstract structures in (ii) together with closure of  $B$  with respect to appropriate parent-child relations in (iii) ensures that  $B$  is stable under the action of diffeomorphisms and electric diffeomorphisms as discussed in section 3.1. The role of property (i) is also to ensure sufficient overlap in  $B$  given the fact that there is a finite dimensional space of intertwiners. Property (ii) ensures  $\epsilon$ -independent overlap as well as  $h$ -independent overlap (see the discussion in section 4.4); the former is necessary for the continuum limit constraint action to exist and the latter is an important ingredient of our proof of diffeomorphism covariance of the constraint action in section 6. Property (iii) ensures that  $B$  is closed under suitable ‘parent-child’ relations which in turn ensures the kind of overlap required in the discussion in the first paragraph of this section. The reason we insist here on ‘at least one GR vertex’ in (i) is for the ensuing simplicity of expression for the off-shell amplitudes in section 3.4.

Our demonstration of anomaly freedom of hamiltonian constraint commutators in section 4 and 5 uses only properties (i)-(iii) without any further specification of Bra Sets. The considerations of section 6 which demonstrate diffeomorphism covariance require a certain property of linear independence of off -shell states to hold. This property is proved in section 7. The proof of linear independence for off shell states with a single Bra Set label but different metric and ‘vertex smooth’ function labels requires Bra Sets to satisfy an additional property (iv)(a). The proof for the general case of different Bra Set labels requires a further property (iv)(b). It seems plausible that the properties (iv)(a,b) are implied by property (iii) above. However a putative proof is beyond the scope of this work. Instead in section 7 we explicitly construct a rich family of Bra Sets which

---

<sup>17</sup>In a previous version of this work, similar to [11] we attempted to impose a similar condition by also including propagation type children; however it turns out the weaker condition here suffices and can be imposed consistently.

satisfy properties (i)-(iv).

More in detail: It is straightforward to see that properties (i)-(iii) hold if we choose as our Bra Set, the set  $E_{\gamma_{m,c,d}}$  (see 9 of section 3.1 above) with  $\gamma_{m,c,d}$  chosen so that all vertices of states in this set are GR and there is at least one such vertex. Properties (i),(ii) hold by virtue of this choice and due to the realization of elements of  $E_{\gamma_{m,c,d}}$  as embeddings of abstract structures and (iii) holds by virtue of the procedure of adding bivalent kinks to the interior of edges of  $\gamma_{0c}$  as outlined in 6 of the previous section. Clearly identical argumentation applies to the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}}$  with  $\gamma_{0c,d}$  chosen so that all vertices of states in this set are GR and there is at least one such vertex. Thus  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}}$  for any such  $\gamma_{0c,d}$  also satisfies (i)-(iii) As we shall see in section 7.7, a family of Bra Sets for which we are able to conclusively demonstrate satisfaction of properties (i)-(iii) *and* (iv), is provided by the family of sets  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}}$  (one for each distinct isomorphism class of  $\gamma_{0,c}$  with appropriate  $d$ ).

NOTE: In the next and subsequent sections, we shall refer to a certain ‘distance’ function between two points also by  $d$ . However from the context it will be amply clear whether the symbol  $d$  refers to this distance or to the decorations of graph defined above and there will be no scope for confusion.

### 3.3 Kink Sets

Let  $S$  be a spin net. The set of bivalent and trivalent kinks in the graph underlying  $S$  is called the Kink Set  $\mathbf{K}$  of  $S$ . We are interested in segregating elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  into subsets of ‘closest kinks’ with respect to the metric  $h$ .

To this end, we first define the function  $d(a_1, a_2)$  between any two distinct points  $a_1, a_2 \in \Sigma$  as follows: If there exists a unique geodesic (with respect to the metric  $h$ ) with length  $l, l < 1$  which joins  $a_1$  to  $a_2$  then we define  $d = l$  else we set  $d = 1$ . We shall refer to  $d$  as a ‘distance’ function. Next, compute the distances  $d(k, k')$  between all pairs of elements  $k \neq k'$  of  $\mathbf{K}$  and follow the following algorithm to segregate elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  into subsets.

Look for a set of 3 kinks such that their interkink distances are smaller than those between the remaining kinks and also smaller than the distance between any remaining kink and any member of this triplet. If such a set exists call it  $K_3^{(1)}$ . If no such set exists, look for a pair of closest kinks so that the distance between them is smaller than the distances between the remaining kinks and also smaller than the distance between any remaining kink and any member of this pair. If such a set exists, call it  $K_2^{(1)}$  and stop the procedure so that there are only two subsets, namely  $K_2^{(1)}$  and its complement  $K'$ . If no such set exists there is only one relevant subset  $\mathbf{K}$ .

If  $K_3^{(1)}$  exists, remove  $K_3^{(1)}$  from  $\mathbf{K}$  and repeat the above procedure for the resulting set of kinks. Clearly, the procedure then comes to a halt after some number  $n \geq 1$  of iterations with the final ‘closest’ kink set being either a 2 kink set or a 3 kink set. Denote by  $K_3^{(i)}$  the 3- kink set obtained at the  $i$ th iteration and by  $K_2^{(n)}$  the 2-kink set (if it exists) obtained at the (necessarily)  $n$ th iteration. It follows that we have a segregation of  $\mathbf{K}$  into either of

Case 0:  $\mathbf{K}$  (here the procedure ends necessarily at the first step  $n = 1$  with no ‘closest’ 2 kink or 3 kink sets) or

Case 1:  $K_3^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, n-1, K_2^{(n)}, \mathbf{K} - (\cup_{i=1}^{n-1} K_3^{(i)} \cup K_2^{(n)})$  or

Case 2:  $K_3^{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, n, \mathbf{K} - (\cup_{i=1}^n K_3^{(i)})$ .

Above, for Case 1, it is understood that if  $n = 1$  the procedure yields a segregation of  $\mathbf{K}$  into a

single 2 point kink set and its complement.

For future purposes it is useful to define the minimum and maximum interkink distances in any 3 kink set  $K_3^{(i)}$  as

$$d_{\max}^{(i)} = \max_{k,k' \in K_3^{(i)}} d(k,k'), \quad d_{\min}^{(i)} = \min_{k \neq k' \in K_3^{(i)}} d(k,k') \quad (3.2)$$

Here, if all 3 interkink distances are equal we define the maximum and minimum distance both to be equal to this interkink distance.

### 3.4 The coefficients

Consider an off shell state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ . The coefficient of the bra  $\langle s|$  (also referred to as the off shell amplitude for  $s$ ) in the formal sum over bras associated with  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle)$ . Consider the set of spin network states  $B_\perp$  such that every element of  $B_\perp$  is orthogonal to every element of  $B$ . Then since  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is a sum over states in  $B$ , the amplitude of this off shell state on any element of  $B_\perp$  vanishes. and, since  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is a linear map on the finite span of spin nets, we may specify  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  through its amplitudes on elements of  $B$  (each of which are asymmetric spin network basis states, see 6, section 3.1 and (i), section 3.2). In section 3.4.1 we specify the amplitude for any element of  $B$ . In section 3.4.2 we derive the amplitude for any spin network state based on its specification in section 3.4.1. In section 3.4.3 we discuss a useful property of the amplitude of section 3.4.2.

#### 3.4.1 Amplitude for states in $B$ and perpendicular to $B$

The amplitude  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle)$  for any asymmetric spin network (ASN) basis state  $|s\rangle$  is:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle) = 0 \quad \text{if } \langle s| \in B_\perp \quad (3.3)$$

$$= \left( \prod_{v \in V(s)} f(v) \right) g_{s,h} \quad \text{if } \langle s| \in B \quad (3.4)$$

where we recall again that any state in  $B$  is necessarily an asymmetric spin network basis state. Here  $V(s)$  is the set of vertices of  $s \in B$ , each such vertex being GR by virtue of property (i), section 3.2.  $f$  is a  $C^r$  function on  $\Sigma$  so that the off shell amplitude depends on the product of evaluations of  $f$  at each vertex of  $s$ .  $g_{s,h}$  is a (positive) function  $g(\mathbf{K}, h)$  of the Kink Set  $\mathbf{K}$  of  $s$  segregated with respect to the metric  $h$  which depends on the network of interkink distances defined in terms of  $h$  between elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  endowed with the  $h$  dependent segregation structure defined in section 3.2.

Let the Kink Set segregation procedure of section 3.2 terminate in  $n$  steps,  $n \geq 1$  yielding the (exhaustive) segregation structures defined in Cases 0 to 2 of that section. For Case 0,  $\mathbf{K}$  does not admit any non-trivial segregation and we set

$$g(\mathbf{K}, h) = 1 \quad (3.5)$$

For Case 1, we define  $g$  to be:

$$g(\mathbf{K}, h) := \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \frac{d_{\min}^{(i)}}{d_{\max}^{(i)}} \right)^2 \right) \left( d(k_1^{(n)}, k_2^{(n)}) \right)^2 \quad \text{if } n > 1 \quad (3.6)$$

$$:= \left( d(k_1^{(1)}, k_2^{(1)}) \right)^2 \quad \text{if } n = 1 \quad (3.7)$$

Finally, for Case 2, we define  $g(\mathbf{K}, h)$  to be:

$$g(\mathbf{K}, h) := \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{d_{\min}^{(i)}}{d_{\max}^{(i)}} \right)^2 \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, we set  $g_{s,h} = g(\mathbf{K}, h)$  with  $g(\mathbf{K}, h)$  defined through equations (3.5)-(3.8).

### 3.4.2 Amplitude for arbitrary spin network state

Consider any expansion of a spin network state  $|s\rangle$  in terms of other spin network states. Clearly, the only spin networks which contribute non-trivially to this expansion are those for which all spin net labels agree with those of  $s$  except, possibly, the vertex intertwiner labels. Hence all these spin networks live on the same *embedded colored graph* as  $s$  (by embedded colored graph we mean the graph as a subset of  $\Sigma$  with specified edge colorings). This immediately implies that any spin network state  $|s\rangle$  may either be expanded in terms of a *finite* number of asymmetric spin network basis states (see 6, section 3.1) or is orthogonal to every such basis state. In the former case we have that:

$$|s\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^p c_i^s |s_i\rangle. \quad (3.9)$$

where  $|s_i\rangle$  are asymmetric spin network basis states. Recall from section 3.2 that a spin net  $s$  will be said to have overlap in  $B$  if  $s$  has non-vanishing inner product with at least one element of  $B$ , where for convenience we have omitted to represent the spin nets involved in bra-ket notation. Let  $s$  has overlap in  $B$ . Hence it shares all its labels except perhaps intertwiners with some element of  $B$ . The discussion above in conjunction with property (i), section 3.2, implies that (a) this element of  $B$  is an element of the asymmetric spin network basis and (b) all states living on the same embedded colored graph as  $s$  with all possible choices of volume basis intertwiner labels at vertices are in  $B$ . It follows that if  $s$  has overlap in  $B$ , it admits an expansion (3.9) in which every  $s_i$  is in  $B$ . Conversely, if  $s$  does not have overlap in  $B$ , then either  $s$  admits an expansion (3.9) in which no  $s_i$  with  $c_i^s \neq 0$  is in  $B$  or  $s$  is orthogonal to every asymmetric spin net basis element. It then follows from (3.4) that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(|s\rangle) = 0 \quad \text{if } |s\rangle \text{ has no overlap in } B \quad (3.10)$$

$$= \left( \prod_{v \in V(s)} f(v) \right) g_{s,h} \gamma_s \quad \text{if } |s\rangle \text{ has overlap in } B \quad (3.11)$$

$$(3.12)$$

where, referring to the expansion (3.9),

$$\gamma_s := \sum_{i=1}^p c_i^s \quad s_i \in B, \quad i = 1, \dots, p \quad (3.13)$$

### 3.4.3 Useful properties of $\gamma_s$

Let  $v$  be a vertex of the spin network  $s$ . Consider a neighborhood  $R_v$  of  $v$  which is small enough that it contains no vertex of  $s$  other than  $v$ . Denote the Rovelli-Smolin (RS) Volume operator associated with this region by  $\hat{V}_{R_v}$ . From 7., section 3.1, independent of the choice of  $R_v$ ,  $\hat{V}_{R_v}$  acts as a self adjoint operator on the intertwiner at  $v$ . Denote this ‘RS vertex volume operator’ by  $\hat{V}_v$ . Clearly, every asymmetric spin network basis element with a vertex at  $v$  is an eigen state of  $\hat{V}_v$ .

Next, consider the action of the inverse determinant metric operator  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v)$  on  $|s\rangle$ . As discussed in Reference [2] and reiterated in section 2.1.2, this operator also acts as a linear operator on the space of intertwiners at  $v$  in  $s$ . Let us call this linear operator as  $\hat{\lambda}_v$ . Recall that in this work the operator  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v)$  is defined via a Tychonoff regulation. It then follows

from the construction of this operator in [2] that upto a factor  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  is defined via Footnote 4 with  $\hat{O} := (\hat{V}_v)^{\frac{2}{3}}$  so that eigenstates of  $\hat{V}_v$  with eigen values  $\nu_v \neq 0$  are eigen states of  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  with upto a numerical factor) eigen values  $(\nu_v)^{-\frac{2}{3}}$  and so that the zero eigen value eigen states of  $\hat{V}_v$  are annihilated by  $\hat{\lambda}_v$ . We shall refer to  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  as the RS inverse volume operator.

Note that for a spin net  $s$  with vertex  $v$ , just as the action of  $\hat{V}_{Rv}$  on  $s$  yields an intertwiner change through the action of  $\hat{V}_v$ , the discussion above indicates that the action of  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v)$  on  $s$  also yields an intertwiner change through the action of  $\hat{\lambda}_v$ .

Next, let  $|s\rangle$  be a spin network state with basis expansion (3.9). Let  $s$  have a GR vertex at  $v$ . Consider an electric diffeomorphism type deformation, without first acting with  $\hat{\lambda}_v$ , of  $|s\rangle$  along its  $I_v$ th edge at  $v$  which yields the state  $|s_{I,\epsilon}\rangle$ . The vertex  $v$  and its vertex structure is displaced to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  as detailed in sections 2.1.2, 2.3.1 - 2.3.3. Recall that:

- (i)  $s_{I,\epsilon}$  differs from  $s$  only in an  $\epsilon$  size neighborhood of  $v$ .
- (ii) In this neighborhood of  $v$ , the vertex  $v$  in  $s$  is replaced by the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $s_{I,\epsilon}$ . The displaced vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $s_{I,\epsilon}$  has the same intertwiner as that of  $v$  in  $s$  and the edges emanating from  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $s_{I,\epsilon}$  are the deformed counterparts of those from  $v$  in  $s$  with the same edge colorings.
- (iii) Bivalent kinks are created in this  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $v$ .
- (iv) While the edge tangent structure at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $s_{I,\epsilon}$  is, in general, not diffeomorphic to that at  $v$  in  $s$ , the RS Volume operator is insensitive to this difference so that as operators on intertwiners, the RS vertex volume operator at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $|s_{I,\epsilon}\rangle$  and that at  $v$  in  $|s\rangle$  are *identical*. Similar conclusions hold for the RS vertex inverse volume operator as well for vertex operators composed of products of powers of the RS vertex volume and inverse volume operators.

It follows from (i)-(iii) above together with the detailed construction of the ASN basis (see (iii) of 6, section 3.1) that  $|s_{I,\epsilon}\rangle$  has the basis expansion:

$$|s_{I,\epsilon}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^p c_i^s |(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle \quad (3.14)$$

where  $|(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle$  is the electric diffeomorphism type deformation (i.e. without first acting with  $\hat{\lambda}$ ) of  $|s_i\rangle$  and its coefficient  $c_i^s$  in the expansion (3.14) is identical to the coefficient of  $|s_i\rangle$  in the expansion (3.9). An immediate consequence of this is that:

Next let  $v$  be a non-degenerate vertex of  $s$ . From the discussion above it follows that the action of  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v)$  on  $|s\rangle$  results in a change of intertwiner at  $v$  through the action of  $\hat{\lambda}_v$ . As in the rest of this paper, we denote the resulting state by  $|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle$ . In this notation,  $|(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I,\epsilon}}}\rangle$  is obtained from the action of  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v_{I,\epsilon})$  on  $|s_{I,\epsilon}\rangle$  with the intertwiner change in  $|(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I,\epsilon}}}\rangle$  effected through the action of  $\hat{\lambda}_{v_{I,\epsilon}}$  on the intertwiner at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in  $|s_{I,\epsilon}\rangle$ . From (i)-(iv) above the new intertwiner in  $|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle$  at  $v$  and in  $|(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I,\epsilon}}}\rangle$  at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  are identical. It follows that the state obtained through an electric diffeomorphism type deformation at  $v$  of  $|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle$  is the same as  $|(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I,\epsilon}}}\rangle$ . This relationship is expressed in our notation as:

$$|s_{\lambda_v, I, \epsilon}\rangle = |(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I,\epsilon}}}\rangle. \quad (3.15)$$

Similar argumentation may be applied to each  $s_i$  in the expansion (3.9). Since  $s_i$  is an eigen vector of  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  with some eigen value  $\lambda_{i,v}$ , it then follows that  $s_{I,\epsilon}$  is an eigen vector of  $\hat{\lambda}_{v_{I,\epsilon}}$  with same

eigen value. <sup>18</sup> Accordingly we have:

$$\hat{\lambda}_v |s_i\rangle = \lambda_{i,v} |s_i\rangle \quad (3.16)$$

$$|(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\lambda_{v,I,\epsilon}\rangle := \hat{\lambda}_{v,I,\epsilon} |(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle = \lambda_{i,v} |(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle \quad (3.17)$$

From (3.15) and (3.17) we have that:

$$|(s_i)_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}\rangle = \lambda_{i,v} |(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle \quad (3.18)$$

From (3.9) and (3.16) we have that:

$$|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle = \sum_i c_i^s \lambda_{i,v} |s_i\rangle \quad (3.19)$$

Replacing  $s$  by  $s_{\lambda_v}$  in (3.14) yields:

$$|s_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}\rangle = \sum_i c_i^s \lambda_{i,v} |(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle \quad (3.20)$$

$$= \sum_i c_i^s |(s_i)_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}\rangle \quad (3.21)$$

where we have used (3.18) in the last line above. Note that for  $v$  non-degenerate in  $s_i$ ,  $(s_i)_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}$  is, upto a factor of  $\lambda_{i,v}$  an electric diffeomorphism child of  $s_i$ . From (iii), section 3.2, it follows that if  $s_i \in B$  and  $v$  is non-degenerate in  $s_i$ , then  $(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}$  is in  $B$ . Hence  $s_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}$  has overlap in  $B$  if  $s$  has overlap in  $B$  and  $v$  is non-degenerate in  $s$ . From (3.20), (3.19), (3.15) it follows that for  $s$  with overlap in  $B$ :

$$\gamma_{(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}} = \gamma_{s_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}} = \gamma_{s_{\lambda_v}} = \sum_i c_i^s \lambda_{i,v}. \quad (3.22)$$

Repeating these arguments for an application of the inverse determinant metric operator twice at  $v$  in  $|s\rangle$  (instead of once as above) and denoting the result by  $|s_{\lambda_v,\lambda_v}\rangle$ , we have in obvious notation that:

$$\gamma_{(s_{I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon},\lambda_{v,I,\epsilon}} = \gamma_{s_{\lambda_v,\lambda_v}}. \quad (3.23)$$

Finally, consider the action of the operator  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(\bar{v})$ , with  $\bar{v} \neq v$ , on  $|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle$  with  $\bar{v}, v$  nondegenerate. Since this operator changes the intertwiner exclusively at  $\bar{v}$  it commutes with the action of an electric diffeomorphism at  $v$  which is supported away from  $\bar{v}$ . It follows that:

$$|(s_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}\rangle = |((s_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}})_{I_v,\epsilon}\rangle, \quad \bar{v} \neq v \quad (3.24)$$

where the notation signifies that the state on the left hand side state is obtained by an electric diffeomorphism type deformation of  $|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle$  along its  $I_v$ th edge followed by the action of  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(\bar{v})$  and that the state on the right hand side is obtained by the action of  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tau^{-2} \hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(\bar{v})$  on  $|s_{\lambda_v}\rangle$  to yield  $|((s_{\lambda_v})_{\bar{v}})\rangle$  followed by an electric diffeomorphism type deformation along the  $I_v$ th edge at  $v$  of  $|((s_{\lambda_v})_{\bar{v}})\rangle$ . If  $s$  has overlap in  $B$  then similar arguments as above imply that the states in (3.24) have overlap in  $B$ . Next, an application of  $\hat{\lambda}_{\bar{v}}$  on (3.19), (3.20) yields:

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\bar{v}} |s_{\lambda_v}\rangle = \sum_i c_i^s \lambda_{i,\bar{v}} \lambda_{i,v} |s_i\rangle \quad (3.25)$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\bar{v}} |s_{\lambda_v,I,\epsilon}\rangle = \sum_i c_i^s \lambda_{i,\bar{v}} \lambda_{i,v} |(s_i)_{I,\epsilon}\rangle \quad (3.26)$$

---

<sup>18</sup>Here, as above, we have suppressed the ‘ $v$ ’ subscripts on the edge index  $I$ , as well as the additional specification of edge triples  $\vec{J}$  to avoid notational clutter.

It then follows from (3.24), (3.25), (3.26) that:

$$\gamma_{(s_{\lambda v, I, \epsilon})_{\lambda \bar{v}}} = \gamma_{((s_{\lambda v})_{\lambda \bar{v}})_{I v, \epsilon}} = \gamma_{(s_{\lambda v})_{\lambda \bar{v}}} = \sum_i c_i^s \lambda_{i, \bar{v}} \lambda_{i, v}, \quad \bar{v} \neq v. \quad (3.27)$$

Finally, given  $s$  with expansion (3.9) and its image  $s_\phi$  by a diffeomorphism  $\phi$ , we have that:

$$|s_\phi\rangle = \hat{U}(\phi)|s\rangle = \sum_i c_i^s |(s_i)_\phi\rangle \quad (3.28)$$

where we have defined  $|(s_i)_\phi\rangle = \hat{U}(\phi)|s_i\rangle$ . From (ii), 6 of section 3.1 we have that  $\{(s_i)_\phi\}$  are also asymmetric spin net basis elements and each  $(s_i)_\phi$  is an embedding of the same embeddable abstract spin network which embeds to  $s_i$ . It then follows from (ii), section 3.2 that  $s_\phi$  has overlap in  $B$  if  $s$  has overlap in  $B$  (and conversely using the fact that  $\phi^{-1}$  is a diffeomorphism). From (3.9), (3.28) we have that for such  $s$ :

$$\gamma_s = \gamma_{s_\phi} = \sum_i c_i^s \quad (3.29)$$

## 4 Continuum Limit Action on $\Psi_{B, f, h}$

As described in section 2, the action of the constraint operator at parameter  $\epsilon$  on a state  $S$  deforms the state to give ‘diffeomorphism’ type children and ‘propagation’ type children. The deformations endow these children with extra kinks relative to their parent  $S$ . As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , these kinks contract towards each other and induce a certain contraction behavior onto the off shell amplitudes for these children through the dependence of these amplitudes on the interkink distance function  $g$  defined in the previous section. Clearly, an evaluation of the (dual) continuum action of the constraint on an off shell basis state then depends on the contraction behavior of  $g$ . We describe this contraction behavior in section 4.1. We use this contraction behavior to evaluate the continuum limit action of a single Hamiltonian constraint in section 4.2 and of a pair of constraints and their commutator in section 4.3.

### 4.1 Contraction behavior of the interkink distance function

First consider a ‘diffeomorphism’ type deformation of a state  $S \in B$  along its  $I$ th edge at its (necessarily GR) nondegenerate vertex  $v$ . From property (iii), section 3.2,  $S_{\lambda, I, \vec{J}, \epsilon} \in B$ . Relative to  $S$ , the deformed spin net  $S_{\lambda, I, \vec{J}, \epsilon}$  has 3 extra kinks. Clearly, for small enough  $\epsilon$  these kinks form the 3-kink set  $K_3^{(1)}$  defined in section 3.3. From section 2.3, specifically, equation (2.22) it follows that for small enough  $\epsilon$ , and *independent* of the choice of kink triple  $\vec{J}$ ,

$$g_{S(\lambda, I, \vec{J}, \epsilon)} = \frac{1}{4}g_S + O(\epsilon^{q \geq 2}) \quad (4.1)$$

where we have suppressed the  $h$  subscript of  $g$  to avoid notational clutter.

Next consider the case of a propagation type deformation of a state  $S$ , not necessarily in  $B$ , at its nondegenerate (but from Footnote 8, not necessarily GR) vertex  $v$  which yields a child  $C_\epsilon = S_{\alpha, I, J, \epsilon} \in B$ . From the Note at the end of section 2.4, recall that propagation type deformations in both the GR and NGR case can be denoted in this manner. From (ii), (iv) at the end of section 2.5 it follows that independent of the particular type of propagation deformation, this child is endowed with 2 extra kinks, one at  $v_{I, \epsilon}$  and one at  $\tilde{v}_J$  relative to its parent  $S$ . Additionally, depending on

the particular type of propagation deformation, the vertex  $v$  of  $S$  can be either a GR vertex in  $C_\epsilon$  (since  $C_\epsilon \in B$ ) or a point in the interior of an edge in  $C_\epsilon$  or a (bivalent or trivalent) kink in  $C_\epsilon$ . In the case of a bivalent or trivalent kink, it follows that for small enough  $\epsilon$ , the kinks at  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J, v$  form the 3 kink set  $K_3^{(1)}$  defined in section 3.3. From the discussion around (2.25) and from (2.32) we have that for this set:

$$d_{\min} = d(v, \tilde{v}_J) = O(\epsilon^{q \geq 2}) \quad d_{\max} = \max(d(v, v_{I,\epsilon}), d(\tilde{v}_J, v_{I,\epsilon})) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon) \quad (4.2)$$

from which it follows that

$$g_{C_\epsilon} = O(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.3)$$

In the case that  $v$  is a GR vertex or an interior point of an edge in  $C_\epsilon$ , for small enough  $\epsilon$ , clearly, the kinks at  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  are the closest pair of kinks in the kink set of  $C_\epsilon$ . Two possibilities manifest at any  $\epsilon$ . Either there is no 3rd kink  $k$  in  $C_\epsilon$  which can form a 3-kink set  $K_3^{(1)}$  or there is such a kink  $k$ . In the former case we have a segregation of the kink set of  $C_\epsilon$  into a single 2 kink set and its complement. In the latter case, clearly  $k$  is already present in  $S$  and we have the 3 kink set  $K_3^{(1)} = \{v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J, k\}$ . While no kinks in  $C_\epsilon$  other than  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  move as  $\epsilon$  decreases, it is possible that the segregation structure of the Kink Set of  $C_\epsilon$  could change from one in which the set of nearest kinks is a 2 kink set to one in which the set of nearest kinks is a 3-kink set and vice versa. Moreover in the case that 3-kink sets are encountered at different values of  $\epsilon$ , it is possible that the identity of the nearest ‘spectator’ kink  $k$  in these 3 kink sets also changes. Despite these diverse possibilities, we show next, that the interkink distance function vanishes as  $O(\epsilon^2)$ .

Note that from (2.31)-(2.33) and the Note in section 2.4, it follows for all small enough  $\epsilon$  that the distance from any fixed non-contracting ‘spectator’ kink  $\bar{k}$  (so that  $\bar{k} \in C_\epsilon$  and  $\bar{k} \in S$ ), to the contracting pair satisfies:

$$\max(d(\bar{k}, v_{I,\epsilon}), d(\bar{k}, \tilde{v}_J)) > \bar{D}_{\bar{k}} \quad (4.4)$$

for some  $\epsilon$  independent positive constant  $0 < \bar{D}_{\bar{k}} \leq 1$ . To see this, note that the kinks  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  contract to the parental vertex  $v \in S$ . It follows that we may set  $\bar{D}_{\bar{k}} := \frac{1}{2}d(\bar{k}, v)$ . Since there are a finite number of kinks in  $S$ , we may define

$$\min_{\bar{k} \in S} \bar{D}_{\bar{k}} = \bar{D} \quad (4.5)$$

so that  $\bar{D} > 0$  is also an  $\epsilon$  independent constant bounded above by 1. It also follows that for small enough  $\epsilon$ , equations (2.25), (2.31), (2.33) imply that:

$$(d(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J))^2 \leq D_1 \epsilon^2 \quad (4.6)$$

for some  $\epsilon$  independent  $D_1 > 0$ . Next, for any (small enough)  $\epsilon$ , define the set  $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$  as:

$$\mathcal{S}_\epsilon = \{(d(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J))^2, d_{\bar{k}}, \bar{k} \in S\} \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$d_{\bar{k}} := g(\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}, h) \left( \frac{d(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J)}{\max(d(\bar{k}, v_{I,\epsilon}), d(\bar{k}, \tilde{v}_J))} \right)^2. \quad (4.8)$$

Here  $\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}$  is the kink set obtained by removing the kinks  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J, \bar{k}$  from the kink set of  $C_\epsilon$  and  $g(\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}, h)$  is the interkink distance function defined for the kink set  $\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}$  segregated with respect to  $h$  and defined in section 3.4 through equations (3.5)-(3.8). Note that the absence of  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  in  $\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}$  implies that  $g(\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}, h)$  is some strictly positive  $\epsilon$  independent number bounded by 1. Define:

$$\max_{\bar{k} \in S} g(\mathbf{K}_{\bar{k}}, h) = \bar{D}_1 \quad (4.9)$$

so that  $\bar{D}_1$  is also a strictly positive  $\epsilon$  independent number bounded by 1:

$$0 < \bar{D}_1 \leq 1. \quad (4.10)$$

Next, note that from the discussion of the segregation behavior of the kink set above, it follows that for any small enough  $\epsilon$ , taking into account the possible diversity of kink segregation behaviors discussed above, we have that:

$$g_{C_\epsilon} \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon. \quad (4.11)$$

It follows from (4.5), (4.6) and (4.10) that there exists an  $\epsilon$  independent constant  $D := \frac{D_1}{\bar{D}^2}$  such that

$$\max_{x_\epsilon \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon} x_\epsilon \leq D\epsilon^2. \quad (4.12)$$

from which we obtain the bound:

$$g_{C_\epsilon} \leq D\epsilon^2. \quad (4.13)$$

Equations (4.3) and (4.13) imply that for any propagation child we have the contraction behavior:

$$g_{C_\epsilon} \leq E\epsilon^2 \quad (4.14)$$

for some  $E > 0$  which is independent of  $\epsilon$  so that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{g_{C_\epsilon}}{\epsilon} = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

## 4.2 Single Hamiltonian Constraint

The (dual) action of a single Hamiltonian constraint at parameter  $\epsilon$  on  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is defined through the evaluations, for all spin networks  $S$ , of the amplitude:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S) \quad (4.16)$$

The continuum limit action of a single Hamiltonian constraint on  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ , is defined to be the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit of the evaluations, for all  $S$ , of the amplitude (4.16):

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S), \quad (4.17)$$

Before embarking on the calculation proper of this continuum limit action, we describe the underlying mechanism through which the calculation leads to a well defined continuum limit. First note that the continuum limit contribution of the action on GR vertices to (2.35) vanishes if  $S$  has any NGR vertices because the Bra Set  $B$  only contains states with exclusively GR vertices. Similarly the continuum limit contribution of the ‘diffeomorphism’ part of the constraint action on NGR vertices also vanishes for the same reason. Next, since the contraction behavior of the kink distance function in the case of propagation type deformations leads an overall factor of  $O(\epsilon^2)$  (4.15), this overpowers the factor of  $\epsilon$  in the denominator of (2.34) and renders the propagation part of the constraint action on any vertex (GR or NGR) trivial in the continuum limit. Thus the only non-trivial amplitudes are those for states  $S$  with exclusively GR vertices and the contribution to the continuum limit action on these states comes only from the ‘diffeomorphism’ part of the action i.e only from the first line of (2.34). The contribution from  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$  leads to the evaluation of  $f$  at the displaced vertex  $v_{I, \epsilon}$  together with a factor of 1/4 coming from the contraction behavior of the interkink distance function (4.1). The contribution from  $S_{\lambda_v}$  leads to an evaluation of  $f$  at the

original vertex  $v$  with the factor  $1/4$ . The difference of these two is then clearly of  $O(\epsilon)$  and yields, in the continuum limit, a derivative of  $f$  along the  $I_v$ th edge tangent at  $v$ .

We now proceed with the calculation and flesh out the rough picture presented above in full technical detail. It is convenient to employ a notation for the propagation type states generated by the constraint action on nondegenerate GR vertices which is similar to that employed to denote propagation type states generated by the constraint action on nondegenerate NGR vertices. Accordingly, we decompose the propagation type children in equation (2.34),  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}, \tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$ , into their constituent spin networks. Each such spin network has one of the kink and vertex structures detailed in (ii) of section 2.5. We enumerate these spin networks by a ‘deformation’ index  $\beta_{I,J}, I \neq J$  similar to the deformation index  $\alpha_{IJ}$  used in section 2.4 for the spin networks created by propagation type deformations of an NGR vertex  $v$ . In particular it is immediate to see that the deformations indexed by  $\beta_{IJ}$  satisfy exactly the same general properties outlined in the second paragraph of section 2.4, the only difference from the NGR case being that the possible presentations of the vertex  $v$  in these deformed spin networks are as detailed in (ii), section 2.5 rather than in the 3rd paragraph of section 2.4.

Thus the label  $\beta_{IJ}$  denotes a deformation of  $S$  in the vicinity of its nondegenerate GR vertex  $v$  which introduces the pair of kinks  $v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  together with the edge  $e(v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J)$ <sup>19</sup> colored with spin  $j_J$  and which encodes the changes in colorings on the edges  $e(v, v_{I,\epsilon}), e(\tilde{v}_J, v)$  and the change in the intertwiner at  $v$  relative to  $S$ . Depending on  $\beta_{IJ}$  the colorings of either or both of  $e(v, v_{I,\epsilon}), e(\tilde{v}_J, v)$  can be the trivial  $j = 0$  coloring. In this notation the constituent spin networks in the decomposition of  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(1)I,J,K,\epsilon}$  are denoted by  $S_{\beta_{IK}, \epsilon}$  for appropriate  $\beta_{IK}$  and those in the decomposition of  $\tilde{S}_{\lambda,(2)I,J,\epsilon}$  by  $S_{\beta_{IJ}, \epsilon}$  for appropriate  $\beta_{IJ}$ . As for  $\alpha_{IJ}, \epsilon$  the deformation label  $\beta_{IJ}$  encodes the abstract deformation structure (namely that of the colored graph structure and intertwiner change) whereas the label  $\epsilon$  indicates that this deformation is restricted to an  $\epsilon$  size vicinity of  $v$ .

Accordingly, augmenting  $\beta_{IJ}$  with an index  $v$  denoting the nondegenerate GR vertex of  $S$  at which the constraint acts, we re-express the second line of (2.34) as:

$$\frac{3}{4} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{(\sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{K_v \neq I_v, J_v} \tilde{S}_{\lambda_v, (1)I_v, J_v, K_v, \epsilon}) + (\sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \tilde{S}_{\lambda_v, (2)I_v, J_v, \epsilon})}{\epsilon} = \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}} P_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}} S_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon} \right) \quad (4.18)$$

for appropriately defined deformations  $\beta_{vI_v J_v}$  and complex coefficients  $P_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}}$ . In this notation, the constraint action (2.34) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) &:= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(s)} N(x(v)) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{([\frac{1}{N_v-1} P_3 \sum_{\tilde{J}_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \tilde{J}_v, \epsilon}] - \frac{1}{4} S_{\lambda_v})}{\epsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}} P_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}} \frac{S_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{v \in V_{NGR}(s)} \frac{N(x(v))}{\epsilon} \left( \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} A_{vI_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon} \right) + B_v S_{\lambda_v} + \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}} P_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}} S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon} \right) \right). \quad (4.19) \end{aligned}$$

Here, as in section 2.5,  $V_{GR}$  and  $V_{NGR}$  refer, respectively, to the set of *nondegenerate* GR and NGR vertices of  $S$ . In contrast, the set of all vertices of  $S$ , degenerate or nondegenerate, GR or NGR, is denoted hereon by  $V(S)$ . In this regard, note that for any  $S$  with overlap in  $B$ ,  $V(S)$  has exclusively GR vertices some or all of which could be degenerate/nodegenerate.

<sup>19</sup>Here  $e(p, q)$  refers to an edge  $e$  with endpoints  $p, q$

Next, we show that if  $S$  has one or more NGR vertices, its continuum limit amplitude (4.17) vanishes. First consider the contribution to this amplitude from the GR vertices of  $S$ . The relevant constraint action in the first two lines of (4.19) above. Since in each of the states in these two lines, there is no action on NGR vertices, these vertices and their edge tangent structure remain unchanged. Since the Bra Set  $B$  contains states *all* of whose vertices are GR, it follows that for small enough  $\epsilon$ , the amplitude (4.16) vanishes for  $S$  for which  $V(S)$  has at least one NGR vertex, and, hence so does its continuum limit amplitude (4.17). Next, consider the contribution from NGR vertices of  $S$ . The same argument as above implies that this contribution would vanish if  $S$  has 2 or more NGR vertices. Let us then consider the case where  $S$  has a single NGR vertex at  $v$ . If  $v$  is degenerate, this contribution vanishes. If  $v$  is nondegenerate, it follows from the above discussion together with (4.19) that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S) = \Psi_{B,f,h}\left(\frac{N(x(v))}{\epsilon}\left(\sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} A_{vI_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}\right) + B_v S_{\lambda_v} + \left(\sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}} P_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}} S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}\right)\right). \quad (4.20)$$

Note that  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  is NGR in  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}$ , and that  $v$  is NGR in  $S_{\lambda_v}$ . Hence the amplitudes for these states vanish and we have that

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S) = \frac{N(x(v))}{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}} P_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}} \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon})\right). \quad (4.21)$$

Clearly, the only nontrivial contributions arise from those  $S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}$  which have overlap in  $B$ . From (3.11), we have for such  $S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}$  that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}) = \left(\prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon})} f(\bar{v})\right) g_{S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}, h} \gamma_{S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}}. \quad (4.22)$$

Note that  $S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}$  for fixed  $\alpha_{vI_v J_v}$  and for all small enough  $\epsilon$  has the same abstract graph structure and the same  $\epsilon$  independent vertex intertwiners. It follows that  $\gamma_{S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}}$  is independent of  $\epsilon$ . Next, note that from (4.15) we have that

$$g_{S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}, h} = O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.23)$$

Using the fact that  $f$  is a  $C^r$  function (so that its evaluations are bounded independent of  $\epsilon$ ) together with (4.23) in (4.22) implies that for small enough  $\epsilon$ :

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\alpha_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}) = \frac{O(\epsilon^2)}{\epsilon} = O(\epsilon) \quad (4.24)$$

which implies that the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit of (4.24), and, hence of (4.21) vanishes.

Next, let  $S$  be a spin network which has exclusively GR vertices so that  $V(S)$  comprises only of (not necessarily nondegenerate) GR vertices. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S(A) := \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x(v)) & \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{([\frac{1}{N_v-1} P_3] \sum_{\vec{j}_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v, \epsilon}) - \frac{1}{4} S_{\lambda_v}}{\epsilon} \right. \\ & \left. - \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \sum_{J_v \neq I_v} \sum_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}} P_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}} \frac{S_{\beta_{vI_v J_v}, \epsilon}}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where we remind the reader that  $V_{GR}$  is the set of all *nondegenerate* GR vertices in  $V(S)$ . Note that if  $S$  does not have overlap in  $B$ , none of the states in the first line of (4.25) have overlap in  $B$ . To see this recall from section 3.4.2 that if  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$  and has an expansion (3.9), none of the asymmetric spin network basis states in this expansion are in  $B$ . Thus, if  $\{S_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  are the set of these states (with non-zero expansion coefficients), we have that  $S_i \notin B$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . If  $S_i \notin B$ , none of its children are in  $B$  else  $S_i$  would be a possible parent, by electric diffeomorphism, of a child in  $B$  and hence, itself in  $B$  by (iii), section 3.2. However, equation (3.21) shows that every electric diffeomorphism child of  $S$  is a linear combination of children of  $\{S_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ . This shows that no electric diffeomorphism child of  $S$  in the first line of (4.25) can have overlap in  $B$ . Note also that (3.19) shows that  $S_{\lambda_v}$  also cannot have overlap in  $B$  if  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$ . It follows that none of the states in the first line of (4.25) can have any overlap with states in  $B$ , if  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$  but admits the expansion (3.9).

Next, let  $S$  not admit such an expansion. Then it must be the case that the embedded colored graph underlying  $S$  is distinct from that underlying any asymmetric spin net basis element so that  $S$  necessarily cannot have overlap in  $B$  by virtue of the fact that every element of  $B$  is such an asymmetric spin net basis element (see (i), section 3.2). Since  $S_{\lambda_v}$  lives on the same colored decorated graph as  $S$ , it also does not admit such an expansion and hence also does not have overlap in  $B$ . Similarly if  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  also does not admit an expansion of type (3.9), its decorated colored graph is also distinct from that underlying any asymmetric spin network basis element and hence  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  does not have overlap in  $B$ . Next, recall again that in any expansion of a spin network in terms of other spin networks, all spin networks contributing non-trivially to the expansion necessarily live on the same embedded colored graph. Suppose now that  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  does admit an expansion (3.9) so that its embedded colored graph is a permissible embedding of some abstract decorated graph  $\gamma'_{m,c,d}$  which necessarily has (at least) a triple of appropriately placed bivalent kinks in its non-loop component. Clearly  $S$  must live on an embedded colored graph obtained by removing a triple of kinks from the non-loop component of that underlying  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$ , which implies that the embedded colored graph underlying  $S$  is a permissible embedding of the abstract decorated graph obtained by removing an appropriate triple of kinks from edges in the non-loop component of  $\gamma'_{m,c,d}$ . Since such a graph is of type  $\gamma_{m,c,d}$  or  $\gamma'_{m,c,d}$ ,  $S$  necessarily admits an expansion in terms of embedded spin networks each of which is an embedding of an element of  $\mathbf{E}\gamma_{m,c}$ . Thus  $S$  must admit an expansion of type (3.9) which is a contradiction so that  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  cannot have overlap in  $B$ . Thus, if  $S$  does not have overlap in  $B$ , none of the states in the first line of (4.25) can have any overlap in  $B$ , which proves the assertion. As a result, the contribution from the first line of (4.25) vanishes.

Next, consider the ‘propagation’ contributions in the second line of (4.25). These contributions can be seen vanish in the continuum limit by arguments identical to those which lead to (4.23), (4.24) *whether or not*  $S$  has overlap in  $B$ . More in detail for any nondegenerate vertex  $v$  in  $S$ , we have, once again, that:

$$g_{S_{\alpha_v I_v J_v, \epsilon, h}} = O(\epsilon^2), \quad \Psi_{B, f, h}(S_{\alpha_v I_v J_v, \epsilon}) = \frac{O(\epsilon^2)}{\epsilon} = O(\epsilon). \quad (4.26)$$

so that the continuum limit of the propagation part of the constraint vanishes.

As a result, the amplitude (4.16) for  $S$  with no overlap in  $B$  vanishes in its continuum limit (4.17) and the only possibly non-trivial contributions to this continuum limit amplitude for  $S$  which has overlap in  $B$  arise solely from the first line of (4.25). Therefore, in (4.25) we restrict attention to  $S$  which has overlap in  $B$  and consider contributions only from its first line. From arguments similar to those above it then follows that all the states in the first line of (4.25) have overlap in  $B$

so that the contributions of interest evaluate to:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S) = \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(s)} N(x(v)) \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{([\frac{1}{N_v-1P_3} \sum_{\vec{j}_v} \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon})] - \frac{1}{4} \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\lambda_v}))}{\epsilon}. \quad (4.27)$$

Omitting the subscript ‘ $h$ ’ on the interkink distance function  $g$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}) &= \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I, \epsilon}} f(v') f(v_{I, \epsilon}) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v, \epsilon}} \right) \\ &= \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') f(v_{I, \epsilon}) \right) \left( \frac{1}{4} g_S \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v}} + O(\epsilon^2) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

where we have used (3.11) in the first line and (4.1) and (3.22) in the second line of (4.28). Here, in the first line  $v'$  ranges over all vertices of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v, \epsilon}$  other than  $v_{I, \epsilon}$ . Equivalently, in the second line  $v'$  ranges over all elements of  $S$  other than the parental vertex of interest,  $v$ .

Next, note that in the RNC’s at  $v$  we have that

$$x^\mu(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) = x^\mu(v) + \epsilon \hat{e}_{I_v}^\mu + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.29)$$

where  $\hat{e}_{I_v}^\mu$  is the unit (with respect to the metric  $h$ ) tangent to the  $I_v$ th edge at  $v$ . To see this, note that  $I_v$ th edge is a  $C^r$ ,  $r \gg 1$  curve and hence a  $C^{r-1}$  curve in terms of the  $C^{r-1}$  RNCs at  $v$ . In a  $C^{r-1}$  parameterization by some parameter  $t$  such that  $v$  lies at parameter  $t = 0$  and  $v_{I, \epsilon}$  at parameter  $t_\epsilon$ , Taylor expansion yields

$$x^\mu(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) - x^\mu(v) = \frac{dx^\mu}{dt}(t=0)t_\epsilon + O(t_\epsilon^2). \quad (4.30)$$

Since  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  lies at an RNC coordinate distance  $\epsilon$  from  $v$  and since the metric at  $v$  in RNCs is  $h_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}$  we have that

$$\epsilon^2 = \sum_{\mu=1}^3 (x^\mu(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) - x^\mu(v))^2 \quad (4.31)$$

$$= (t_\epsilon)^2 (\delta_{\mu\nu} (\frac{dx^\mu}{dt}(t=0) \frac{dx^\nu}{dt}(t=0))) + O(t_\epsilon) \quad (4.32)$$

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon = \mathbf{O}(t_\epsilon) \Rightarrow O(t_\epsilon) = O(\epsilon) \quad (4.33)$$

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) = t_\epsilon (h_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^\mu}{dt}(t=0) \frac{dx^\nu}{dt}(t=0))^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4.34)$$

where we substituted (4.33) in (the square root of) (4.32) to obtain (4.34). Using (4.34) in (4.30) together with the fact that  $\frac{dx^\mu}{dt}(t=0)$  is the  $I_v$ th edge tangent in the parameterization  $t$  yields the desired result (4.29). Note that by virtue of the defining property of RNCs the unit edge tangent with respect to the metric  $h$  agrees with the unit coordinate edge tangent (see also (2.19)). Using the fact that  $f$  is  $C^r$ , (4.29) implies that:

$$f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) = f(v) + \epsilon \hat{e}_{I_v}^\mu \partial_\mu f(v) + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.35)$$

Using this in conjunction with (4.28) and (3.22) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[ \frac{1}{N_v - 1 P_3} \sum_{\vec{j}_v} \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}) \right] - \frac{1}{4} \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\lambda_v}) \\
&= \left( \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} g_S \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v}}(f(v) + \epsilon \hat{e}_{I_v}^\mu \partial f(v) + O(\epsilon^2)) \right) - \left( \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} g_S \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v}} f(v) \right) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{4} g_S \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \hat{e}_{I_v}^\mu \partial_\mu f(v) \right) \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

from which it follows that:

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S) = \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x(v)) g_S \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^\mu \partial_\mu f(v) \right) \tag{4.37}$$

where we remind the reader that the vertex set  $V(S)$  of  $S$  has only GR vertices, that  $V_{GR}(S)$  is the set of nondegenerate vertices of  $S$  and that in (4.37),  $v'$  ranges over all elements of  $V(S)$  other than  $v$ . To summarise, the continuum limit of the single action of the Hamiltonian constraint on the off shell basis state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is given by the following exhaustive set of amplitudes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}(N)S) &:= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S) \\
&= 0 \text{ if } S \text{ has no overlap in } B \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x(v)) g_S \gamma_{S_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \in V(S), v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \right) \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{if } S \text{ has overlap in } B
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

where we have replaced the coordinate index  $\mu$  by an abstract index to emphasize the coordinate independence of the derivative of  $f$  along the unit (with respect to  $h$ )  $I_v$ th edge tangent at  $v$ .

### 4.3 Constraint Product and Commutator

The (dual) action of a product of Hamiltonian constraints at parameters  $\bar{\epsilon}, \epsilon$  on  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is defined through the evaluations, for all spin networks  $S$ , of the amplitude:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S). \tag{4.40}$$

The continuum limit action of the product of Hamiltonian constraints on  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ , is defined to be the  $\bar{\epsilon}, \epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit of the evaluations, for all  $S$ , of the amplitude (4.40):

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S)). \tag{4.41}$$

The commutator between a pair of Hamiltonian constraints can then be inferred directly from (4.41) to be

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S)) - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(N)\hat{H}_\epsilon(M)S)). \tag{4.42}$$

In section 4.3.1 we show that the continuum limit of the constraint product amplitude (4.41) vanishes for  $S$  which has one or more NGR vertices. In section 4.3.2 we evaluate the continuum limit of the constraint product amplitude for  $S$  which has exclusively GR vertices. In section 4.3.3 we infer the commutator (4.42) from the evaluation of (4.41) in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.

### 4.3.1 Vanishing Product Amplitude for the case that $S$ has NGR vertices

We have that:

$$\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)S = \hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)(\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)S|_{V_{GR}(S)}) + \hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)(\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)S|_{V_{NGR}(S)}). \quad (4.43)$$

The first contribution above, from nondegenerate GR vertices in  $S$  results in spin networks which we denote by  $\{S_{\chi,\epsilon}\}$  for some appropriate enumeration index  $\chi$ . From (4.38) the  $\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$  limit of the amplitude  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)(S_{\chi,\epsilon}))$  vanishes because every  $S_{\chi,\epsilon}$  has NGR vertices where  $\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)$  has not acted. The same argument shows that the contribution of the second term in (4.43) to the continuum limit in  $\bar{\epsilon}$  also vanishes if there are 2 or more NGR vertices in  $S$ .

Consider the remaining case, in which  $S$  has a single NGR vertex at  $v_0$ . Let  $v_0$  be nondegenerate (else there is no contribution to the second term of (4.43) so that both terms on the right hand side of (4.43) vanish). From section 2.4, the diffeomorphism part of the action of  $\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)$  at  $v_0$  results in spin nets which continue to have a single NGR vertex. It follows that the  $\bar{\epsilon}$  continuum limit vanishes on these spin networks. Hence we only need to consider the propagation type children generated by  $\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)$  at  $v_0$  for which the propagation deformation results in  $v_0$  changing from an NGR vertex in  $S$  to a GR vertex or a point in the interior of an edge or to a (trivalent or bivalent) kink in the child. Amongst these children, from (4.38), we only need to consider children which happen to have overlap in  $B$ . Let us denote such a child by  $C_{\epsilon}$ . The continuum limit action of  $\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)$  on such a state is given by (4.39):

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}(M)C_{\epsilon}) = \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(C_{\epsilon})} M(x(v))g_{C_{\epsilon}}\gamma_{C_{\epsilon}\lambda_v} \left( \prod_{v' \in V(C_{\epsilon}), v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} f(v) \right). \quad (4.44)$$

Note that none of the vertices of  $C_{\epsilon}$  change their positions as  $\epsilon$  decreases, only the kinks contract. Also note that  $\gamma_{C_{\epsilon}\lambda_v}$  only depends on the colored graph structure and vertex intertwiners of  $C_{\epsilon}$  and these are independent of  $\epsilon$ . Thus  $\gamma_{C_{\epsilon}\lambda_v}$  is independent of  $\epsilon$ . The only  $\epsilon$  dependent contribution to (4.44) is then  $g_{C_{\epsilon}}$ . From (4.15) this contribution is of  $O(\epsilon^2)$  for small enough  $\epsilon$ . Since the propagation children generated from an NGR vertex come with a factor of  $\epsilon^{-1}$  (see (2.29), we have that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}(M)\frac{C_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon}) = O(\epsilon) \quad (4.45)$$

which implies that the contribution of the second term of (4.43) to the continuum limit product amplitude in (4.41) vanishes because it involves the double limit in which the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit is taken after the  $\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$  limit.

To summarise: the continuum limit product amplitude vanishes for spin networks  $S$  with at least one NGR vertex. Accordingly, in the next section we focus on the case in which  $S$  has exclusively GR vertices.

### 4.3.2 Product Amplitude for the case of exclusively GR vertices

Consider the continuum limit product amplitude (4.41) in the case that  $S$  has exclusively GR vertices. First consider the propagation type states generated by the action of  $\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)$  on such  $S$ . It is immediate to see that the arguments of section 4.3.1 for the contribution of such propagation children continue to hold if the vertex  $v_0$  in those arguments is GR in  $S$  instead of NGR in  $S$ . Hence if the propagation part of action of  $\hat{H}_{\epsilon}(N)$  on  $S$  results children with overlap in  $B$ , the contribution of such propagation children to the product amplitude vanishes in the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  continuum limit. If such propagation children do not have overlap in  $B$ , (4.38) implies that the action of  $\hat{H}(M)$  on such

children vanishes. Hence the only remaining contributions to the product amplitude arise from the action of the diffeomorphism part of  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)$  on  $S$  i.e from the states in the first line of (4.25). First, consider the case in which  $S$  has no overlap with  $B$ . Recall from the arguments immediately after (4.25) that if  $S$  has exclusively GR vertices and has no overlap with  $B$ , none of the states in the first line of (4.25) have overlap in  $S$ . Equation (4.38) then implies that the contribution of the electric diffeomorphism part of  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)$  to the product amplitude vanishes for such  $S$ . It follows that the continuum limit product amplitude vanishes for  $S$  with no overlap in  $B$  and for  $S$  with overlap in  $B$  only the children generated by the diffeomorphism part of  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)$  i.e. the states in the first line of (4.25) contribute to this amplitude. Recall, from the discussion after (4.25) that for  $S$  with overlap in  $B$  all the states in the first line of (4.25) have overlap in  $B$ . From these arguments together with (2.34) it follows that for  $S$  with overlap in  $B$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)S)) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h} \left( \hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M) \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x(v)) \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{([\frac{1}{N_v-1P_3} \sum_{\vec{j}_v} S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}]^{-\frac{1}{4} S_{\lambda_v}})}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

$$= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x(v)) \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{([\sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{N_v-1P_3} \sum_{\vec{j}_v} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})]^{-N_v \frac{1}{4}} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v})}{\epsilon} \right) \quad (4.47)$$

where in the last line we have used the independence of  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v})$  from the label  $I_v$  to replace the sum over  $I_v$  by a factor of  $N_v$ .

From (4.39) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}) =: \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}) \\ &= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \in V_{GR}(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})} M(x_{\bar{v}}(\bar{v})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}} \gamma(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}} (\prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}')) (\sum_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v})) \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

Here  $\bar{v}, \bar{v}'$  refer to vertices of the state  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}$ . The vertex label  $\bar{v}$  ranges over the set of nondegenerate (necessarily GR) vertices  $V_{GR}(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})$  and can either be  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  or any of the undeformed nondegenerate vertices of  $S$  (i.e nondegenerate vertices other than  $v$ ). The vertex label  $\bar{v}'$  ranges over the entire vertex set of necessarily GR but not necessarily nondegenerate vertices,  $V(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})$ .

The index  $\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}$  is an edge index for the edges emanating from  $\bar{v}$  in  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}$ .

In the argument of the lapse  $M$  we have found it useful to add an explicit subscript  $\bar{v}$  to the Riemann Normal Coordinate notation adopted so far. Thus  $\{x_{\bar{v}}\}$  refers to the Riemann Normal Coordinates centered at the point  $\bar{v}$ .  $M(x_{\bar{v}}(\bar{v}))$  refers to the evaluation of the density weighted lapse  $M$  at the point  $\bar{v}$  in the RNCs  $\{x_{\bar{v}}\}$  centered at  $\bar{v}$ . If  $\bar{v} = v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  we shall find it useful to relate the evaluation of the lapse  $M$  at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  in the RNCs centered at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  to its evaluation at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  in the RNCs centered at  $v$ . The evaluations in these two sets of coordinates are related by an appropriate factor of the determinant of the Jacobian between these two sets of coordinates. From (2.21) the determinant of this Jacobian is unity to  $O(\epsilon^2)$ . It follows that the two evaluations, in the notation used above, are related as follows:

$$M(x_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) = M(x_v(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.49)$$

$\gamma(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}$  is the  $\gamma$  factor for the spin network  $(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}$  which is obtained from  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}$  by the action of the inverse determinant operator at  $\bar{v}$  which changes the intertwiner at  $\bar{v} \in S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon}$

(see the paragraph after (2.12) for a precise definition of this inverse determinant metric operator). Separating out the vertex contributions to (4.48) from  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  and the remaining vertices of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}$  we write the right hand side of (4.48) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \in V_{GR}(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})} M(x_{\bar{v}}(\bar{v})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}') \right) \left( \sum_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} M(x_{\bar{v}}(\bar{v})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}, v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(\bar{v}') \right) f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) \left( \sum_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \right) \\
&+ \frac{3}{8\pi} M(x_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(v') \right) \left( \sum_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) \right). \quad (4.50)
\end{aligned}$$

In the second line, since  $\bar{v} \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}$ , equation (3.27) implies that

$$\gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} = \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}}. \quad (4.51)$$

In the third line, equations (3.15) and (3.23) imply that:

$$\gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})_{\lambda_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}} = \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}. \quad (4.52)$$

Let us now simplify the second line of (4.50) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} M(x_{\bar{v}}(\bar{v})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}, v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(\bar{v}') \right) f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) \left( \sum_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} M(x_{\bar{v}}(\bar{v})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}, v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(\bar{v}') \right) f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) \left( \sum_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{\bar{I}_{\bar{v}}}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v'} f(v'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \left( \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \right) \\
&+ \epsilon \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v', v} f(v'') \right) \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \\
&+ O(\epsilon^2) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v'} f(v'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \\
&+ \epsilon \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v', v} f(v'') \right) \left( \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \\
&+ O(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.53)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.51) to simplify the gamma factor of the first line to obtain the second, (4.35) to expand the second line and finally, (4.1) to expand the interkink distance function of the diffeomorphism child  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v, \epsilon}$  in terms of that of its parent. In the first two lines of the above set

of equations,  $\bar{v}$  ranges over all nondegenerate vertices of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  other than  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$ . This range is the same as that of all nondegenerate vertices of  $S$  other than  $v$ . Accordingly, in the remaining part of (4.53), we have renamed  $\bar{v}$  as  $v'$  with  $v'$  ranging over all vertices in  $V_{GR}(S)$  other than  $v$ . On the other hand, in the first two lines of the above equations  $\bar{v}'$  ranges over the entire vertex set of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  modulo the restrictions under the product sign. Renaming  $\bar{v}'$  as  $v''$  in the remaining part of (4.53) it is easy to see that this range is the same as that of all vertices in  $V(S)$  modulo the restrictions under the product sign.

Next, we simplify the third line of (4.50). In order to do we adopt the following simplifying edge enumeration for edges at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  which assigns the same identifying number to the deformed counterpart of any edge at  $v$  as that of its undeformed counterpart. Accordingly we shall assume an enumeration of these edges such that the  $J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}$ th edge  $e_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}$  at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  is the deformed counterpart of the edge  $e_{J_v=J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}$  at  $v$  (here the deformation is that corresponding to an electric diffeomorphism along the  $I_v$ th edge of  $v$ ). We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3}{8\pi} M(x_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon})_{\lambda_v, I_v, \epsilon}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(v') \right) \left( \sum_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) \right) \\ &= \frac{3}{8\pi} (M(x_v(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) + O(\epsilon^2)) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(v') \right) \left( \sum_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{J_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) \right) \quad (4.54) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{3}{8\pi} (M(x_v(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) + O(\epsilon^2)) g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} (N_v \hat{e}_{I_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) + O(\epsilon^2)) \quad (4.55)$$

$$= \frac{3}{8\pi} g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_v M(x_v(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) \hat{e}_{I_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.56)$$

$$= \frac{3}{8\pi} \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v, \epsilon}} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_v M(x_v(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) \hat{e}_{I_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.57)$$

where  $v'$  ranges over the entire vertex set of  $S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}$  other than  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$ , this range coinciding with the entire vertex set of  $S$  other than  $v$ .

In (4.54) we have used (4.52) to simplify the  $\gamma$  factor. We have also used (4.49) in (4.54) to transit from the  $\{x_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}\}$  RNCs centered at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  to the  $\{x_v\}$  RNCs centered at  $v$  in the evaluation of the lapse  $M$ . Since the parameter  $\epsilon$  is measured with respect to the  $\{x_v\}$  RNCs, this will enable us, subsequently, to expand the lapse via a Taylor series expansion of the type (4.35).

In (4.55) we use the ‘upward conical stiffening’ of the edge tangent structure at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  as encoded in (2.26) to simplify the sum over edge tangents. In (4.56) we use the boundedness of the various pieces of (4.55) to separate out the  $O(\epsilon^2)$  piece. We shall continue to do this as we go along without explicit mention. In (4.57) we use the contraction behaviour (4.1) of the interkink distance function  $g$ .

Next, we expand the quantity  $M(x_v(v_{I_v, \epsilon})) \hat{e}_{I_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v, \epsilon})$  (4.57) in a Taylor series about  $v$  using (4.29)-(4.34). Recall that the RNCs are  $C^{r-1}$  coordinates, the metric  $h$  is  $C^{r-1}$  tensor,  $f$  is a  $C^r$  function and  $e_{I_v}$  is a semianalytic  $C^r$  edge with, as in (4.29)-(4.34), semianalytic parameterization  $t$  such that  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  is located on the edge  $e_{I_v}$  at parameter value  $t = t_\epsilon = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  and  $v$  at  $t = 0$ . From (2.26) and the numbering convention of edges discussed above, it follows that  $\hat{e}_{I_{v_{I_v, \epsilon}}}^a$  in (4.57) is the unit (with respect to the metric  $h$  at  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$ ) edge tangent to the edge  $e_{I_v}$  at the point  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  located at parameter value  $t_\epsilon$ .

It is convenient to use the following notation. Denote the point on the edge  $e_{I_v}$  at parameter  $t$  by  $e_{I_v}(t)$ , and the edge tangent at the point  $e_{I_v}(t)$  by  $\dot{e}^a_{I_v}(t)$ . Then the unit (with respect to  $h$ ) edge tangent at this point is:

$$\hat{e}_{I_v^a}(t) = \frac{\dot{e}^a_{I_v}(t)}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|} \quad (4.58)$$

where  $|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|$  is the metric norm of  $\dot{e}^a_{I_v}(t)$  i.e.

$$|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|^2 := h_{ab}(e_{I_v}(t))\dot{e}^a_{I_v}(t)\dot{e}^b_{I_v}(t). \quad (4.59)$$

Finally denote  $M(x_v(e_{I_v}(t)))$  by  $M(t)$ .

It then follows that  $M(x_v(p))(\hat{e}_{I_v^a}(p)\partial_a f(p))|_{p=e_{I_v}(t)} = (M(t)\frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|}\frac{df}{dt})$  is a  $C^{r-2}$  function of  $t$  and admits a Taylor expansion about  $t = 0$ :

$$M(x_v(v_{I_v,\epsilon}))\hat{e}_{I_v^a}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v,\epsilon}) = (M(t)\frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|}\frac{df}{dt})|_{t=t\epsilon} \quad (4.60)$$

$$= M(t=0)\frac{df}{dt}|_{t=0} + t\epsilon\left(\frac{d}{dt}(M(t)\frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|}\frac{df}{dt})\right)|_{t=0} + O(t_\epsilon^2) \quad (4.61)$$

$$= M(x_v(v))(\hat{e}_{I_v^a}\partial_a f(v)) + \frac{\epsilon}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t=0)|}\left(\frac{d}{dt}(M(t)\frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|}\frac{df}{dt})\right)|_{t=0} + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.62)$$

where in the last line we have used  $e_{I_v}(t=0) = v$  in the first term and (4.58) together with (4.34). Finally using the obvious notation:

$$\hat{e}_{I_v^a}\partial_a F(p)|_{p=e_{I_v}(t)} \equiv \frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|}\dot{e}^a_{I_v}(t)\partial_a F(e_{I_v}(t)) = \frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_v}(t)|}\frac{dF(e_{I_v}(t))}{dt} \quad (4.63)$$

where  $F = F(e_{I_v}(t))$  is any differentiable function  $F : e_{I_v} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , we can use the Taylor expansion (4.62) in (4.57) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{3}{8\pi}M(x_{v_{I_v,\epsilon}}(v_{I_v,\epsilon}))g_{S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v\epsilon}}\gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v\epsilon})\lambda_v I_v,\epsilon}\left(\prod_{v' \neq v_{I_v,\epsilon}} f(v')\right)\left(\sum_{J_{v_{I_v,\epsilon}}=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4}\hat{e}_{J_{v_{I_v,\epsilon}}}^a \partial_a f(v_{I_v,\epsilon})\right) \\ &= \frac{3}{8\pi}\frac{1}{4}g_{S_{\lambda_v}}\gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})\lambda_v}\left(\prod_{v' \neq v} f(v')\right)\frac{1}{4}N_v \\ & \quad (M(x_v(v))\hat{e}_{I_v^a}\partial_a f(v) + \epsilon\hat{e}_{I_v^b}\partial_b(M(x_v(v))\hat{e}_{I_v^a}\partial_a f(v))) + O(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.64)$$

Using (4.53) and (4.64) in (4.50) and recalling that (4.50) is the right hand side of (4.48), it follows

that equation (4.48) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v'} f(v'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \\
&+ \frac{3}{8\pi} \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_v M(x_v(v)) \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \\
&+ \epsilon \left( \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v'} f(v'') \right) \left( \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \right. \\
&+ \frac{3}{8\pi} \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_v \hat{e}_{I_v}^b \partial_b (M(x_v(v)) \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v)) \\
&+ O(\epsilon^2) \tag{4.65}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the 0th order and 1st order contributions in  $\epsilon$  to (4.65) are independent of the  $\vec{J}_v$  label of the first line of (4.65). Hence in the expression in square brackets in (4.47) the combinatorial factor in the denominator cancels with the factor obtained by summing over  $\vec{J}_v$  and up to terms of  $O(\epsilon^2)$  we have that:

$$\frac{1}{N_v - 1 P_3} \sum_{\vec{J}_v} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}) = \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}) \tag{4.66}$$

with the right hand side of (4.66) being given by that of (4.65). In (4.47) there is also an additional sum over  $I_v$  in the square brackets for this amplitude. Performing this sum, we obtain the zeroth order in  $\epsilon$  contribution to the square bracketed term to be

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[ \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{N_v - 1 P_3} \sum_{\vec{J}_v} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}) \right] |_0 \\
&= N_v \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v'} f(v'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \\
&+ N_v \frac{3}{8\pi} \frac{1}{4} g_{S_{\lambda_v}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) M(x_v(v)) \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v). \tag{4.67}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using (4.39) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v}) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v'} M(x_{v'}(v')) g_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v'} f(v'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right). \tag{4.68}
\end{aligned}$$

Separating out the contributions from  $v$  and  $v' \neq v$  in (4.68) it is immediate to see from (4.67) that:

$$\left[ \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{N_v - 1 P_3} \sum_{\vec{J}_v} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{J}_v \epsilon}) \right] |_0 = N_v \frac{1}{4} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v}). \tag{4.69}$$

This implies that in the numerator of the term inside the limit operation in (4.47), the zeroth order in  $\epsilon$  contribution to the square brackets cancels with the term following it. Since the denominator contains a factor of  $\epsilon$ ,  $O(\epsilon^2)$  contributions to the square bracket vanish in the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit and the only nontrivial contributions come from a sum over  $I_v$  of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  contributions to the right hand side of (4.66). These contributions can be read off from (4.65). Putting all this together, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)S) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (\lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(N)S)) \\
&= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x_v(v)) \\
& \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{[\sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{N_v-1P_3} \sum_{\vec{j}_v} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v, I_v, \vec{j}_v \epsilon})] - N_v \frac{1}{4} \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)S_{\lambda_v})}{\epsilon} \right) \\
&= \left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x_v(v)) \frac{1}{4} g_S \\
& \left( \sum_{v' \neq v} M(x_{v'}(v')) \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \neq v', v} f(v'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}}^a \partial_a f(v') \right) \right. \\
& \left. + \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_v \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \hat{e}_{I_v}^b \partial_b (M(x_v(v)) \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v)) \right). \tag{4.70}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have denoted  $N(x(v))$  (see (4.47)) by  $N(x_v(v))$  to bring the notation in line with that used in the analysis of (4.50). Also we have replaced  $g_{S_{\lambda_v}}$  by  $g_S$  because  $S_{\lambda_v}$  and  $S$  only differ by their intertwiners at  $v$  and the interkink distance function is insensitive to this difference as it only depends on the kink structure of the state. For the equations from (4.57) on, we have not explicitly mentioned the ranges of vertex labels under the summation and product signs as these are straightforward to infer as we go along so that in the final equation (4.70) above these ranges are as follows. The vertex label  $v$  as indicated ranges over the set  $V_{GR}(S)$  of all nondegenerate (and necessarily GR, since  $S$  has overlap with  $B$ ) vertices of  $S$ . The vertex label  $v'$  also ranges over  $V_{GR}(S)$  whereas the vertex label  $v''$  ranges over the set  $V(S)$  of all (necessarily GR but not necessarily nondegenerate) vertices of  $S$ .

### 4.3.3 Constraint Commutator

The continuum limit commutator amplitude can be read off from the part of the continuum limit product amplitude which is antisymmetric under interchange of the lapse functions  $M, N$  (see (4.41), (4.42)). It follows from the considerations of sections 4.3.1 - 4.3.3 that the continuum limit commutator amplitude is only non-trivial for spin networks states which have overlap in  $B$ , in which case this amplitude commutator can be read off from the part of (4.70).

Our final result is then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{B,f,h}([\hat{H}(M), \hat{H}(N)]S) \\ = & 0 \quad \text{if } S \text{ has no overlap in } B \end{aligned} \quad (4.71)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = & \left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{16} g_S \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})\lambda_v} N_v \left( \prod_{v' \in V(S), v' \neq v} f(v') \right) \\ & \left( N(x_v(v)) \hat{e}_{I_v}^b \partial_b M(x_v(v)) - M(x_v(v)) \hat{e}_{I_v}^b \partial_b N(x_v(v)) \right) \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v) \\ & \text{if } S \text{ has overlap in } B \end{aligned} \quad (4.72)$$

#### 4.4 On the importance of embeddable abstract spin networks

Consider the off shell state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ . Let us fix the Bra Set  $B$ . Note that the calculations and results of sections 4.2, 4.3 go through for fixed  $B$  and *any* choice of  $f, h$ . In particular, even if we change  $h$ , the calculations hold despite the fact that we are changing the regulating RNCs. The reason for this is tied to the role of embeddable abstract spin networks in the definition of  $B$  in section 3. Specifically, the associated decorated abstract spin network (see section 3.1) for each deformed child generated by the action of the constraint on a parent is *independent* of the metric  $h$  used to define the deformation. This implies that if a child generated by the constraint action with respect to RNCs defined by a metric  $h$  has overlap with  $B$ , the corresponding child generated with respect to RNCs defined with respect to a different metric  $h'$  will also have overlap with  $B$ , this overlap only depending on the (same) underlying decorated abstract spin network associated with the  $h$ -child and the  $h'$ -child. It is important to emphasize that while we can, using the techniques of Appendix D, relate constraint actions at different  $\epsilon$  with respect to the *same* metric  $h$  by diffeomorphisms if we so wish, we do not know if constraint actions defined with respect to different metrics are diffeomorphic. Since the metrics under consideration are all diffeomorphic to each other, it may be possible to define these actions so that they are indeed diffeomorphic to each other. Instead, by going beyond diffeomorphism classes to ‘decorated abstract spin network’-classes in the definition of Bra Sets, we bypass this issue. The consequent fact, that the results of sections 4.2, 4.3 go through for fixed  $B$  regardless of  $h$ , is a crucial ingredient in our proof of diffeomorphism covariance of the constraint action in section 6. A potential advantage of the use of abstract structures over a putative attempt to incorporate the desired property of the constraint actions for different  $h$  being diffeomorphic, is that while the latter is expected to leave an imprint of the diffeomorphism class of metrics  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  on the off-shell space, the former could possibly lead to an off shell space independent of the choice of (diffeomorphism class of)  $h_0$ . In a similar fashion an insistence on abstract structures may conceivably also lead to a manifestly  $h_0$  independent physical state space; this would be desirable as it would signal independence of physics from the choice of regulating structure.

### 5 Quantization of $\{H(M), H(N)\}$

For notational convenience denote the Poisson bracket  $\{H(M), H(N)\}$  by  $O(M, N)$ . From (2.9), we have that on the Gauss Law constraint surface:

$$\{H[M], H[N]\} := O(M, N) = \int d^3x F_{ab}^k E_k^b \omega_c q^{-2/3} E_i^a E_i^c, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\omega_c = (N \partial_c M - M \partial_c N) \quad (5.2)$$

The expression on the right hand side is the diffeomorphism constraint smeared with a metric dependent ‘shift’ vector field:

$$L^a = \omega_c q^{-2/3} E_i^a E_i^c. \quad (5.3)$$

We shall construct the operator  $\hat{O}(M, N)$  corresponding to  $\{H(M), H(N)\}$  by regulating the right hand side of (5.1) in three steps. First, in section 5.1 we construct a regulated operator  $\hat{L}_\epsilon^a$  corresponding to the ‘metric shift’  $L^a$ . Next, in section 5.2 we use this regulated version to construct a regulated version  $\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)$  of  $\hat{O}(M, N)$  as a  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$  times the difference between a finite ‘ $\epsilon$  size’ diffeomorphism and the identity. Importantly, in line with the classical expression, this diffeomorphism will be an ordinary *semianalytic* diffeomorphism rather than an electric diffeomorphism. Finally in section 5.3 we compute the continuum limit action of  $\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)$  on the basis state  $\Psi_{B, f, h}$  and show that this continuum limit agrees with the constraint commutator continuum limit (4.72).

### 5.1 Construction of $\hat{L}_\epsilon^a$

Denote the metric shift at point  $p$  by  $L^a(p)$ . In this section we construct the corresponding regulated metric shift operator  $\hat{L}_\epsilon^a(p)$ . Our final result is as follows. For every nondegenerate vertex  $v$  of  $S$ , consider a small neighborhood  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$  of coordinate size  $\epsilon$  as measured by the RNC’s at  $v$ . Let  $\epsilon$  be small enough that  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$  contains no other vertex of  $S$ . Then  $\hat{L}_\epsilon^a(p)$  is non-trivial only if  $p \in B_{2\epsilon}(v)$  for some non-degenerate vertex  $v$  of  $S$  with action

$$\hat{L}_\epsilon^a(p)S = \frac{2}{\left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\right)^2} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (j_I)(j_I + 1)(\omega_c(v)\hat{e}_I^c(v))\hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p)(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \quad (5.4)$$

where  $\hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p)$  is a regulated version of the unit coordinate edge tangent  $\hat{e}_{I_v}^a(v)$  supported only in  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$  and defined through equations (D.10), (D.11) with the identification  $f^\mu \equiv \hat{e}_{I_v, v}^\mu$  in the coordinate system defined in section D.2. It follows from this definition that as in the regularization of the electric shift [2], for every small enough  $\epsilon$ ,  $\hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p)$  is chosen such that on the intersection of the  $I_v$ th edge  $e_{I_v}$  with  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$ ,  $\hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p)$  is parallel to the edge tangent to  $e_{I_v}$  i.e.

$$\hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p) = \lambda(p)\hat{e}_{I_v}^a(p) \text{ for } p \in e_{I_v} \cap B_{2\epsilon}(v), \quad (5.5)$$

and that, as in [2],  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p)$  vanishes everywhere except at  $v$  where it is equal to  $\hat{e}_{I_v}^a(v)$ . It is in this sense that  $\hat{e}_{I_v, \epsilon}^a(p)$  is a regularization of  $\hat{e}_{I_v}^a(v)$ .

The rest of this section is devoted to a derivation of (5.4).

Fix RNC’s at a point  $q \in \Sigma$ . Let  $B_\epsilon(q)$  denote an open coordinate ball of radius  $\epsilon$  centered at  $q$ . Let  $\bar{B}_{\epsilon^n}(q)$  be the closure of the open ball of radius  $\epsilon^n$ ,  $n \gg 1$  centered at  $q$ . Define  $B'_\epsilon(q)$  as the exterior of  $\bar{B}_{\epsilon^n}(q)$  in  $B_\epsilon(q)$ :

$$B'_\epsilon(q) = B_\epsilon(q) - \bar{B}_{\epsilon^n}(q). \quad (5.6)$$

In what follows we shall often replace the argument consisting of the point  $q$  by its coordinate value i.e. we write  $B'_\epsilon(x)$  and we implicitly mean  $B'_\epsilon(q)$  for  $q$  with coordinates  $x^\mu$ ,  $\mu = 1, 2, 3$ . We shall also often employ a similar notation for arguments of fields so that, for e.g.  $E_i^a(x)$  will mean the evaluation of  $E_i^a(q)$  at a point  $q$  which has coordinates  $x^\mu$ ,  $\mu = 1, 2, 3$  with density weights also evaluated with respect to  $\{x\}$ .

Next, recall from [2] and the discussion in section 3.4.3, we may regulate  $\hat{q}^{-\frac{1}{3}}(p)$  to have non-trivial action only if  $p$  coincides with a nondegenerate vertex  $v$  of  $S$  in which case we have for all small enough  $\delta$ :

$$(\hat{q}_\delta^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v))S := \delta^2 S_{\lambda_v}. \quad (5.7)$$

Next, we define the classical approximant  $L_{\tau,\eta}^a(p)$   $\eta \ll \tau$ :

$$L_{\tau,\eta}^a(p) := \omega_c(p) \left( \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi\tau^3} \int_{B'_\tau(p)} d^3x \left( \int_{B_{\eta'(x)}} d^3\bar{x} \frac{E_i^c(\bar{x})}{\frac{4}{3}\pi\eta^3} \right) E_i^a(x) \right) (q_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(p))(q_\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}}(p)) \quad (5.8)$$

where  $(q_\delta^{-\frac{1}{3}}(p))$  is the classical precursor of (5.7) defined through an appropriate power of the volume of  $B_\delta(v)$  measured with respect to the metric  $q_{ab}$  as in Reference [2] and Footnote 4.

It is straightforward to check that:

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} (\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} L_{\tau,\eta}^a(p)) = L^a(p) \quad (5.9)$$

so that  $L_{\tau,\eta}^a(p)$   $\eta \ll \tau$  is indeed an approximant to the metric shift. Next, we construct a quantization of this approximant. We choose an operator ordering in which quantum operators appear in the same order in which their classical correspondents appear in (5.8) so that  $\hat{q}_\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}}(p)$  appears right most. Then if  $p$  is not a nondegenerate vertex of  $S$ , we have, for all small enough  $\eta$ , that

$$\hat{L}_{\tau,\eta}^a(p)S = 0. \quad (5.10)$$

If  $p = v$  is a nondegenerate vertex of  $S$ , we have that:

$$\hat{L}_{\tau,\eta}^a(v)S := \omega_c(v) \left( \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi\tau^3} \int_{B'_\tau(v)} d^3x \left( \int_{B_{\eta'(x)}} d^3\bar{x} \frac{\hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x})}{\frac{4}{3}\pi\eta^3} \right) \hat{E}_i^a(x) \right) (\hat{q}_\tau^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v))(\hat{q}_\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}}(v))S \quad (5.11)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\tau\eta} \omega_c(v) \int_{B'_\tau(v)} d^3x \int_{B_{\eta'(x)}} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x}) \hat{E}_i^a(x) (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \quad (5.12)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\tau\eta} \omega_c(v) \int_{B'_\tau(v)} d^3x \int_{B_{\eta'(x)}} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x}) \quad (5.13)$$

$$i \sum_I \int_{e_I} dt_I \dot{e}_I^a \delta^3(x, e_I(t_I)) (h_{e_I}(1, t_I) \tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \frac{\partial (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^C_D}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \frac{i}{\tau\eta} \omega_c(v) \sum_I \int_{\tau_{n,I}}^{\tau_I} dt_I \dot{e}_I^a \int_{B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x}) (h_{e_I}(1, t_I) \tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \frac{\partial (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^C_D}. \quad (5.14)$$

Above, we have used (5.7) in (5.12). The standard action of the triad operator in (5.12) yields (5.13). In (5.13), similar to our considerations in [2],  $\tau_i$  is the matrix representative of the  $i$ th generator of  $su(2)$  in the  $j_I$  spin representation which colors the edge  $e_I$  in  $S$ . For notational convenience we have suppressed the subscript  $v$  in the edge index  $I$  and edge parameter  $t_I$ . Integration over the Dirac delta function in (5.13) yields (5.14). For small enough  $\tau$ , this leads to an integration over the part of the edge  $e_I$  between the parameter values  $\tau_{n,I}$  and  $\tau_I$  with  $e(\tau_{n,I})$  being the point of intersection of  $e_I$  with the boundary of  $\bar{B}_{\tau^n}(v)$  and  $e(\tau_I)$  the point of intersection of  $e_I$  with the boundary of  $\bar{B}_\tau(v)$ .

In what follows we retain only leading order contributions in the small parameters  $\eta, \tau$  to (5.14). We follow the standard practice employed in LQG derivations of operator actions, of estimating these contributions by assuming that the spin network wave function  $S \equiv S(A)$  is evaluated on smooth (i.e.  $C^r$ ) connections rather than distributional elements of the quantum configuration space. We proceed as follows.

Next, we evaluate the action of  $\int_{B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x})$  in (5.14) on the holonomy combination to its right. Note that  $S$  (and hence  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$ ) is a monomial in each of its constituent edge holonomies

and for small enough  $\tau, \eta$ ,  $B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}$  intersects  $S$  only in a subset of its  $I$ th edge. Note also the argument  $\bar{x}$  of the triad operator is not coincident with  $e_I(t_I)$  in this subset. It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x})(h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \\
&= i \int_{B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}} d^3\bar{x} \left( \int_{t_I}^1 d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c \delta^3(\bar{x}, e_I(\bar{t}_I))(h_{e_I}(1, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_0^{t_I} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c \delta^3(\bar{x}, e_I(\bar{t}_I))(h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, 0))^C_D \right) \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}}. \tag{5.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, consider  $e(t_I)$  which is a coordinate distance of at least  $2\eta$  away from  $e_I(\tau_{n,I})$  as well as  $e_I(\tau_I)$ . The parameter range for which this is satisfied is almost all of  $\tau_{n,I} < t_I < \tau_I$  except for a parameter range of  $O(\eta)$  near the endpoints  $\tau_{n,I}, \tau_I$  (the fact that the parameter range is of the same order of the distance between the end points of the parameter range is implied by the  $C^r$  property of the edge  $e_I$  through (4.34)). For such  $t_I$ , the intersection of  $e_I$  with  $B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}$  is the union of two disjoint segments of  $e_I$ , one between the parameter values  $t_I + \eta_{n,I}^+, t_I + \eta_I^+$  and one between the parameter values  $t_I - \eta^-, t_I - \eta_{n,I}^-$  where  $\eta_{\pm}, \eta_{n,I}^{\pm}$  are parameter values such that:

- (i)  $e_I$  intersects the boundary of  $\bar{B}_{\eta^n}(e_I(t_I))$  in the pair of points  $e_I(t_I + \eta_{n,I}^+), e_I(t_I - \eta_{n,I}^-)$ .
- (ii)  $e_I$  intersects the boundary of  $\bar{B}_{\eta}(e_I(t_I))$  in the pair of points  $e_I(t_I + \eta_I^+), e_I(t_I - \eta_I^-)$ .

For such  $e_I(t_I)$  we continue on from (5.15). Integrating the delta function over  $d^3\bar{x}$  and using (i), (ii) above we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{\eta'(e_I(t_I))}} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x})(h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \\
&= i \left( \int_{t_I + \eta_{n,I}^+}^{t_I + \eta_I^+} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c (h_{e_I}(1, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{t_I - \eta_I^-}^{t_I - \eta_{n,I}^-} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c (h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, 0))^C_D \right) \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \tag{5.16}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= i \left( \int_{t_I + \eta_{n,I}^+}^{t_I + \eta_I^+} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c (h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i \tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \right. \\
&+ \left. \int_{t_I - \eta_I^-}^{t_I - \eta_{n,I}^-} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c (h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i \tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^C_D \right) \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} + O(\eta^2) \tag{5.17}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= -i(j_I)(j_I + 1) \left( \int_{t_I + \eta_{n,I}^+}^{t_I + \eta_I^+} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c + \int_{t_I - \eta_I^-}^{t_I - \eta_{n,I}^-} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c \right) (h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D} \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}}) + O(\eta^2) \tag{5.18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -i(j_I)(j_I + 1) \left( (e_I^c(t_I + \eta_I^+) - e_I^c(t_I + \eta_{n,I}^+)) + (e^c(t_I - \eta_{n,I}^-) - e^c(t_I - \eta_I^-)) \right) \\
&h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D} \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} + O(\eta^2) \tag{5.19}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= -i(j_I)(j_I + 1)(2\hat{e}^c(t_I)\eta)(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} + O(\eta^2). \tag{5.20}$$

Here, in the first integral of (5.16) we have used  $h_{e_I}(1, \bar{t}_I) = h_{e_I}(1, t_I)(h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, t_I))^{-1}$ , the fact that parameter and distance orders are the same for  $C^r$  edges (4.34) and the smooth connection expansion of holonomies  $h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, t_I) = \mathbf{1} + O(\eta)$ , and similarly for the second integral. This results in (5.17) from (5.16). To obtain (5.18) we use the standard  $su(2)$  representation property  $\tau_i \tau_i =$

$-j_I(j_I + 1)\mathbf{1}$ . The integrations in (5.18) yield the differences between the RN coordinates of the  $I$ th edge at the parameter end points for each of the two integrals therein so as to yield (5.19). It is straightforward to use expansions of the type (4.29) together with  $n \gg 1$  and (i)-(ii) above to show that the contribution of these coordinate differences in (5.19) yields, to  $O(\eta^2)$ , the  $(2\hat{e}^c(t_I)\eta)$  factor in (5.20). Finally from the fact that  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  is a monomial in its edge holonomies, we replace  $h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D} \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}}$  in (5.19) by  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  in (5.20).

Next, let us estimate the contribution to (5.14) from those  $e(t_I)$  which are within a distance of  $2\eta$  from  $e_I(\tau_{n,I})$  or  $e_I(\tau_I)$ . Integrating over the delta functions in (5.15) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\eta'}(e_I(t_I))} d^3\bar{x} \hat{E}_i^c(\bar{x})(h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^{C_D} \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \\ &= i \left( \int_{B_{\eta'}(e_I(t_I)) \cap e_{1,t_I}} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c(h_{e_I}(1, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^{C_D} \right. \\ &+ \left. i \int_{B_{\eta'}(e_I(t_I)) \cap e_{0,t_I}} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^c(h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, 0))^{C_D} \right) \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \quad (5.21) \end{aligned}$$

Using the boundedness of the functions of the connection encountered in (5.21) together with (4.29) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{B_{\eta'}(e_I(t_I)) \cap e_{(1,t_I)}} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^\mu(h_{e_I}(1, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, 0))^{C_D} \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{B_{\eta'}(e_I(t_I)) \cap e_{(0,t_I)}} d\bar{t}_I \dot{e}_I^\mu(h_{e_I}(1, t_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(t_I, \bar{t}_I)\tau_i h_{e_I}(\bar{t}_I, 0))^{C_D} \frac{\partial(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}{\partial h_{e_I}(1, 0)^{C_D}} \right| \\ &\leq \bar{C}\eta \quad (5.22) \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\bar{C} > 0$  where  $\dot{e}_I^\mu$  are RNC components of the edge tangent  $\dot{e}_I^a$ . Note that this sort of a bound is independent of the parameter value  $t_I$  and hence valid for all  $e(t_I)$  whether or not within a distance of  $2\eta$  from  $e_I(\tau_{n,I})$  or  $e_I(\tau_I)$ . Denote the set of points  $e(t_I)$  within a distance of  $2\eta$  from  $e_I(\tau_{n,I})$  or  $e_I(\tau_I)$  by  $\mathbf{U}_{I,2\eta}$  and denote the set of parameter values  $t_I$  of these points by  $U_{I,2\eta}$ . From expansions of the type (4.29) it follows that

$$\left| \int_{U_{I,2\eta}} dt_I \dot{e}_I^\mu \right| \leq \bar{C}_1 \eta \quad (5.23)$$

for some  $\bar{C}_1 > 0$ . Denote the open interval in parameter space with end points  $\tau_{n,I}, \tau_I$  by  $(\tau_{n,I}, \tau_I)$ . We may write (5.14) as:

$$\hat{L}_{\tau,\eta}^a(v)S = \left( \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi} \right)^2 \frac{i}{\tau\eta} \omega_c(v) \left( \sum_I \left[ \int_{(\tau_{n,I}, \tau_I) - U_{I,2\eta}} dt_I \dot{e}_I^a(-i(j_I)(j_I + 1)2\hat{e}^c(t_I)\eta(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}) \right] + O(\eta^2) \right) \quad (5.24)$$

$$= \left( \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi} \right)^2 \frac{i}{\tau\eta} \omega_c(v) \left( \sum_I \left[ \int_{(\tau_{n,I}, \tau_I)} dt_I \dot{e}_I^a(-i(j_I)(j_I + 1)2\hat{e}^c(t_I)\eta(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}) \right] + O(\eta^2) \right) \quad (5.25)$$

$$= \left( \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi} \right)^2 \frac{i}{\tau} \omega_c(v) \left( \sum_I \left[ \int_{(\tau_{n,I}, \tau_I)} dt_I \dot{e}_I^a(-i(j_I)(j_I + 1)2\hat{e}^c(t_I)(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}) \right] + O(\eta) \right). \quad (5.26)$$

In (5.14) the  $t_I$  integration range can be divided into  $U_{I,2\eta}$  and its complement. The integral over  $U_{I,2\eta}$  may be bounded using the boundedness of the RNC components  $\omega_\mu(v)$  of  $\omega_c(v)$  together with

(5.22) and (5.23) to obtain the  $O(\eta^2)$  term in (5.24). For the remaining range of integration we use (5.20) to get the rest of (5.24). In (5.25) we increase the range of the complement of  $U_{I,2\eta}$  back to its original range at the cost of an extra integral over  $U_{I,2\eta}$ . Using the bound (5.23) it is straightforward to see that this extra integral also yields a term of  $O(\eta^2)$  and we obtain (5.26). Using expansions of the type (4.29) in (5.26) together with  $n \gg 1$  yields:

$$\hat{L}_{\tau,\eta}^a(v)S = \left(\frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \frac{2}{\tau} \omega_c(v) \left( \sum_I \tau \hat{e}_I^c(t_I=0) \hat{e}_I^a(t_I=0) (j_I)(j_I+1) (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} + O(\tau^2) + O(\eta) \right) \quad (5.27)$$

$$= \left( \left(\frac{2}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \omega_c(v) \sum_I \hat{e}_I^c(t_I=0) \hat{e}_I^a(t_I=0) (j_I)(j_I+1) (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \right) + O(\tau) + \frac{O(\eta)}{\tau}. \quad (5.28)$$

Taking the limit  $\eta \rightarrow 0$  followed by that of  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  yields

$$\hat{L}^a(v)S := \left(\frac{2}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \omega_c(v) \sum_I \hat{e}_I^c(t_I=0) \hat{e}_I^a(t_I=0) (j_I)(j_I+1) (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \quad (5.29)$$

Finally, *exactly* as for the electric shift [2] we replace  $\hat{e}_I^a(t_I=0)$  by  $\hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a(p)$  in (5.29) to obtain the desired result:

$$\hat{L}_\epsilon^a(p)S := \left(\frac{2}{\frac{4}{3}\pi}\right)^2 \omega_c(v) \sum_I \hat{e}_I^c(t_I=0) \hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a(p) (j_I)(j_I+1) (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}. \quad (5.30)$$

Since  $\hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a(p)$  is a  $C^{r-1}$  vector field of compact support around  $v$  such that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a(p)$  is nonvanishing only when  $p = v$  with  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a(v) = \hat{e}_I^a(t_I=0)(v)$ , it follows that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{L}_\epsilon^a(p)S$  is also non-trivial only at  $v$  where it equals the right hand side of (5.29). Hence, from (5.10) and (5.29) it follows that (5.30) defines a regulation of the quantum metric shift operator  $\hat{L}^a$ .

## 5.2 Construction of $\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)$

From (5.1) we define the operator correspondent of  $O(M, N)$  at regularization parameter  $\epsilon$  to be:

$$\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S = \int d^3x \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b \hat{L}_\epsilon^a S \quad (5.31)$$

with  $\hat{L}_\epsilon^a S$  given by (5.4). Substituting from (5.4) we obtain:

$$\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S = \frac{2}{\left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\right)^2} \sum_v (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_I^c(v)) \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (j_I)(j_I+1) \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}. \quad (5.32)$$

where the sum is over all nondegenerate vertices  $v$  in  $S$ . The operator under the integral is exactly the diffeomorphism constraint smeared with the  $C^r$  vector field  $\hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a$  taking on the role of a shift vector field. From [23], we expect that the diffeomorphism constraint operator smeared with this shift can be expressed in terms of the difference between a small diffeomorphism and the identity divided by the smallness parameter. In section 5.2.1 we show that this expectation is borne out when  $v$  is a GR vertex, the small parameter being  $\epsilon$ . In order to do so we use heuristic argumentation which closely parallels that underlying the derivation of the Hamiltonian constraint action in [2], the only significant difference with [2] being that the finite transformation generated by  $\hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a$  is taken to be a semianalytic diffeomorphism rather than an electric diffeomorphism. In section 5.2.2 we consider the case that  $v$  is an NGR vertex. In contrast to our treatment of the GR case, here we provide

a heuristic argumentation which does not involve the area of the loops formed by segments of the deformed and undeformed edges, but which directly seeks to write the operator under the integral as the difference between a small diffeomorphism and the identity.

The reason we adopt different approaches for the GR and NGR cases is as follows. Recall that in the case of the electric diffeomorphisms which underlie the Hamiltonian constraint action, we transited from (2.13) to (2.14) in section 2.1.2 so as to conveniently absorb overall factors by changing the area of the small loops  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$ , these small loops being tied to the choice of electric diffeomorphism [2]. It turns out to be crucial, for the satisfaction of the anomaly free condition, to absorb overall factors in a similar manner for the action (5.32) for the GR case. Clearly, in order to do so, we require an argumentation in which small loops of area  $O(\epsilon^2)$  play a key role. This is the reason we rely on the argumentation of [2] for the GR case. In contrast, when  $v$  is NGR, the anomaly free condition does not require such an absorption of overall factors and a more direct heuristic argumentation suffices for our purposes.

### 5.2.1 The case when $v$ is GR

Due to the close similarity with the considerations of [2] we shall be succinct, for details the reader is urged to consult Reference [2].

Let us focus on the contribution from a nondegenerate vertex  $v$  of  $S$ . To avoid notational clutter we suppress the subscript  $v$  at various places. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{Iv,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda \\
&= i \sum_J \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \int_{e_J} dt_J \dot{e}^a(t_J) \delta^3(x, e_J(t_J)) [h_{e_J}(1, t_J) \tau_k h_{e_J}(t_J, 0)]_{B_J}^{A_J} \frac{\partial(S_\lambda)_\lambda}{\partial h_{e_J B_J}^{A_J}} \\
&= i \sum_J \int_0^{t_{\epsilon,J,I}} dt_J (\hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k) \dot{e}_J^b(t_J) [h_{e_J}(1, t_J) \tau_k h_{e_J}(t_J, 0)]_{B_J}^{A_J} \frac{\partial(S_\lambda)_\lambda}{\partial h_{e_J B_J}^{A_J}} \\
&= i \sum_J \int_0^{t_{\epsilon,J,I}} dt_J (\hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k) \dot{e}_J^b(t_J) h_{e_J}(1, 0) (\tau_k + O(\epsilon))_{B_J}^{A_J} \frac{\partial(S_\lambda)_\lambda}{\partial h_{e_J B_J}^{A_J}} \\
&= i \sum_{J \neq I} \int_0^{t_{\epsilon,J,I}} dt_J (\hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a F_{ab}^k) \dot{e}_J^b(t_J) (h_{e_J}(1, 0) \tau_k)_{B_J}^{A_J} \frac{\partial(S_\lambda)_\lambda}{\partial h_{e_J B_J}^{A_J}}. \tag{5.33}
\end{aligned}$$

In the second line above we used the standard action of the triad operator. The third line results from integrating the delta function in the second over  $d^3x$  with the edge  $e_J$  intersecting the boundary of  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$  in a single point with parameter value  $t_{\epsilon,J,I}$ . In the 4th line we use the standard holonomy expansion for smooth connections in conjunction with expansions of type (4.29). In the 5th line we retain only the leading order term from the 4th line and use (5.5) to restrict the sum over  $J$ .

From an analysis identical to [2] we have that:

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} \int_0^{t_{\epsilon,J,I}} dt_J \dot{e}_J^b \hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a F_{ab}^i \tau_i = -\frac{(h_{\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}} - 1)}{\epsilon} + O(\epsilon^2) \tag{5.34}$$

where the loop  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  is defined as:

$$\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon} = (e_{J(t_{\epsilon,J,I},0)})^{-1} \circ \bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_{J(t_{J,I,\epsilon},0)}) \circ e_{I(\epsilon_I,0)} \tag{5.35}$$

Here we use an obvious notation in which the part of an edge  $e$  between parameter values  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  is denoted by  $e_{t_2,t_1}$ , the image of such an edge by a diffeomorphism  $\phi$  is denoted by  $\phi(e_{t_2,t_1})$

and edge composition is denoted by ‘o’. From Appendix D.2, similar to section 3 of Reference [2],  $t_I = \epsilon_I$  is the parameter value such that the point  $e_I(t_I = \epsilon_I)$  is exactly  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  i.e.:

$$e_I(t_I = \epsilon_I) = v_{I,\epsilon}. \quad (5.36)$$

We remark here that the *only* significant difference with the analysis of section 3, Reference [2] is that the *electric* diffeomorphism  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  of that work is replaced here by the *semianalytic* diffeomorphism  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$ .<sup>20</sup> Hence in contrast to the situation with  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$ , *no kinks* are created by  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$ . In more detail, the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  is imagined to be the finite transformation generated by the vector field  $e_{I,\epsilon}$  and is assumed to enjoy the following properties:

- (i)  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  is the identity outside the support  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$  of  $e_{I,\epsilon}$ .
  - (ii) Consistent with (5.5),  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  maps  $e_I$  to itself.
  - (iii) In particular  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  displaces  $v$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  where as in section 2.3.1,  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is located at a coordinate distance  $\epsilon$  from  $v$  along the edge  $e_I$ , the coordinates being the RNC at  $v$ .
- $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  subject to (i)-(iii) is constructed in Appendix D.2 (see equation (D.13)).

Substituting (5.34) in (5.33) we get to leading order in  $\epsilon$  that:

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda = -\frac{i}{\epsilon} \sum_{J \neq I} (h_{e_J}(1,0)(h_{\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1}))_{B_J}^{A_J} \frac{\partial (S_\lambda)_\lambda}{\partial h_{e_J}^{A_J}}. \quad (5.37)$$

In equation (5.37) each  $h_{e_J}(1,0)(h_{\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})$  term is of  $O(\epsilon^2)$  when evaluated on smooth (i.e.  $C^\infty$ ) connections. As in [2] we re-express the sum over such contributions in (5.37) in terms of products of such contributions, this re-expression agreeing with (5.37) to leading order in  $\epsilon$  so as to lead to a valid approximant constraint action at regulation parameter value  $\epsilon$ . We recall the essential steps below, for details the reader may consult Reference [2].

Denoting  $h_{e_J}(1,0)$  by  $x_\alpha$ ,  $(h_{e_J}(1,0)(h_{\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1}))_{B_J}^{A_J}$  by  $\delta x_\alpha$  and  $(S_\lambda)_\lambda$  by  $F(x)$ , equation (5.37) is of the form  $\sum_\alpha \delta x_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha} F(x)$  which can be rewritten to leading order in  $\delta x_\alpha$  as  $F(x + \delta x) - F(x)$ . The fact that  $F \sim (S_\lambda)_\lambda$  is a *product* over edge holonomies leads to the replacement of the sum over edges of the form (5.37) by a difference of products over edges. Using the notation employed in [2] we write  $(S_\lambda)_\lambda$  as:

$$(S_\lambda)_\lambda = C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \left( \prod_{K=1}^N h_{e_K}(1,0)^{B_K}_{A_K} \right) S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} \quad (5.38)$$

where  $C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N}$  is the intertwiner at  $v$  and  $S_{rest}$  does *not* depend on the edge holonomies over edges which emanate from  $v$ . From the discussion above, we rewrite (5.37) to leading order in  $\epsilon$  as:

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda = -\frac{i}{\epsilon} \left( C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \left( \prod_{J \neq I} h_{e_J}(1,0) h_{\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}}^{B_J}_{A_J} \right) S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} - (S_\lambda)_\lambda \right) \quad (5.39)$$

$$= -\frac{i}{\epsilon} \left( C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_{J \neq I} (h_{e_J}(1, t_{\epsilon,J,I}) h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(t_{J,I,\epsilon}, 0) h_{e_I}(\epsilon_I, 0))^{B_J}_{A_J} h_{e_I}^{B_I}_{A_I} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} - (S_\lambda)_\lambda \right) \quad (5.40)$$

$$= -\frac{i}{\epsilon} \left( C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_{J \neq I} (h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(1,0) h_{e_I}(\epsilon_I, 0))^{B_J}_{A_J} h_{e_I}(1,0)^{B_I}_{A_I} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} - (S_\lambda)_\lambda \right). \quad (5.41)$$

<sup>20</sup>An additional but insignificant difference with the analysis of [2] is the difference in the detailed specification of the support of the vector field  $\hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a$  in Appendix D.2 and in that work.

In (5.39) we have used the equivalent to leading order ‘difference in products’ form as discussed above. In (5.40) we have used (5.35). In (5.41),  $h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(1,0)$  denotes the holonomy over the image of the edge  $e_J$  by the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$ . In obtaining (5.41) from (5.40), we have used the fact that the diffeomorphism  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  is of compact support and that the part of the  $J$ th edge which lies within this support is that between parameter values  $t_J = 0$  and  $t_J = t_{\epsilon,J,I}$  to conclude that:

$$\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_{J(1,0)}) = \bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_{J(1,t_{J,I,\epsilon})}) \circ \bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_{J(t_{J,I,\epsilon},0)}) = e_{J(1,t_{J,I,\epsilon})} \circ \bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_{J(t_{J,I,\epsilon},0)}). \quad (5.42)$$

Next, recall that the invariance of the intertwiner  $C_{\lambda,\lambda}$  under a gauge transformation  $g$  implies that:

$$(C_\lambda)_{\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \left( \prod_{J \neq I} g^{B_J}_{A_J} \right) = (C_\lambda)_{\lambda}^{B_1 \dots B_N} g^{-1 A_I}_{B_I}. \quad (5.43)$$

Setting  $g = h_{e_I}(\epsilon_I, 0)$  it is straightforward to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_{J \neq I} (h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(1,0) h_{e_I}(\epsilon_I, 0))^{B_J}_{A_J} h_{e_I}(1,0)^{B_I}_{A_I} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} \\ &= C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_{J \neq I} (h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(1,0))^{B_J}_{A_J} h_{e_I}(1,\epsilon_I)^{B_I}_{A_I} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

From properties (i)-(iii) of  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  in conjunction with (5.36) it is straightforward to see that:

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_{J \neq I} (h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(1,0))^{B_J}_{A_J} h_{e_I}(1,\epsilon_I)^{B_I}_{A_I} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} \\ &= C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_{J \neq I} (h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)}(1,0))^{B_J}_{A_J} h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_I)}(1,0)^{B_I}_{A_I} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

$$= C_{\lambda,\lambda}^{A_1 \dots A_N} \prod_K (h_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_K)}(1,0))^{B_K}_{A_K} S_{rest B_1 \dots B_N} \quad (5.46)$$

$$= \hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}}(S_\lambda)_\lambda \quad (5.47)$$

where  $\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}}$  is the unitary operator corresponding to the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$ . Using (5.47) in (5.41) we have:

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3 x \hat{E}_{Iv,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda = -i \frac{(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})}{\epsilon} (S_\lambda)_\lambda. \quad (5.48)$$

Similar to the transition from (2.13) to (2.14) in section 2.1.2, we absorb overall factors in (5.48) by changing the area of the small loops  $\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}$ . Specifically we assume the existence of semianalytic diffeomorphisms  $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  such that the loop  $\bar{l}_{IJ,c_I,\epsilon}$  has a coordinate area which is  $c_I$  times the coordinate area of its counterpart  $\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}$  with the loop  $\bar{l}_{IJ,c_I,\epsilon}$  defined as:

$$\bar{l}_{IJ,c_I,\epsilon} = (e_{J(t_{\epsilon,J,I,c_I},0)})^{-1} \circ \bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}(e_{J(t_{\epsilon,J,I,c_I},0)}) \circ e_{I(\epsilon_I,0)} \quad (5.49)$$

Here  $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  is subject to similar properties as  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  i.e.

(i) $_{c_I}$   $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  is the identity outside a ball  $U_{c_I,\epsilon}$  of radius  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  around  $v$ . (ii) $_{c_I}$   $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  maps  $e_I$  to itself. (iii) $_{c_I}$   $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  displaces  $v$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  where as in section 2.3.1,  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is located at a coordinate distance  $\epsilon$  from  $v$  along the edge  $e_I$ , the coordinates being the RNC at  $v$ .

$\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  subject to (i)<sub>c<sub>I</sub></sub> - (iii)<sub>c<sub>I</sub></sub> is constructed in Appendix D.2.

In equation (5.49), the parameter value  $t_J = t_{\epsilon,J,I,c_I}$  is the parameter value at which the edge  $e_J$  intersects the boundary of the ball  $U_{c_I,\epsilon}$ . We emphasize that while the area of the small loops change by a factor of  $c_I$ , the position of the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is unchanged. With this change, we have, to leading order in  $\epsilon$ , for holonomy evaluations on smooth (i.e.  $C^r$  connections), that:

$$h_{\bar{I}_{J,c_I,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1} = c_I(h_{\bar{I}_{J,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1}) \quad (5.50)$$

so that (5.34) takes the form

$$\int_0^{t_{\epsilon,J,I}} dt_J \dot{e}_J^b \hat{e}_{I,\epsilon}^a F_{ab}^i \tau_i = -\frac{(h_{\bar{I}_{J,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})}{\epsilon} + O(\epsilon^2) = -\frac{(h_{\bar{I}_{J,c_I,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})}{c_I \epsilon} + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (5.51)$$

Using (5.51), (5.49) instead of (5.34), (5.35) in the analysis of section 5.2 subsequent to (5.34) it is straightforward to obtain:

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda = -i \frac{(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})}{c_I \epsilon} (S_\lambda)_\lambda. \quad (5.52)$$

Using (5.52) in (5.32), restoring the ‘ $v$ ’ subscripts and denoting the contribution to the operator action  $\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S$  from the nondegenerate GR vertices of  $S$  by  $\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S|_{V_{GR}(S)}$  yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S|_{V_{GR}(S)} &= \frac{2}{\left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\right)^2} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_I^c(v)) (j_{I_v})(j_{I_v} + 1) \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \\ &= -i \frac{2}{\left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\right)^2} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_I^c(v)) (j_{I_v})(j_{I_v} + 1) \frac{(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v,c_{I_v},\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})}{c_{I_v} \epsilon} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

Finally, we choose

$$c_{I_v} = \frac{128(j_{I_v})(j_{I_v} + 1)}{N_v} \quad (5.54)$$

to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S|_{V_{GR}(S)} &= \frac{2}{\left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\right)^2} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_I^c(v)) (j_{I_v})(j_{I_v} + 1) \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \\ &= -i \left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{16} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_I^c(v)) N_v \frac{(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v,c_{I_v},\epsilon}} - \mathbf{1})}{\epsilon} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.55)$$

### 5.2.2 The case when $v$ is NGR

In this section we motivate the action of the quantum operator  $\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b$  in (5.32). by thinking of it as a quantization of the classical expression  $\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a F_{ab}^k E_k^b$ .

Recall that on the Gauss Law constraint surface we have, for any shift vector field  $N^a$ , the identity:

$$\int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x N^a F_{ab}^k E_k^b = \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} A_b^k E_k^b \quad (5.56)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}}$  denotes the Lie derivative with respect to  $N^a$ . At the quantum level, we replace the triad operator by the functional derivative with respect to the connection and obtain, heuristically, the following operator action on a gauge invariant wave function  $\Psi(A)$  of the connection

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x N^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b \Psi(A) &= -i \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} A_b^k \frac{\delta}{\delta A_b^k} \Psi(A) \\ &= -i \frac{\Psi(A_b^k + \delta \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} A_b^k) - \Psi(A_b^k)}{\delta} + O(\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (5.57)$$

We may then replace  $A_b^k + \delta \mathcal{L}_{\vec{N}} A_b^k$  by  $((\phi_{\vec{N},\delta})_* A)_b^k$  where  $\phi_{\vec{N},\delta}$  is a diffeomorphism which translates points an affine amount  $\delta$  along the orbits of  $N^a$  to obtain a finite  $\delta$ - approximant to the operator:

$$\left( \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x N^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b \right)_\delta \Psi(A) = -\frac{\hat{U}_{\phi_{\vec{N},\delta}} - \mathbf{1}}{\delta} \Psi(A) \quad (5.58)$$

where the  $\delta$  subscript indicates that the expression is a finite  $\delta$  approximant and  $\hat{U}_{\phi_{\vec{N},\delta}}$  is the unitary operator corresponding to the diffeomorphism  $\phi_{\vec{N},\delta}$ . Setting  $N^a \equiv \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a$ ,  $\Psi(A) \equiv (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  in the above equation obtains:

$$\left( \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b \right)_\delta (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} = \frac{\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v,\delta}} - \mathbf{1}}{\delta} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \quad (5.59)$$

where  $\bar{\phi}_{I_v,\delta}$  is constructed through Appendix D.2 simply as  $\bar{\phi}_{I_v,\delta} \equiv \psi_{\lambda=\delta}$  for sufficiently small  $\delta$  and corresponds exactly to the desired finite transformation which translates points along the orbits of  $\hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a$  by an affine amount  $\delta$  to leading order in  $\delta$ .

The  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  limit dual operator action on the off shell basis state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  then defines the  $\epsilon$  approximant dual operator action:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Psi_{B,f,h} \left( \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda \right) \\ &:= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h} \left( \left( \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b \right)_\delta (S_\lambda)_\lambda \right) \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h} \left( \frac{(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v,\epsilon,\delta}} - \mathbf{1})}{\delta} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.60)$$

By assumption the state  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  has an NGR vertex at  $v$  and, hence, so does its diffeomorphic image by the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v,\epsilon,\delta}}$ . It follows that the states appearing on the right hand side of (5.60) have no overlap with  $B$  which in turn implies that the right hand side vanishes. Thus for all small enough  $\epsilon$  we have that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h} \left( \int_{B_{2\epsilon}(v)} d^3x \hat{e}_{I_v,\epsilon}^a \hat{F}_{ab}^k \hat{E}_k^b (S_\lambda)_\lambda \right) = 0. \quad (5.61)$$

### 5.3 The Continuum Limit Operator $\hat{O}(M, N)$

In this section we evaluate the continuum limit (dual) operator action on the state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ . Consider the case that  $S$  has no overlap with  $B$ . It follows from (i), section 3.2 that the embedded colored

graph underlying  $S$  is distinct from the embedded colored graph underlying any element of  $B$ . Since  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  lives on the same embedded colored graph as  $S$ ,  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  also cannot have overlap in  $B$ . From the discussion around (3.28), (3.29) in section (3.4.3), we have that any diffeomorphic image of  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  also cannot have overlap in  $B$ . Since the actions (5.55), (5.60) result in states identical to or diffeomorphic to  $(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}$  irrespective of whether  $v$  is GR or NGR, it follows that the dual operator action amplitude  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S)$  vanishes for  $S$  with no overlap in  $B$ .

Hence, we need consider amplitudes only for  $S$  with overlap in  $B$ . Accordingly let  $S$  have overlap with  $B$ . Two successive actions of  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  on  $S$  yields  $(S_\lambda)_\lambda$  which, from an analysis similar to that underlying (3.16) and (3.19) indicates that  $(S_\lambda)_\lambda$  has overlap in  $B$ . The discussion around (3.28) and (3.29) then implies that all diffeomorphic images of  $(S_\lambda)_\lambda$  have overlap in  $B$ . It then follows from (5.55), (5.54) that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S) = -i\left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{16} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_{I_v}^c(v)) N_v \Psi_{B,f,h} \left( \frac{(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v, c_{I_v}, \epsilon}} - 1)}{\epsilon} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} \right). \quad (5.62)$$

Denoting

$$\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v, c_{I_v}, \epsilon}} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v} := ((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon} \quad (5.63)$$

we have that

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v, c_{I_v}, \epsilon}} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}) = \left( \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon})} f(\bar{v}) \right) g_{((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon}, h} \gamma_{((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon}}. \quad (5.64)$$

Diffeomorphism invariance of the RS Volume operator together with (ii), 6 of section 3.1 implies that the gamma factor is invariant under diffeomorphisms (more specifically, see (3.29)) so that

$$\gamma_{((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon}} = \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}}. \quad (5.65)$$

From the fact that no kinks are created by the action of  $\bar{\phi}_{I_v, c_{I_v}, \epsilon}$  and the fact that  $\bar{\phi}_{I_v, c_{I_v}, \epsilon}$  is non-trivial only in an  $\epsilon$ -vicinity of  $v$ , it follows that for small enough  $\epsilon$ , we have that:

$$g_{((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon}, h} = g_{S, h}. \quad (5.66)$$

Using (5.65) and (5.66) in (5.64), together with the fact that  $v$  is displaced to  $v_{I_v, \epsilon}$  in  $((S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v})_{\text{diff}, I_v, \epsilon}$  we obtain

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{U}_{\bar{\phi}_{I_v, c_{I_v}, \epsilon}} (S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}) = g_{S, h} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S), \bar{v} \neq v} f(\bar{v}) \right) f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}). \quad (5.67)$$

Using (5.67) in (5.62) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S) \\ &= -i\left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{16} g_{S, h} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_{I_v}^c(v)) \left( \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S), \bar{v} \neq v} f(\bar{v}) \right) N_v \frac{f(v_{I_v, \epsilon}) - f(v)}{\epsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (5.68)$$

Using (4.35) in the above equation yields the continuum limit operator amplitude:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S) \\ &= -i\left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{16} g_{S, h} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_{I_v}^c(v)) \left( \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S), \bar{v} \neq v} f(\bar{v}) \right) N_v \hat{e}_{I_v}^a \partial_a f(v). \end{aligned} \quad (5.69)$$

Thus we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{O}_\epsilon(M, N)S) := \Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{O}(M, N)S) \\ & = 0 \text{ if } S \text{ has no overlap in } B \end{aligned} \quad (5.70)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = -i \left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{16} g_{S,h} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S)} \gamma_{(S\lambda_v)\lambda_v} \\ & \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} (\omega_c(v) \hat{e}_{I_v}^c(v)) \left( \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S), \bar{v} \neq v} f(\bar{v}) \right) N_v \hat{e}_I^a \partial_a f(v) \text{ if } S \text{ has overlap in } B. \end{aligned} \quad (5.71)$$

Comparing (4.71), (4.72) with (5.70), (5.71), it follows that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}([\hat{H}(M), \hat{H}(N)]S) = i \Psi_{B,f,h}(\widehat{\{H(M), H(N)\}}S), \quad \forall S. \quad (5.72)$$

From (5.72) it follows that the commutator between a pair of Hamiltonian constraints is anomaly free on a domain consisting of the finite linear span of off shell basis states.

## 6 Action of Spatial Diffeomorphisms

In section 6.1 we show that the group of semianalytic diffeomorphisms is represented without anomalies on any off shell basis state, and hence on the finite span of such states. In section 6.2 we show that the continuum limit (dual) action, of the Hamiltonian constraint as well as that of the product of a pair of Hamiltonian constraints, on any off shell basis state is diffeomorphism covariant. As we shall see, the key feature of our constructions which simply and directly ensures diffeomorphism covariance is the tying of the choice of regulating coordinates (i.e. the RNC's) to the metric label of the off shell basis state. In section 6.3, we discuss the conditions under which the results of section 6.2 extend to the finite span of off shell basis states.

### 6.1 Action on $\Psi_{B,f,h}$

Let the unitary operator corresponding to the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\phi$  be  $\hat{U}(\phi)$ . and denote the diffeomorphic image of the state  $S$  by  $\hat{U}(\phi)$  by  $S_\phi$ . Let  $S$  have overlap in  $B$ . From the discussion around equations (3.28), (3.29), it follows that  $S_\phi$  also has overlap in  $B$ . Then we have that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)S) = \Psi_{B,f,h}(S_{\phi^{-1}}) \quad (6.1)$$

$$= g_{S_{\phi^{-1}},h} \gamma_{S_{\phi^{-1}}} \prod_{v \in V(S_{\phi^{-1}})} f(v). \quad (6.2)$$

Clearly every  $v \in V(S_{\phi^{-1}})$  is the image by  $\phi^{-1}$  of some  $\bar{v} \in V(S)$  so that:

$$\prod_{v \in V(S_{\phi^{-1}})} f(v) = \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S)} f(\phi^{-1}(\bar{v})) = \prod_{\bar{v} \in V(S)} (\phi^* f)(\bar{v}) \quad (6.3)$$

where we use *Wald's notation* [24] in which  $(\phi^* f)$  denotes the *push forward* of  $f$  with respect to  $\phi$ . Next in order to emphasize its dependence on the metric, let us denote the distance  $d$ , defined in section 3.3 with respect to the metric  $h$ , by  $d_h$ . It is straightforward to verify that for any pair of points  $p, q \in \Sigma$ ,

$$d_h(\phi^{-1}p, \phi^{-1}q) = d_{\phi^*h}(p, q). \quad (6.4)$$

Since  $g_h$  is determined by the network of interkink distances with respect to  $h$ , and since any kink at the position  $k$  in  $S$  is moved to the position  $\phi^{-1}(k)$  in  $S_{\phi^{-1}}$  equation (6.4) immediately implies that:

$$g_{S_{\phi^{-1}},h} = g_{S,\phi^*h}. \quad (6.5)$$

Finally, it is straightforward to see that the diffeomorphism invariance of the RS volume operator together with (ii),6, section 3.1 (in particular, equation (3.29)) ensures that:

$$\gamma_{S_{\phi^{-1}}} = \gamma_S. \quad (6.6)$$

Equations (6.2), (6.3), (6.5), (6.6) together with definition of off shell state amplitudes (3.11) imply that:

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)S) = g_{S,\phi^*h}\gamma_S \prod_{v \in V(S)} \phi^* f(v) = \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(S). \quad (6.7)$$

On the other hand if  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$ , the discussion around equations (3.28), (3.29) implies that  $S_{\phi^{-1}}$  cannot have overlap in  $B$  so that for such  $S$

$$\Psi_{B,f,h}(\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)S) = 0 = \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(S), \quad (6.8)$$

with the last equality following from the fact that  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$ .<sup>21</sup> Equations (6.7), (6.8) together imply that:

$$\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,f,h} = \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h} \quad (6.9)$$

where the equality is of two elements of the algebraic dual to the finite span of spin nets. It follows that:

$$\hat{U}(\phi_2)\hat{U}(\phi_1)\Psi_{B,f,h} = \hat{U}(\phi_2)\Psi_{B,\phi_1^*f,\phi_1^*h} \quad (6.10)$$

$$= \Psi_{B,\phi_2^*\phi_1^*f,\phi_2^*\phi_1^*h} = \Psi_{B,(\phi_2 \circ \phi_1)^*f,(\phi_2 \circ \phi_1)^*h} \quad (6.11)$$

$$= \hat{U}(\phi_2 \circ \phi_1)\Psi_{B,f,h}. \quad (6.12)$$

Equation (6.12) shows that the group of semianalytic diffeomorphisms is represented without anomaly on any basis off shell state. It is immediate to see that our considerations above extend to the finite span of such basis states and that diffeomorphisms map elements of this finite span into the finite span so that the group of semianalytic diffeomorphisms is represented without anomaly on this finite span.

Finally, consider a pair of diffeomorphisms  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  such that  $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$ . From (6.9), we have  $\hat{U}(\phi_i)\Psi_{B,f,h} = \Psi_{B,\phi_i^*f,\phi_i^*h}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $h$  has no symmetries it follows that  $\phi_1^*h \neq \phi_2^*h$ . Then the considerations of section 7 imply that  $\Psi_{B,\phi_1^*f,\phi_1^*h} \neq \Psi_{B,\phi_2^*f,\phi_2^*h}$ . Conversely, it follows that if  $\hat{U}(\phi_1)\Psi_{B,f,h} = \hat{U}(\phi_2)\Psi_{B,f,h}$ , it must be the case that  $\phi_1 = \phi_2$ . This implies that the representation of diffeomorphisms on the finite span of basis off shell states is also *faithful*.

## 6.2 Diffeomorphism Covariance on an off shell basis state

Diffeomorphism covariance of the single Hamiltonian constraint action is the statement that:

$$\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi) = H(\phi_*N), \forall \phi \quad (6.13)$$

---

<sup>21</sup>Note that (ii), 6, section 3.1 in conjunction with the invertibility of  $\phi$  implies that  $\phi$  induces a bijection on  $B$ .

where  $\phi$  is a semianalytic  $C^r$  diffeomorphism. The dual action amplitude of the left hand side operator on an off shell basis state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is  $\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,f,h}(S)$ . We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,f,h}(S) &= \hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(S) \\ &=: \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\ &:= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S).\end{aligned}\quad (6.14)$$

Here we have used (6.9) in the first line. In the second line we have used the definition of dual action. In doing so we have used the flexibility, given its classical reality, of calling the Hamiltonian constraint in the first line  $\hat{H}(N)$  instead of  $\hat{H}^\dagger(N)$ . In the third line we have used the definition of the continuum limit action. Hence the diffeomorphism covariance condition can be written in terms of amplitudes as:

$$\Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) = \Psi_{B,f,h}(H(\phi_*N)S) \quad \forall S. \quad (6.15)$$

From section 4.2 both the left hand side and the right hand side of the above equation are known. Below, we show their equality. As noted above, if  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$ , neither does  $\hat{U}(\phi)S$  and (4.38) implies that

$$\Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) = \Psi_{B,f,h}(H(\phi_*N)S) = 0 \quad \forall S \text{ with no overlap in } B. \quad (6.16)$$

On the other hand, as noted above (see the discussion around (3.28), (3.29)) if  $S$  has overlap in  $B$  so does  $\hat{U}(\phi)S$  and we may use (4.39) to evaluate both sides of (6.15). Below, we denote  $\hat{U}(\phi)S$  by  $S_\phi$  for notational convenience. In what follows, it is important to keep track of the metric dependence of various quantities. Accordingly, we restore the metric subscript to the interkink distance function so as to denote the interkink distance function for the state  $S$  with respect to metric  $h$  by  $g_{S,h}$ .

We also append a subscript  $h$  to the unit edge tangent  $\hat{e}_{I_v}^a$  with respect to  $h$  so as to denote it by  $\hat{e}_{I_v,h}^a$ . We also denote the RNCs  $\{x\}$  with respect to the metric  $h$  by  $\{x\}_h$  and the lapse computed at point  $v$  with respect to the RNCs  $\{x\}_h$  centered at  $v$  by  $N(x_h(v))$ . Then for any  $S$  with overlap in  $B$ , equation F (4.39) implies that the left hand side of (6.15) is:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\ &= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S_\phi)} N(x_{\phi^*h}(v)) g_{S_\phi,\phi^*h} \gamma_{(S_\phi)\lambda_v} \left( \prod_{v' \neq v} (\phi^*f)(v') \right) \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v,\phi^*h}^a \partial_a (\phi^*f)(v) \right)\end{aligned}\quad (6.17)$$

$$= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}))) g_{S_\phi,\phi^*h} \gamma_{(S_\phi)\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} (\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}')) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}=1}^{N_{\phi(\bar{v})}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})},\phi^*h}^a \partial_a (\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v})) \right).\quad (6.18)$$

where we have used the invariance under diffeomorphisms of the nondegeneracy of vertices to replace  $V_{GR}(S_\phi)$  by  $V_{GR}(S)$  in the third line and where  $v', \bar{v}'$  range over  $V(S_\phi), V(S)$  respectively (recall that  $V_{GR}(S)$  denotes the non-degenerate, (and in the case of overlap in  $B$ , exclusively) GR vertices of  $S$  whereas  $V(S)$  refers to all (and in the case of overlap in  $B$ , exclusively GR,) vertices of  $S$ ).

Diffeomorphism covariance of the RS Volume operator implies that  $(S_\phi)_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})}}$  is the image of  $S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}$  by  $\phi$ , so that:

$$\sum_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}=1}^{N_{\phi(\bar{v})}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})},\phi^*h}^a \partial_a (\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v})) = \sum_{I_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}},h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}). \quad (6.19)$$

It also follows that the elements of the kink set of  $S_\phi$  are diffeomorphic images by  $\phi$  of elements of the kink set of  $S$ . It immediately follows from the definition of the interkink distance function  $g_{S,k}$  in section 3.4.1 that:

$$g_{S_\phi, \phi^*h} = g_{S,h}. \quad (6.20)$$

As noted above,  $(S_\phi)_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})}}$  is the image of  $S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}$  by  $\phi$ . Equation (3.29) then implies that:

$$\gamma_{(S_\phi)_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})}}} = \gamma_{S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}}. \quad (6.21)$$

Next, from the definition of RNCs it follows that the RNCs  $\{x_h\}$  with respect to the metric  $h$  around the point  $v$  and the RNCs  $\{x_{\phi^*h}\}$  with respect to the push forward of  $h$  around the point  $\phi(v)$  are related, in general, by a constant (i.e.  $p$  independent) rigid rotation so that for  $p$  in a convex normal neighborhood of  $v$ :

$$x_{\phi^*h}^\mu(\phi(p)) = R^\mu{}_\nu x_h^\nu(p). \quad (6.22)$$

Denoting the evaluation of a lapse  $N$  at  $p$  in coordinates  $\{x_h\}$  by  $N(x_h(p))$ ,<sup>22</sup> it follows from (6.22) together with the fact that  $\det R = 1$  that:

$$N(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}))) = (\phi_*N)(x_h(\bar{v})). \quad (6.23)$$

Using (6.19)-(6.23), together with the definition of the push forward of  $f$  whereby  $(\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}')) = f(\bar{v}')$ , in (6.18) implies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{B, \phi^*f, \phi^*h}(\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\ &= \frac{3}{8\pi} \sum_{\bar{v} \in V(S)} (\phi_*N)(x_h(\bar{v})) g_{S,h} \gamma_{S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}') \right) \sum_{I_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}},h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

It is immediate to see that the right hand side of the above equation is exactly  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(H(\phi_*N)S)$  which, together with (6.16) completes the demonstration of (6.15).

Next we turn to a proof of diffeomorphism invariance of the product of two Hamiltonian constraints. Since the proof is along the same lines as for the single Hamiltonian constraint action, we shall be brief. We need to show that:

$$\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{H}(M)\hat{U}(\phi) = H(\phi_*N)H(\phi_*M), \forall \phi \quad (6.25)$$

where  $\phi$  is a semianalytic  $C^r$  diffeomorphism. The amplitude on  $S$  for the (dual) action of the left hand side operator on an off shell basis state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  is  $\hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{H}(M)\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,f,h}(S)$ . From (6.9), the definition of dual action and the classical reality driven flexibility of choice between  $\hat{H}(L)$  and  $\hat{H}^\dagger(L)$  for  $L = N, M$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{H}(M)\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,f,h}(S) &= \hat{U}^\dagger(\phi)\hat{H}(N)\hat{H}(M)\Psi_{B, \phi^*f, \phi^*h}(S) \\ &=: \Psi_{B, \phi^*f, \phi^*h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\ &:= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \lim_{\bar{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} \Psi_{B, \phi^*f, \phi^*h}(\hat{H}_{\bar{\epsilon}}(M)\hat{H}_\epsilon(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

<sup>22</sup>This notation looks similar but is different to that utilised in section 4.3.2 where the  $v$  subscript on  $x$  referred to the point around which the RNCs  $\{x\}$  is centered. In contrast, here the subscript  $h$  refers to the metric with respect to which the RNCs are defined with the center point not being explicitly denoted but, rather, implicitly understood from context.

Hence the diffeomorphism covariance condition can be written in terms of amplitudes as:

$$\Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) = \Psi_{B,f,h}(H(\phi_*M)H(\phi_*N)S) \quad \forall S. \quad (6.27)$$

From section 4.3 both the left hand side and the right hand side of the above equation are known. As above, if  $S$  has no overlap in  $B$ , neither does  $\hat{U}(\phi)S$  and section 4.3.1 implies that

$$\Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) = \Psi_{B,f,h}(H(\phi_*M)H(\phi_*N)S) = 0 \quad \forall S \text{ with no overlap in } B. \quad (6.28)$$

Let  $S$ , and hence  $S_\phi$ , have overlap in  $B$ . In the notation developed above, equation (4.70) implies that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\ = & \left( \frac{3}{8\pi} \right)^2 \sum_{v \in V_{GR}(S_\phi)} N(x_{\phi^*h}(v)) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_\phi, \phi^*h} \\ & \left( \sum_{v' \in V_{GR}(S_\phi), v' \neq v} M(x_{\phi^*h}(v')) \gamma_{((S_\phi)_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_{v'}}} \left( \prod_{v'' \in V(S_\phi), v'' \neq v', v} (\phi^*f)(v'') \right) \right. \\ & \left. \left( \sum_{I_v=1}^{N_v} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_v, \phi^*h}^a \partial_a(\phi^*f)(v) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{v'}=1}^{N_{v'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{v'}, \phi^*h}^a \partial_a(\phi^*f)(v') \right) \right. \\ + & \left. \gamma_{((S_\phi)_{\lambda_v})_{\lambda_v}} \left( \prod_{v' \in V(S_\phi), v' \neq v} (\phi^*f)(v') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_v \hat{e}_{I_v, \phi^*h}^b \partial_b(M(x_{\phi^*h}(v)) \hat{e}_{I_v, \phi^*h}^a \partial_a(\phi^*f)(v)) \right) \\ = & \left( \frac{3}{8\pi} \right)^2 \sum_{\bar{v} \in V_{GR}(S)} N(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}))) \frac{1}{4} g_{S_\phi, \phi^*h} \\ & \left( \sum_{\bar{v}' \in V_{GR}(S), \bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} M(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}')))) \gamma_{((S_\phi)_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})})_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v}')}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}'' \in V(S), \bar{v}'' \neq \bar{v}', \bar{v}} (\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}'')) \right) \right. \\ & \left. \left( \sum_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}=1}^{N_{\phi(\bar{v})}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}), \phi^*h}^a} \partial_a(\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v})) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}')}=1}^{N_{\phi(\bar{v}')}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}'), \phi^*h}^a} \partial_a(\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}')) \right) \right. \\ + & \left. \gamma_{((S_\phi)_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})})_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \in V(S), \bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} (\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}')) \right) \frac{1}{4} N_{\phi(\bar{v})} \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}), \phi^*h}^b} \partial_b(M(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}))) \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}), \phi^*h}^a} \partial_a(\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}))) \right). \quad (6.29) \end{aligned}$$

Diffeomorphism covariance of the RS volume operator implies that  $((S_\phi)_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v})})_{\lambda_{\phi(\bar{v}')}}$  is the image by the diffeomorphism  $\phi$  of  $(S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}'}}$ . Using this fact with (3.29) to simplify the gamma factors above, together with (6.19), (6.20) and (6.23), it follows that (6.29) simplifies to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\ = & \left( \frac{3}{8\pi} \right)^2 \sum_{\bar{v} \in V(S)} (\phi_*N)(x_h(\bar{v})) \frac{1}{4} g_{S,h} \\ & \left( \sum_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} (\phi_*M)(x_h(\bar{v}')) \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}'}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}'' \neq \bar{v}', \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}, h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{\bar{v}'}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}'}, h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}') \right) \right. \\ + & \left. \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_{\phi(\bar{v})} \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}), \phi^*h}^b} \partial_b(M(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}))) \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v}), \phi^*h}^a} \partial_a(\phi^*f)(\phi(\bar{v}))) \right). \quad (6.30) \end{aligned}$$

Next, note that any parameterization  $e_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t)$  for the  $I_{\bar{v}}$ th edge  $e_{I_{\bar{v}}}$  emanating from  $\bar{v}$  in  $S$ , defines a natural parameterization by the same parameter  $t$  for its diffeomorphic image  $e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}} := \phi(e_{I_{\bar{v}}})$  emanating from  $\phi(\bar{v})$  in  $S_\phi$  through

$$e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t) := \phi(e_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t)). \quad (6.31)$$

In this parameterization the following results hold.

First, from the defining properties of push forward by  $\phi$ , we have that

$$\dot{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}^a(t) = \phi^* \dot{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}}^a(t) \quad (6.32)$$

where similar to (4.63), the tangent vector to an edge  $e(t)$  with respect to its parameter  $t$  is denoted by  $\dot{e}^a(t)$ . It then follows, again from the properties of the pushforward operation that:

$$\dot{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}^a(t) \dot{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}^b(t) \phi^* h_{ab}(e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t)) = \phi^* \dot{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}}^a(t) \phi^* \dot{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}}^b(t) \phi^* h_{ab}(\phi(e_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t))) = \dot{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}}^a(t) \dot{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}}^b(t) h_{ab}(e_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t)) \quad (6.33)$$

from which the equality of the metric norms of these edge tangents follow i.e.

$$|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t)|_{\phi^*h} = |\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t)|_h \quad (6.34)$$

where the metric subscripts indicate which metric is being used to calculate the norm. Second, reiterating the discussion around (6.22), from the definition of RNCs it follows that the RNCs  $\{x_h\}$  with respect to the metric  $h$  around the point  $v$  and the RNCs  $\{x_{\phi^*h}\}$  with respect to the push forward of  $h$  around the point  $\phi(v)$  are related, in general, by a constant rigid rotation so that for  $p$  in a convex normal neighborhood of  $v$ . Similar to (6.23), denoting the evaluation of a lapse  $M$  at  $p$  in coordinates  $\{x_h\}$  by  $M(x_h(p))$ , it then follows from (6.22) together with the fact that  $\det R = 1$  therein, that:

$$M(x_{\phi^*h}(e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t))) = \phi_* M(x_h(e_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t))). \quad (6.35)$$

Third, let  $F : e_{I_v} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  be a function of points on the  $I_v$ th edge at  $v$ . Defining its pushforward  $F_\phi : e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}} = \phi(e_{I_v}) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  by  $F_\phi(e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t)) := F(e_{I_v}(t))$ , it immediately follows that:

$$\frac{dF_\phi(e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t))}{dt} = \frac{dF(e_{I_v}(t))}{dt}. \quad (6.36)$$

Next, recalling the notation (4.63) employed in section 4.3.2, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}, \phi^*h}^b \partial_b (M(x_{\phi^*h}(\phi(\bar{v}))) \hat{e}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}, \phi^*h}^a \partial_a (\phi^* f)(\phi(\bar{v}))) \\ := & \frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t)|_{\phi^*h}} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{M(x_{\phi^*h}(e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t)))}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t)|_{\phi^*h}} \frac{d(\phi^* f)(e_{I_{\phi(\bar{v})}}(t))}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \end{aligned} \quad (6.37)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t)|_h} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\phi_* M(x_h(e_{I_v}(t)))}{|\vec{\dot{e}}_{I_{\bar{v}}}(t)|_h} \frac{df(e_{I_v}(t))}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \quad (6.38)$$

$$= \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}, h}^b \partial_b (\phi_* M(x_h(\bar{v}))) \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}}, h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}). \quad (6.39)$$

In the third line we used (6.34), (6.35) and (6.36). In the fourth line we have again used notation of the type (4.63) to revert to the parameterization independent form (6.39). Using (6.39) in (6.30) together with the fact that vertex valence is invariant under diffeomorphisms (so that  $N_{\phi(\bar{v})} = N_{\bar{v}}$ )

<sup>23</sup> yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_{B,\phi^*f,\phi^*h}(\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N)\hat{U}(\phi)S) \\
= & \left(\frac{3}{8\pi}\right)^2 \sum_{\bar{v} \in V_{GR}(S)} (\phi_*N)(x_h(\bar{v})) \frac{1}{4} g_{S,h} \\
& \left( \sum_{\bar{v}' \in V_{GR}(S), \bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} (\phi_*M)(x_h(\bar{v}')) \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}'}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}'' \in V(S), \bar{v}'' \neq \bar{v}', \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}'') \right) \left( \sum_{I_{\bar{v}}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}},h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}) \right) \left( \sum_{I_{\bar{v}'}=1}^{N_{\bar{v}'}} \frac{1}{4} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}'},h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v}') \right) \right. \\
& \left. + \gamma_{(S_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}})_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}}} \left( \prod_{\bar{v}' \in V(S), \bar{v}' \neq \bar{v}} f(\bar{v}') \right) \frac{1}{4} N_{\bar{v}} \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}},h}^b \partial_b (\phi_*M(x_h(\bar{v})) \hat{e}_{I_{\bar{v}},h}^a \partial_a f(\bar{v})) \right). \tag{6.40}
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to verify, from (4.70) that the right hand side of (6.40) is exactly  $\Psi_{B,f,h}(H(\phi_*M)H(\phi_*N)S)$ . This completes our proof of (6.27).

### 6.3 Diffeomorphism Covariance on finite span of off shell basis states

The exposition of the previous two sections highlights the fact that the key ingredient which ensures diffeomorphism covariance is the metric label dependence of the regulating coordinate structure in the constraint action. Thus, given an off shell state with metric label  $h$ , the regulation prescription is to use, as regulating coordinates, the RNCs associated with  $h$ . In the case of a finite superposition of such off shell states with distinct metric labels, the prescription is well defined iff any such finite superposition is *uniquely* decomposable into its constituent basis states so that for the constraint action on each basis state, we use the RNCs associated with its metric label and then superpose the results.

If this is not true, there exists an element in the finite span which is expressible as two distinct superpositions of basis states, Since the prescription underlying the constraint action depends on the metric labels of the constituent basis elements, the constraint action is then no longer uniquely defined. To illustrate what we mean let us suppose, just for the sake of argument, that the same element  $\Psi$  in the finite span could be written in two different ways as:

$$\Psi = a_1 \Psi_{B,f,h_1} + a_2 \Psi_{B,f,h_2} = b_1 \Psi_{B,f,h_1} + b_2 \Psi_{B,f,h_2} \tag{6.41}$$

with  $a_i \neq b_i, i = 1, 2$  and  $h_1 \neq h_2$ . Since the constraint action on each basis state is different the amplitudes  $A_i(N, S) = \Psi_{B,f,h_i}(\hat{H}(N)S)$  would be different for  $i = 1$  and  $i = 2$ . The amplitude  $\Psi(\hat{H}(N)S)$  would then evaluate to  $a_1 A_1 + a_2 A_2$  when using the first superposition and  $b_1 A_1 + b_2 A_2$  when using the second and there is no reason to expect that these two combinations coincide. Consequently a weak formulation of diffeomorphism covariant anomaly free action results which applies to each specific basis expansion representation of the state  $\Psi$  separately. In particular, anomaly freedom holds in the sense of the equality of  $[\hat{H}(M), \hat{H}((N))]$  and  $i\{H(\widehat{M}), \widehat{H}(N)\}$  on identical choices of basis expansion of  $\Psi$  and a similarly weak statement holds for diffeomorphism covariance so the left and right hand sides of (6.13), (6.25) are equal when evaluated on identical choices of basis expansion of  $\Psi$ .<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand if the uniqueness of decomposition is true, the prescription is well defined (in the context of the simple example above this would imply that  $a_i = b_i, i = 1, 2$ ). In section

<sup>23</sup>Please note that although the same letter  $N$  is involved in the notation of one of the lapses as well as vertex valence, the latter is distinguished from the former by the presence of the vertex subscript to  $N$

<sup>24</sup>In the absence of a proof of uniqueness of decomposition in [11], a similarly weak statement (see section 13[11] for its articulation) holds for the results derived in that work.

7 we prove certain properties of linear independence of off shell states which ensure the required uniqueness of decomposition so as to render the metric label dependent regularization prescription for the constraint action well defined. The proof requires that the Bra Set labels satisfy an additional property (iv) beyond properties (i)-(iii) of section 3.2. While it seems plausible to us that property (iv) may follow directly from properties (i)-(iii) a putative proof is beyond the scope of this work. Instead, as discussed in the last paragraph of section 3.2 we shall provide an explicit example of a rich family of Bra Sets which satisfy properties (i)- (iv). These matters are discussed further in section 7.

Finally, we note that we have phrased our results in section 4.3 and in section 6.2 for the constraint operator product, in terms of a definition of this product as the continuum limit of the product of single approximant actions on the finite span of basis off shell states. In this definition the action of the *product* of approximants is evaluated *first* and the *continuum limit* is taken *second*. Instead, these results can also be phrased in terms of a definition of this product as that of two continuum limit single constraint actions each on a suitable domain of states in the algebraic dual. In this definition, one can think of the *continuum limit* being taken first and the *product* second. In section 7 these results are rephrased, as precise statements of anomaly free Hamiltonian constraint commutators in terms of continuum limit dual operator action on domains in the algebraic dual space.

The next section, section 7, is quite technical and may be skipped on a first reading

## 7 Linear Independence of Off Shell States and Anomaly Free Domains

In section 7.1.1 we consider a set  $\mathbf{K}$  consisting of  $3m$  points in the vicinity of a point  $p \in \Sigma$ . The elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  are close enough to  $p$  that  $\mathbf{K}$  is contained in a single coordinate patch  $\{x\}$  around  $p$  with  $\{x\}$  being some fixed coordinates which are not necessarily RNCs. The elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  are placed in such a manner as to afford  $\mathbf{K}$  a segregation structure in terms of  $m$  3 point subsets,  $K_3^{(i)}$  as described in section 3.3 except that the distance used here is the coordinate distance in contrast to the geodesic distance used in section 3.3. The detailed placement of points is dictated by the choice of 2 tangent vectors  $u, v$  at  $p$ . In section 7.1.2 we show that the coordinate distance based segregation structure of section 7.1.1 implies the same segregation structure in terms of geodesic distances. We also determine  $g(\mathbf{K}, h)$  as defined in section 3.3. In section 7.2 we generalise the construction of  $\mathbf{K}$  with the ‘single nested structure’ around  $p$  displayed in section 7.1 to that with multiple nests and determine  $g(\mathbf{K}, h)$  for this multinested set  $\mathbf{K}$ . In section 7.3 we prove a key Lemma. In section 7.4 we use the results of sections 7.1 to 7.3 to construct the desired proof of linear independence for the case of states with a fixed Bra Set label  $B$  subject to an additional technical property (property (iv) of section 7.4). In section 7.5 we remove the restriction of fixed Bra Set label. We show how the obtained linear independence ensures uniqueness of decomposability of states in the finite span of off shell basis states and rephrase the property of anomaly free action proved in sections 4 and 5 in terms of continuum limit operator actions on domains. In section 7.6 we extend the results of section 7.5 to the vector space sum of the finite span of offshell basis states and the space of physical (‘onshell’) states. In section 7.7 we discuss how property (iv) could be satisfied.

## 7.1 Single Nest

Fix a point  $p \in \Sigma$  and a coordinate patch  $\{x\}$  in a neighborhood  $U_p$  of  $p$ . Let  $q \in U_p$ . Denote the coordinates of  $q$  in  $\{x\}$  by  $x^\mu(q)$ ,  $\mu = 1, 2, 3$ . In what follows we shall omit the subscripts  $p, h$  whenever convenient to reduce notational clutter. Let  $u, v$  be a pair of (non-trivial) tangent vectors at  $p$  with coordinates  $u^\mu, v^\mu$ .

We proceed as follows. First we specify the positions of the  $3m$  elements of  $\mathbf{K} \equiv \mathbf{K}_{m,p,\epsilon,\delta}$  relative to  $p$  in terms of  $\{x\}, u^\mu, v^\mu$  and the parameters  $\epsilon, \delta$ . Here  $\delta$  is independent of  $\epsilon$  and subject only to the condition:

$$1 - m\delta > 0. \quad (7.1)$$

Next, we show that in terms of coordinate distances, the placement of points endows  $\mathbf{K}$  with the desired nested structure. Finally we show that coordinate nesting of  $\mathbf{K}$  implies the desired nesting in terms of  $d$ .

### 7.1.1 Single Nest with respect to Coordinate Distances

The  $3m$  points are divided into triples. Elements of  $j$ th triple are denoted by  $p_q^{(j)}$ ,  $q = 1, 2, 3$  and the set of this triple by  $K_3^{(j)}$ .<sup>25</sup> With this notation in place, we specify the positions of the elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  as follows:

$$x^\mu(p_1^{(1)}) - x^\mu(p) = O(\epsilon^{2m(1+2\delta)}) \quad (7.2)$$

$$x^\mu(p_2^{(1)}) - x^\mu(p_1^{(1)}) = \epsilon^{m(1+\delta)}(u^\mu + O(\epsilon^{m\delta})) \quad (7.3)$$

$$x^\mu(p_3^{(1)}) - x^\mu(p_1^{(1)}) = \epsilon^m(v^\mu + O(\epsilon^{m\delta})) \quad (7.4)$$

From (7.3), (7.4) it is straightforward to show that:

$$x^\mu(p_3^{(1)}) - x^\mu(p_2^{(1)}) = \epsilon^m(v^\mu + O(\epsilon^{m\delta})). \quad (7.5)$$

This places the points in the first triple. We specify the placement of elements of the remaining triples as follows.

Let  $m \geq j \geq 2$ . Then the placements satisfy:

$$x^\mu(p_q^{(j)}) - x^\mu(p_r^{(k)}) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\delta)(m-j+2)}) \quad j > k, k = 1, \dots, m-1 \quad q = 1, 2 \quad r = 1, 2, 3 \quad (7.6)$$

$$x^\mu(p_3^{(j)}) - x^\mu(p_r^{(k)}) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{m-j+1}) \quad j > k, k = 1, \dots, m-1 \quad r = 1, 2, 3 \quad (7.7)$$

and

$$x^\mu(p_2^{(j)}) - x^\mu(p_1^{(j)}) = \epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j+2)}(u^\mu + O(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{m\delta}{2})})) \quad (7.8)$$

$$x^\mu(p_3^{(j)}) - x^\mu(p_1^{(j)}) = \epsilon^{m-j+1}(v^\mu + O(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{m\delta}{2})})). \quad (7.9)$$

From (7.8), (7.9) it is straightforward to show that:

$$x^\mu(p_3^{(j)}) - x^\mu(p_2^{(j)}) = \epsilon^{m-j+1}(v^\mu + O(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{m\delta}{2})})). \quad (7.10)$$

---

<sup>25</sup>We have used the notation  $K_3^{(j)} \subset \mathbf{K}$  in section 3.3 for the set of 3 points with specific geodesic distance properties in relation to elements of  $\mathbf{K}$ . While we abuse this notation here, in the next section we shall show that  $K_3^{(j)}$  does indeed satisfy its defining properties detailed in section 3.3.

It is a straightforward exercise to verify that for all small enough  $\epsilon$  these placements endow  $\mathbf{K}$  with a nested structure, in terms of *coordinate* distances, of the type described in section 3.3 (we emphasize that in contrast to the coordinate distance used here, the nested structure in section 3.3 is defined with respect to geodesic distances). This structure is as follows. If  $m = 1$  we have a single triple of points so that  $\mathbf{K} = K_3^{(1)}$ . If  $m > 1$  then for any  $k < m$  the inter point coordinate distances in  $K_3^{(k)}$  are smaller than any of the coordinate distances between any of these points and any point in  $\mathbf{K} - \cup_{k'=1}^k K_3^{(k')}$  as well as the interpoint coordinate distances between elements of  $\mathbf{K} - \cup_{k'=1}^k K_3^{(k')}$ .

### 7.1.2 Single Nest with respect to Geodesic Distances

Fix a point  $p_\epsilon \in U_p$  and a tangent vector  $v_\epsilon^a$  at  $p_\epsilon$ . Let the metric norm  $|\vec{v}_\epsilon|$  of  $v_\epsilon^a$  with respect to  $h$  be of  $\mathbf{O}(1)$ . Consider a point  $q_\epsilon \in U_p$  with  $x^\mu(q_\epsilon) - x^\mu(p_\epsilon) = \epsilon v_\epsilon^\mu$  for small enough  $\epsilon$ . Let the geodesic connecting them be parameterized with affine parameter  $\lambda$  such that the geodesic tangent  $(\frac{d}{d\lambda})^a$  is of unit metric norm so  $h_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^\mu}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^\nu}{d\lambda} = 1$ . Let  $p_\epsilon$  be located at  $\lambda = 0$  and  $q_\epsilon$  at  $\lambda_\epsilon$ . Using the fact that the  $C^{r-1}, r \gg 1$  differentiability of the metric  $h_{\mu\nu}$  implies sufficient differentiability of geodesics for Taylor expansion to first order in the geodesic affine parameter, we have that:

$$x^\mu(q_\epsilon) - x^\mu(p_\epsilon) = \epsilon v_\epsilon^\mu = \lambda_\epsilon \frac{dx^\mu}{d\lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} + O(\lambda_\epsilon^2) \quad (7.11)$$

which implies

$$|\vec{v}_\epsilon(p_\epsilon)|\epsilon = \lambda_\epsilon + O(\lambda_\epsilon^2) \quad (7.12)$$

where  $|\vec{v}_\epsilon(p_\epsilon)|$  is the metric norm of  $v_\epsilon^a$  at  $p_\epsilon$ . On the other hand by virtue of the choice of affine parameterization it immediately follows that the geodesic distance  $d(q_\epsilon, p_\epsilon)$  equals the affine distance  $\lambda_\epsilon$ . This in conjunction with the above equation implies that:

$$d(q_\epsilon, p_\epsilon) = |\vec{v}_\epsilon|\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (7.13)$$

In particular if for some  $\eta > 0$  and for some tangent vector  $v^a \neq 0$  at  $p_\epsilon$  with coordinate components  $v^\mu$  independent of  $\epsilon$ ,  $v_\epsilon^a \equiv v_{\epsilon,\eta}^a$  at  $p_\epsilon$  is such that

$$v_{\epsilon,\eta}^a = v^a + O(\epsilon^\eta), \quad (7.14)$$

it follows from (7.13) that:

$$d(q_\epsilon, p_\epsilon) = |\vec{v}(p_\epsilon)|\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) + O(\epsilon^{\eta+1}), \quad |\vec{v}(p_\epsilon)| := (h_{\mu\nu}(p_\epsilon)v^\mu v^\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (7.15)$$

Finally, let  $p_\epsilon$  be located at a coordinate distance of  $O(\epsilon^\tau), \tau > 0$  from the fixed point  $p \in U_p$  so that:

$$x^\mu(p_\epsilon) - x^\mu(p) = O(\epsilon^\tau). \quad (7.16)$$

Then defining  $v^a$  at every point in  $U_p$  to have the  $\epsilon$  independent coordinates  $v^\mu$  so that the norm of  $v^a$  at  $p$  is  $|\vec{v}(p)| = (h_{\mu\nu}(p)v^\mu v^\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , we have via Taylor expansion of  $h$  around  $p$  that:

$$|\vec{v}(p_\epsilon)| = |\vec{v}(p)| + O(\epsilon^\tau) \quad (7.17)$$

which together with (7.15) implies that:

$$d(q_\epsilon, p_\epsilon) = |\vec{v}(p)|\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) + O(\epsilon^{\eta+1}) + O(\epsilon^{\tau+1}), \quad |\vec{v}(p)| := (h_{\mu\nu}(p)v^\mu v^\nu)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (7.18)$$

Using (7.18) in conjunction with (7.1) and equations (7.2) - (7.10), a tedious but straightforward analysis implies that the network of geodesic distances between elements of  $\mathbf{K}$  satisfy the following equations.

$$d(p_1^{(1)}, p) = O(\epsilon^{2m(1+\delta)}) \quad (7.19)$$

$$d(p_2^{(1)}, p_1^{(1)}) = \epsilon^{m(1+\delta)}(|u(p)| + O(\epsilon^{m\delta})) \quad (7.20)$$

$$d(p_3^{(1)}, p_1^{(1)}) = \epsilon^m(|v(p)| + O(\epsilon^{m\delta})). \quad (7.21)$$

From (7.20), (7.21) it is straightforward to show that:

$$d(p_3^{(1)}, p_2^{(1)}) = \epsilon^m(|v(p)| + O(\epsilon^{m\delta})). \quad (7.22)$$

For  $m \geq j \geq 2$  we have that:

$$d(p_q^{(j)}, p_r^{(k)}) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\delta)(m-j+2)}) \quad j > k, k = 1, \dots, m-1 \quad q = 1, 2 \quad r = 1, 2, 3 \quad (7.23)$$

$$d(p_3^{(1)}, p_1^{(r)}) = \mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{m-j+1}) \quad j > k, k = 1, \dots, m-1 \quad r = 1, 2, 3 \quad (7.24)$$

and

$$d(p_2^{(j)}, p_1^{(j)}) = \epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j+2)}(|u(p)| + O(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{m\delta}{2})})) \quad (7.25)$$

$$d(p_3^{(j)}, p_1^{(j)}) = \epsilon^{m-j+1}(|v(p)| + O(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{m\delta}{2})})) \quad (7.26)$$

From (7.25), (7.26) it is straightforward to show that:

$$d(p_3^{(j)}, p_2^{(j)}) = \epsilon^{m-j+1}(|v(p)| + O(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{m\delta}{2})})). \quad (7.27)$$

It is again a straightforward exercise to verify that for all small enough  $\epsilon$  these placements endow  $\mathbf{K}$  with a nested structure, in terms of geodesic distances, of the type described in section 3.3. This structure is as follows. If  $m = 1$  we have a single triple of points so that  $\mathbf{K} = K_3^{(1)}$ . If  $m > 1$  then for any  $k < m$  the inter point coordinate distances in  $K_3^{(k)}$  are smaller than any of the coordinate distances between any of these points and any point in  $\mathbf{K} - \cup_{k'=1}^k K_3^{(k')}$  as well as the interpoint coordinate distances between elements of  $\mathbf{K} - \cup_{k'=1}^k K_3^{(k')}$ .

A brief account of how this structure is implied by (7.1) and (7.19)-(7.27) is as follows.

First note that for  $m \geq j \geq 2$ ,

$$(m-j+2)(1-\frac{\delta}{2}) - (m-j+1) = 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}(m-j+2) \geq (1-\frac{\delta}{2}m) > 0 \quad (7.28)$$

$$(m-j+2)(1-\delta) - (m-j+1) = 1 - \delta(m-j+2) \geq (1-\delta m) > 0 \quad (7.29)$$

where the last inequality in both equations follows from (7.1).

Next note that (7.20)-(7.22) imply that largest inter point distance in  $K_3^{(1)}$  is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^m)$ . If  $m > 1$ , equations (7.23), (7.24) and (7.29) imply that the shortest distance between any element of  $K_3^{(1)}$  and any element of  $K_3^{(j \neq 1)}$  is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\delta)(m-j+2)})$ , which is smallest for  $j = 2$  so that the shortest distance between any element of  $K_3^{(1)}$  and any element of  $\cup_{j \neq 1} K_3^{(j)}$  is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-m\delta)})$ , which is clearly larger than  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^m)$  for  $m > 1$ . Note also that the shortest interpoint distance between elements of  $K_3^{(j \neq 1)}$  is, from (7.25)-(7.27) and (7.29),  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j+2)})$  which is smallest at  $j = 2$  in which case this distance is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})m})$  which is also larger than  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^m)$ . Hence  $K_3^{(1)}$  exhibits the segregation structure alluded to above.

Next fix  $k$  such that  $m > k > 1$ . Then from (7.25)- (7.27) and (7.28) the largest interpoint distance in  $K_3^{(k)}$  is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{m-k+1})$ . From (7.23), (7.24) and (7.29), the shortest distance between any element of  $K_3^{(j>k)}$  and any element of  $K_3^{(k)}$  is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\delta)(m-j+2)})$  which is smallest at  $j = k + 1$ . Thus the the shortest distance between any element of  $K_3^{(k)}$  and any element of  $\cup_{j>k} K_3^{(j)}$  is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\delta)(m-k+1)})$  which is clearly larger than  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{m-k+1})$ . Note also that the shortest interpoint distance between elements of  $K_3^{(j\neq k)}$  is, from (7.25)- (7.27) and (7.29),  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j+2)})$  which is smallest for  $j = k + 1$  in which case this distance is  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-k+1)})$ , which is again larger than  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^{m-k+1})$ .

This immediately implies that  $\mathbf{K}$  exhibits the segregation structure alluded to above.

We now evaluate  $g(\mathbf{K}, h)$ . To do so note that in  $K_3^{(1)}$  we have to leading order in  $\epsilon$  that

$$\left(\frac{d_{\min}^{(1)}}{d_{\max}^{(1)}}\right) = \left(\frac{\epsilon^{m(1+\delta)}}{\epsilon^m}\right) \left(\frac{|u(p)|}{|v(p)|}\right) = \epsilon^{m\delta} \frac{|u(p)|}{|v(p)|} \quad (7.30)$$

and that in  $K_3^{(j>1)}$  to leading order in  $\epsilon$  we have that:

$$\left(\frac{d_{\min}^{(j)}}{d_{\max}^{(j)}}\right) = \frac{\epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j+2)}}{\epsilon^{m-j+1}} \frac{|u(p)|}{|v(p)|} = \epsilon^{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j-2)} \frac{|u(p)|}{|v(p)|}. \quad (7.31)$$

From (7.30) and (7.31) and the definition of  $g$  (3.8) it follows that to leading order in  $\epsilon$  we have that:

$$g(\mathbf{K}, h) = \epsilon^{2m\delta} \left(\prod_{j=2}^m \epsilon^{2(1-\frac{\delta}{2})(m-j+2)}\right) \left(\frac{|u(p)|}{|v(p)|}\right)^{2m} =: \epsilon^{\alpha(m,\delta)} \left(\frac{|u(p)|}{|v(p)|}\right)^{2m}. \quad (7.32)$$

where we have defined the positive exponent  $\alpha(m, \delta)$  as:

$$\alpha(m, \delta) := 2m\delta + \sum_{j=2}^m 2\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}(m-j+2)\right) \quad (7.33)$$

## 7.2 Multiple Nests

Given  $n$  distinct points  $p_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ , a coordinate patch  $\{x\}_i$  around each  $p_i$ , parameters  $\epsilon_i$  with

$$\epsilon_i \gg \epsilon_j \text{ iff } i > j, \quad (7.34)$$

positive integers  $m_i$  and the  $\epsilon_i$ -independent (but  $m_i$  dependent) parameters  $\delta_i = \delta_i(m_i)$ , with

$$1 - \delta_i m_i > 0, \quad (7.35)$$

and pairs of tangent vectors  $u_i, v_i$  at  $p_i$ , we can repeat the considerations of sections 7.1.1 for each  $i$  by setting  $(p, \epsilon, m, \delta, u, v) := (p_i, \epsilon_i, m_i, \delta_i, u_i, v_i)$  and placing  $3m_i$  points around  $p_i$  in the manner described in section 7.1.1. For small enough  $\{\epsilon_i\}$ , the placement around any  $p_i$  is not influenced by the placement around  $p_{j\neq i}$ . In this way for small enough  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  we obtain  $n$  nested sets  $\mathbf{K}_i$  with their union  $\mathbf{K} = \cup_{i=1}^n \mathbf{K}_i$  also exhibiting a segregation structure in terms of triples of points by virtue of the relative size (7.34) of the small parameters  $\{\epsilon_i\}$ .

Setting

$$\mathbf{K} \equiv \mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}, \quad (7.36)$$

it immediately follows that to leading order in these small parameters we have that:

$$g(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}, h) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^{\alpha(m_i, \delta_i)} \right) \prod_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{|u_j(p_j)|}{|v_j(p_j)|} \right)^{2m_j} \quad (7.37)$$

which in turn implies that

$$\lim_{\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0} (\dots (\lim_{\epsilon_1 \rightarrow 0} \dots) \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^{-\alpha(m_i, \delta_i)} \right) g(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}, h) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{|u_i(p_i)|_h}{|v_i(p_i)|_h} \right)^{2m_i} \quad (7.38)$$

where we have appended the subscript  $h$  to the norm to emphasize that the metric used is  $h$ . For future purposes it is convenient to denote the  $\epsilon_i$  dependent prefactor as follows:

$$\left( \prod_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^{-\alpha(m_i, \delta_i)} \right) =: E(\{\epsilon_i\}, \{m_i\}) \equiv E(\vec{\epsilon}, \vec{m}) \quad (7.39)$$

where we have omitted the explicit dependence of  $E$  on  $\{\delta_i(m_i)\}$  to avoid notational clutter. In this notation we write (7.38) as:

$$\lim_{\vec{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} E(\vec{\epsilon}, \vec{m}) g(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}, h) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{|u_i(p_i)|_h}{|v_i(p_i)|_h} \right)^{2m_i}. \quad (7.40)$$

### 7.3 An Important Lemma

The Lemma which we prove in this section concerns the following set up. We are given  $n$  distinct elements  $h_i, i = 1, \dots, n$  of  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ . Clearly, no pair of these metrics are conformal to each other. Hence, given  $h_1, h_2$  we can always find a point  $p_1$  and vectors  $u_1, v_1$  at  $p_1$  such that the ratio of their norms with respect to  $h_1, h_2$  are unequal. Denote the ratio of these norms with respect to the  $i$ th metric by  $r_i^{(1)}$  and look for  $i$  such that  $r_i^{(1)} \neq r_1^{(1)}$  i.e. look for all metrics in addition to  $h_2$  for which the ratio of metric norms of  $u_1, v_1$  are unequal to that computed with respect to  $h_1$ . Renumber the set of metrics so these metrics with norm ratios different from  $r_1^{(1)}$  at  $p_1$  are  $\{h_{I_1}, I_1 = 1, \dots, n_1\}$ . For the remaining metrics these ratios must be equal to  $r_1^{(1)}$ .

Next, consider  $h_{n_1+1}$ . There exists a point  $p_2$  and vectors  $u_2, v_2$  at  $p_2$  such that the ratio of their norms with respect to this metric and with respect to  $h_1$  are unequal. If this point happens to be  $p_1$ , due to the  $C^{r-1}$  nature of these metrics, we can go to a nearby point and choose a ‘nearby’ pair of vectors for which the desired inequality holds. More in detail, fix a neighborhood of  $p_2$  and a chart thereon. Then it is straightforward to see that we can choose a point close enough to  $p_2$  in this chart and vectors with components close enough to those at  $p_2$  such that the inequality continues to hold. Rename this point as  $p_2$  and the vectors as  $u_2, v_2$ . Denote the ratio of the norms of  $u_2, v_2$  with respect to  $h_i$  by  $r_i^{(2)}$ . Look for all metrics in addition to  $h_{n_1+1}$  in the set  $\{h_{n_1+1}, \dots, h_n\}$  for which the norm ratios are unequal to the ratio  $r_1^{(2)}$  computed with respect to  $h_1$ . Clearly we have  $r_{I_2}^{(2)} \neq r_1^{(2)}$  with  $r_{I_2}^{(2)} = r_1^{(2)}$  i.e. disagreement at the second point, agreement at the first. Renumber this set of remaining metrics so that these metrics are numbered  $h_{I_2}, I_2 = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2$ .

Iterate this procedure so as to get  $p_3$  distinct from  $p_1, p_2$  and  $u_3, v_3$  such that in obvious notation  $r_{I_3}^{(3)} \neq r_1^{(3)}$ , but  $r_{I_3}^{(i')} = r_1^{(i')}$ ,  $i' = 1, 2$  where  $I_3 = n_2 + 1, \dots, n_3$ . Continue this iterative procedure until it ends after some finite number  $m' \leq n$  steps and provides the setting for the Lemma below.

**Lemma:** Let there exist points  $p_{i'} \in \Sigma, i' = 1, \dots, m'$ , pairs of vectors  $u_{i'}, v_{i'}$  at  $p_{i'}$ , metrics  $h_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ , positive integers  $n_{i'}$  with  $n_{i'} < n_{j'}$  for  $i' < j'$  with  $n_{m'} = n$ , indices  $I_{i'}$  with range  $n_{i'-1} + 1, \dots, n_{i'}$  (where  $n_0 := 0$ ) such that for any fixed  $i'$  and all  $I_{i'}$  we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{I_{i'}}^{(j')} &= r_1^{(j')} \quad \text{if } j' < i', \\ r_{I_{i'}}^{(i')} &\neq r_1^{(i')}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.41)$$

where

$$r_k^{(j')} := \left( \frac{|u_{j'}(p_{j'})|_{h_k}}{|v_{j'}(p_{j'})|_{h_k}} \right)^2 \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7.42)$$

Then there exist positive integers  $N_{j'}, j' = 1, \dots, m'$  such that:

$$\prod_{j'=1}^{m'} (r_1^{(j')})^{N_{j'}} \neq \prod_{j'=1}^{m'} (r_k^{(j')})^{N_{j'}}, \quad k = 2, \dots, n \quad (7.43)$$

**Proof:** Choose  $N_1 = 1$ . From (7.41), we have

$$r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq r_1^{(1)}. \quad (7.44)$$

From (7.41),  $r_{I_1}^{(2)} \neq r_1^{(2)}$  but  $r_{I_2}^{(1)} = r_1^{(1)}$ . It follows that:

$$(r_{I_2}^{(2)})^{N_2} r_{I_2}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^{N_2} r_1^{(1)} \quad \text{for any } N_2. \quad (7.45)$$

If  $I_1$  is such that  $r_{I_1}^{(2)} = r_1^{(2)}$ , then again

$$(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^{N_2} r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^{N_2} r_1^{(1)} \quad \text{for any } N_2. \quad (7.46)$$

If  $I_1$  is such that  $r_{I_1}^{(2)} \neq r_1^{(2)}$ , then there exists  $N_{I_1}$  such that:

$$(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^N r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^N r_1^{(1)} \quad \forall N \geq N_{I_1}. \quad (7.47)$$

To see this, first suppose that  $(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^N r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^N r_1^{(1)} \forall N \geq 1$ . In this case  $N_{I_1} = 1$ . Suppose that it is not the case that  $(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^N r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^N r_1^{(1)} \forall N \geq 1$ . Then there exists some  $N_0 \geq 1$  for which  $(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^{N_0} r_{I_1}^{(1)} = (r_1^{(2)})^{N_0} r_1^{(1)}$ . Then  $\forall N > N_0$ , since  $r_{I_1}^{(2)} \neq r_1^{(2)}$  we have that  $(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^{N-N_0} (r_{I_1}^{(2)})^{N_0} r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^{N-N_0} ((r_1^{(2)})^{N_0} r_1^{(1)})$  so that we can set  $N_{I_1} = N_0 + 1$ ,<sup>26</sup> which completes the proof of (7.47).

In the case that there exists  $I_1$  such that  $r_{I_1}^{(2)} \neq r_1^{(2)}$  we set  $N_2 = \max_{I_1 \text{ s.t. } r_{I_1}^{(2)} \neq r_1^{(2)}} N_{I_1}$  else we choose  $N_2 = 1$ . Next, define:

$$\prod_{i'=1}^2 (r_k^{(i')})^{N_{i'}} := \alpha_k^{(2)}. \quad (7.48)$$

Our choice of  $N_1, N_2$  implies that

$$\alpha_{I_{k'}}^{(2)} \neq \alpha_1^{(2)} \quad \forall k' \leq 2. \quad (7.49)$$

<sup>26</sup>Note that it must be the case that for all  $N < N_0$ , we have that  $(r_{I_1}^{(2)})^N r_{I_1}^{(1)} \neq (r_1^{(2)})^N r_1^{(1)}$  else there would exist  $N_1 < N_0$  for which equality holds, in which case our argument above shows that the inequality must hold for all  $N > N_1$  including  $N = N_0$  which is a contradiction. Hence  $N_0$  is unique.

Now  $r_{I_3}^{(3)} \neq r_1^{(3)}$  but  $r_{I_3}^{i' < 3} = r_1^{(i')}$  which implies that  $\alpha_{I_3}^{(2)} = \alpha_1^{(2)}$  (Indeed,  $\alpha_{I_{k'}}^{(2)} = \alpha_1^{(2)}$ ,  $\forall k' \geq 3$ ). This implies that:

$$(r_{I_3}^{(3)})^N \alpha_{I_3}^{(2)} \neq (r_1^{(3)})^N \alpha_1^{(2)} \quad \forall N. \quad (7.50)$$

Next, if there exists any  $I_{i' < 3}$  such that  $r_{I_{i'}}^{(3)} = r_1^{(3)}$ , we have that

$$(r_{I_{i'}}^{(3)})^N \alpha_{I_3}^{(2)} \neq (r_1^{(3)})^N \alpha_1^{(2)} \quad \forall N. \quad (7.51)$$

If there exists  $I_{i' < 3}$  such that  $r_{I_{i'}}^{(3)} \neq r_1^{(3)}$ , then by an argument identical to that used to prove (7.47), there exists  $N_{I_{i'}}$  such that:

$$(r_{I_{i'}}^{(3)})^N \alpha_{I_3}^{(2)} \neq (r_1^{(3)})^N \alpha_1^{(2)} \quad \forall N \geq N_{I_{i'}}. \quad (7.52)$$

If there exist  $I_{i' < 3}$  such that  $r_{I_{i'}}^{(3)} \neq r_1^{(3)}$ , we set  $N_3 = \max_{i' < 3 \text{ s.t. } r_{I_{i'}}^{(3)} \neq r_1^{(3)}} N_{I_{i'}}$ , else we set  $N_3 = 1$ ,

Defining  $\prod_{i'=1}^3 (r_k^{(i')})^{N_{i'}} := \alpha_k^{(3)}$ , our choice for  $N_1, N_2, N_3$  implies that:

$$\alpha_{I_{k'}}^{(3)} \neq \alpha_1^{(3)}, \quad \forall k' \leq 3, \quad (7.53)$$

$$\alpha_{I_{k'}}^{(3)} = \alpha_1^{(3)}, \quad \forall k' > 3. \quad (7.54)$$

Continuing on in this manner, at the  $f'$ th step a choice of  $N_{i'}, i' = 1, \dots, f'$  exists such that:

$$\alpha_{I_{k'}}^{(f')} \neq \alpha_1^{(f')}, \quad \forall k' \leq f', \quad (7.55)$$

$$\alpha_{I_{k'}}^{(f')} = \alpha_1^{(f')}, \quad \forall k' > f'. \quad (7.56)$$

This procedure terminates at the  $m'$ th step and completes the proof.

## 7.4 Proof of Linear Independence: The case of a single Bra Set Label

As indicated towards the end of section 6.3, it is necessary for admissible Bra Set labels for basis states to satisfy additional properties beyond properties (i)-(iii) of section 3.2, for the proof of linear independence below to go through. We specify the additional properties as (iv) below. In order to do so we introduce some preliminary structures.

First, define the relation  $\approx$  between elements of  $B$  as follows. Let  $S_1, S_2 \in B$ . Then  $S_1 \approx S_2$  iff:

(a)  $V(S_1) = V(S_2)$  where  $V(S)$  is the set of vertices of  $S$ .

(b) For every  $v_\alpha \in V(S_1) \exists \epsilon_0^\alpha$  such that  $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0^\alpha$ ,  $B_\epsilon(v_\alpha) \cap S_1 = B_\epsilon(v_\alpha) \cap S_2$  where  $B_\epsilon(v) \cap S$  is the (in general) open spin network obtained by restricting  $S$  to the coordinate ball  $B_\epsilon(v)$  of size  $\epsilon$  about  $v$ .

Clearly, this definition does not depend on the choice of coordinates as  $\epsilon_0^\alpha$  can be arbitrarily small. It is straightforward to see that the fact that  $\epsilon_0^\alpha$  can be chosen arbitrarily small also implies that  $\approx$  is an equivalence relation. Denote the equivalence class of spin nets equivalent to  $S$  under  $\approx$  by  $[S]_B$  and call the set of these equivalence classes for all  $S$  as  $\mathcal{S}_B$ . Denote complex valued functions on this  $\mathcal{S}_B$  by calligraphic alphabets,  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S}_B \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , with the evaluation of  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $[S]_B \in \mathcal{S}_B$  denoted by  $\mathcal{F}([S]_B)$ . Similar to the off shell basis state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ , we define the state  $\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}$  (where as before, the bra set label  $B$  satisfies (i)-(iii) of section 3.2 and the metric label  $h$  is such that

$h \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ ) through its amplitudes on elements of  $B$ . Let  $B_\perp$  be set of spin nets which are orthogonal to every element of  $B$ . Then:

$$\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}(|s\rangle) := 0 \quad \text{if } s \in B_\perp, \quad (7.57)$$

$$= \mathcal{F}([s]_B)g_{s,h} \quad \text{if } s \in B, . \quad (7.58)$$

The action of the complex map can be extended to the finite linear span of spin nets by linearity to yield an element of the algebraic dual space and this map so extended defines the action of the distribution  $\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}$  on the finite linear span of spin nets. We note here that  $\mathcal{F}$  simply denotes a complex map on  $\mathcal{S}_B$ . Concrete examples of  $\mathcal{F}$  may require auxilliary constructs such as  $h$  dependent coordinate patches around vertices for its definition. Our considerations in this section are independent of the detailed choice of  $\mathcal{F}$ ; it is only necessary that  $\mathcal{F}$  be a well defined function on the space  $\mathcal{S}_B$  of equivalence classes  $[S]_B$ . For these considerations to be applicable to the kind of distributions encountered in sections 3, 4 and 6, this definition of  $\mathcal{F}$  must be general enough that those distributions are of the type  $\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}$ . We digress briefly to indicate that this is indeed the case.

The off shell basis state  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$  of section 3 has vanishing amplitudes for states in  $B_\perp$ . Its amplitude on a state  $S$  may be obtained by setting  $\mathcal{F}([S]_B) = \prod_{v \in V(S)} f(v)$ ;  $\mathcal{F}$  clearly only depends on the values of  $f$  at vertices of  $S$  and hence only on  $[S]_B$ . For an off shell state obtained by the first action of the Hamiltonian constraint (4.39) on  $\Psi_{B,f,h}$ , amplitudes on states in  $B_\perp$  vanish by virtue of (4.38) and the amplitude on a state in  $B$  is given by (4.39) with the  $\gamma$  factor set to the appropriate eigenvalue of the  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  operator (see section 3.4).  $\mathcal{F}$  is then obtained as the product over vertex contributions. Each such contribution is either an evaluation of  $f$  at a vertex of  $S$  or a sum over evaluations of directional derivatives of  $f$  along edge tangents at nondegenerate vertices of  $S$  weighted with the  $\hat{\lambda}_v$  eigenvalue at that vertex. The latter contributions clearly only depend on the coloring of edges at the vertex, the vertex intertwiner,<sup>27</sup> the behavior of  $f$  in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of this vertex and the unit edge tangents at the vertex normalized with respect to certain coordinates in this arbitrarily small neighborhood of the vertex (these coordinates happen to be the RNC's with respect to the metric  $h$ ). Thus this contribution too only depends on  $[S]_B$ . Similar comments hold for the action of the constraint product (4.70). In this case in the expression for the amplitude on a state  $S \in B$  there are also '2nd derivative' contributions but clearly these contributions also depend only  $[S]_B$ .

Next, for the purposes of section 7.6, we consider the action of diffeomorphisms on  $\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}$ . To this end note that given any diffeomorphism  $\phi$  and a pair of states  $S_1, S_2 \in B$ , we have that  $S_1 \approx S_2$  iff  $(S_1)_\phi \approx (S_2)_\phi$  where we have used  $S_\phi$  to denote the diffeomorphic image of  $S$  obtained by the action of the unitary operator  $\hat{U}(\phi)$  on  $S$  i.e.  $S_\phi := \hat{U}(\phi)S$ .<sup>28</sup> This follows from the fact that:

(a) <sub>$\phi$</sub>   $V((S_1)_\phi) = V((S_2)_\phi)$  iff (a) holds.

(b) <sub>$\phi$</sub>  The phrasing of (b) does not depend on choice of coordinates so that properties of  $S_1, S_2$  with respect to coordinate spheres in coordinates  $\{x\}$  are replicated by  $(S_1)_\phi, (S_2)_\phi$  with respect to the images of these spheres which are then coordinate spheres with respect to the push forward coordinates  $\phi^*\{x\}$ .

It follows that  $\phi$  induces a well defined map on the space  $\mathcal{S}_B$  of these equivalence classes of elements of  $B$  through

$$\phi([S]_B) := [S_\phi]_B \quad (7.59)$$

<sup>27</sup>Note the property of non-degeneracy depends on these edge colorings and this vertex intertwiner.

<sup>28</sup>Property (ii), Section 3.4.3 implies closure of  $B$  under the action of diffeomorphisms.

We have that:

$$(\phi_1(\phi_2([S]_B))) = \phi_1([\hat{U}(\phi_2)S]_B) = [\hat{U}(\phi_1)\hat{U}(\phi_2)S]_B = [S_{\phi_1 \circ \phi_2}]_B \quad (7.60)$$

so that the map provides a representation of the diffeomorphism group on  $\mathcal{S}_B$ . Equation (7.59) implies that we may define the function  $\mathcal{F}_\phi$  on  $\mathcal{S}_B$  by:

$$\mathcal{F}_\phi([S]_B) := \mathcal{F}([S_\phi]_B) \quad (7.61)$$

Next, recall that the dual action of  $\hat{U}(\phi)$  on  $\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}$  is defined through:

$$\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}(S) = \mathcal{F}([S_{\phi^{-1}}])g_h(S_{\phi^{-1}}), \quad \text{for } S \in B \quad (7.62)$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{for } S \in B_\perp \quad (7.63)$$

$$(7.64)$$

From (7.64), (7.61), (6.5),(6.6), (6.7), (7.59) and (7.60), it follows that:

$$\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h} = \Psi_{B,\mathcal{F}_{\phi^{-1},\phi^*h}} \quad (7.65)$$

$$\hat{U}(\phi_1)\hat{U}(\phi_2)\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h} = \hat{U}(\phi_1 \circ \phi_2)\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h} \quad (7.66)$$

This concludes our analysis of the action of diffeomorphisms on states of the form  $\Psi_{B,\mathcal{F},h}$ .

Next, we define some useful notation. Recall the set  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$  from equation (7.36). Let  $\mathbf{K}_0$  be a fixed set of points such that no  $p_i \in \mathbf{K}_0$ . Fix an equivalence class  $[S]_B$ . Let  $\bar{S}_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}})$  denote a spin net in  $[S]_B$  (assuming such a spin net exists) with Kink set  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}} \cup \mathbf{K}_0$  such that for fixed  $h$  and sufficiently small  $\{\epsilon_i\}$ , the elements of  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$  comprise the ‘closest kinks’ (see section 3.3)<sup>29</sup> so that:

$$g_{\bar{S}_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}), h} = g(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}, h)g(\mathbf{K}_0, h). \quad (7.67)$$

With these preliminaries in place we require that any Bra Set subject to (i)-(iii), section 3.2 is required to satisfy an extra condition which guarantees the existence of states of the type  $\bar{S}_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}})$ . The behavior of the interkink distance function for these states (see (7.67)) for sufficiently small  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  allows us to connect a statement of linear independence of basis off shell states with different metric labels to the Lemma proved in section 7.3 and thereby prove such a statement. The extra condition (iv)(a) is as follows.

**Condition (iv)(a):** For any  $S \in B$ , and for any choice of  $p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i$  and  $\delta_i > 0$  (such that  $1 - m_i\delta_i > 0$ ), there exists  $\mathbf{K}_0$  and a choice of  $\{x\}_i$  at  $p_i$ , such that for every small enough  $\{\epsilon_i\}$ ,  $B$  contains a state  $S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}) \in [S]_B$  where we have used the notation developed in the previous paragraph and where by small enough  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  we mean small enough that (7.67) holds.

In what follows we refer to (i)-(iii), section 3.2 and Condition (iv)(a) above simply as properties (i)-(iv)(a). We proceed to a statement of linear independence and its proof.

---

<sup>29</sup>Note that even if some or all of the  $p_i$  are in  $V(S)$ ,  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$  can be chosen so that its elements are non-coincident with elements of  $V(S)$  by virtue of the fact that the locations of the elements of  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$  are specified only upto certain orders of  $\epsilon$  (see section 7.1.1).

**Statement** Let  $\Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i} \neq 0$  be as defined in (7.57), (7.58) with  $B$  subject to properties (i)-(iv)(a),  $\{h_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  being distinct metric labels. Let  $a_i, i = 1, \dots, n$  denote complex numbers. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i} = 0 \Rightarrow a_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7.68)$$

**Proof:** Let  $S \in B$  such that

$$\mathcal{F}_1([S]_B) \neq 0. \quad (7.69)$$

(if no such  $S$  exists  $\Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_1, h_1} = 0$ ). Consider  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}}$  where  $\{N_{i'}\}$  are chosen exactly as in section 7.3. In particular we can choose  $p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}$  such that (7.41) is satisfied by virtue of the fact that  $h_i \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  and  $h_0$  has no conformal isometries. Define  $\alpha_k$  by

$$\alpha_k := \prod_{j'=1}^{m'} (r_k^{(j')})^{N_{j'}} \quad k = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7.70)$$

Property (iv)(a), guarantees the existence of  $S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}})$ . We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\vec{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} E(\vec{\epsilon}, \vec{N}) & \quad \Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i}(S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}})) \\ & = \mathcal{F}_i([S]_B)g(\mathbf{K}_0, h)\alpha_i \end{aligned} \quad (7.71)$$

where we used (7.40) in (7.71). Next we impose the left hand side of (7.68):

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i} = 0. \quad (7.72)$$

Evaluating the amplitude of (7.72) for  $S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}})$  implies that:

$$\sum_i a'_i \alpha_i = 0, \quad ; a'_i := a_i \mathcal{F}_i([S]_B)g(\mathbf{K}_0, h) \quad (7.73)$$

Replacing  $N_{i'}$  by  $\Lambda N_{i'}$  with  $\Lambda$  a positive integer and repeating these considerations then yields:

$$\sum_i a'_i (\alpha_i)^\Lambda = 0. \quad (7.74)$$

Let the set of  $\bar{n}$  distinct values of  $\alpha_i$  be  $\{\beta_{\bar{i}}, \bar{i} = 1, \dots, \bar{n}\}$  and let  $\bar{i}$  run over the index values in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  for which  $\alpha_{\bar{i}} = \beta_{\bar{i}}$ . Setting, for fixed  $\bar{i}$ ,

$$\sum_{\bar{i}} a'_{\bar{i}} =: b_{\bar{i}}, \quad (7.75)$$

equation (7.74) can be written as:

$$\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^{\bar{n}} b_{\bar{i}} (\beta_{\bar{i}})^\Lambda = 0. \quad (7.76)$$

Renumbering the summands so that  $b_{\bar{i}} =: b'_{j'}$ ,  $\beta_{\bar{i}} = \beta'_{j'}$  with  $\beta'_{j'} > \beta'_{i'}$  iff  $j' < i'$ , we have that  $\beta'_1$  is the largest value of  $\alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ . Suppose that  $\beta'_{m'} = \alpha_1$  for some  $m'$ . Then (7.43) implies that  $b'_{m'} = a'_1$ . Equation (7.76) takes the form

$$\sum_{i'=1}^{\bar{n}} b'_{i'} (\beta'_{i'})^\Lambda = 0. \quad (7.77)$$

Dividing (7.77) by  $\beta'_1$  and taking the  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$  limits yields  $b'_1 = 0$ . Substituting this into (7.77) yields

$$\sum_{\bar{i}'=2}^{\bar{n}} b'_{\bar{i}'} (\beta'_{\bar{i}'})^\Lambda = 0. \quad (7.78)$$

Iterating this procedure  $\bar{m}'$  times implies  $b'_{\bar{m}'} = a'_1 = 0$ , which together with (7.69),(7.73) implies that  $a_1 = 0$ .

Iterating this whole procedure starting (7.72) with  $a_1 = 0$ , we obtain  $a_2 = 0$  and after  $n$  iterations, we have  $a_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, n$  which proves the statement.

## 7.5 Proof of Linear Independence: The case of arbitrary Bra Set Labels

Let  $\Psi_{h_{\hat{\rho}}}$  be a finite linear combination of (non-trivial) off shell basis states with, in general, distinct Bra Set labels but with the same metric label  $h_{\hat{\rho}}$  i.e.

$$\Psi_{h_{\hat{\rho}}} := \sum_{i_{\hat{\rho}}=1}^{\hat{n}_{\hat{\rho}}} c_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})} \Psi_{B_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})}, \mathcal{F}_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})}, h_{\hat{\rho}}} \quad (7.79)$$

where  $c_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})}$  are fixed complex coefficients.

In order to prove the statement of linear independence below for superpositions of states with distinct Bra Set labels we need a further property (iv)(b) of permissible Bra Set labels beyond (iv)(a), section 7.4:

**Condition (iv)(b):** Consider two distinct Bra Sets  $B_1, B_2$  each satisfying (i)-(iv)(a). Let  $S \in B_1$  and let the family of states  $S_{\mathbf{K}_{0,[S]B_1}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}) \in B_1$  for all parameter specifications  $\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}$  described in (iv)(a). Then for sufficiently small  $\{\epsilon_i\}$ , either all of  $S, S_{\mathbf{K}_{0,[S]B_1}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}})$  are elements of  $B_2$  or none of  $S, S_{\mathbf{K}_{0,[S]B_1}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}})$  are in  $B_2$ .

**Statement** Let  $\Psi_{h_{\hat{\rho}}} \neq 0$  be as defined in (7.79) with  $\{h_{\hat{\rho}}, \hat{\rho} = 1, \dots, n\}$  being distinct metric labels. Let  $a_{\hat{\rho}}, \hat{\rho} = 1, \dots, n$  denote complex numbers. Then

$$\sum_{\hat{\rho}=1}^n a_{\hat{\rho}} \Psi_{h_{\hat{\rho}}} = 0 \Rightarrow a_{\hat{\rho}} = 0, \hat{\rho} = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7.80)$$

**Proof:** Since we are given the distinct metrics  $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n$ , we can fix the data

$\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i' = 1, \dots, m'\}$  and for each datum we have the Kink Set

$\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}}$  exactly as in section 7.2. Let  $S \in \cup_{i_1} B_{i_1}^{(1)}$  be such that  $\Psi_{h_1}(S) \neq 0$ ; if such an (asymmetric spin net basis element (see (i), section 3.2))  $S$  did not exist then  $\Psi_{h_1}$  would be trivial. This means that there exists some fixed value of  $i_1 = j$  such that  $S \in B_j^{(1)}$ .

Property (iv)(a) then implies that  $S_{\mathbf{K}_{0,[S]B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}}) \in B_j^{(1)}$  for all parameter specifications detailed in (iv)(a).

Define the set  $\mathcal{I}_{\bar{S}}^{(\hat{\rho})}$  to be the set of values of the index  $i_{\hat{\rho}}$  for which  $\bar{S} \in B_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})}$ . From (iv)(a,b) we have that:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\bar{S}}^{(\hat{\rho})} = \mathcal{I}_{S_{\mathbf{K}_{0,[S]B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}})}^{(\hat{\rho})} \quad (7.81)$$

From (7.79) we have that:

$$\Psi_{h_1}(S) = \left( \sum_{i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_S^{(1)}} c_{i_1}^{(1)} \mathcal{F}_{i_1}^{(1)}([S]_{B_{i_1}^{(1)}}) \right) g_{S, h_1}, \quad (7.82)$$

From (7.79) and (7.81) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{h_1}(S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\})) \\ &= \left( \sum_{i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_{S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}}^{(1)}} \mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\}} \right) \\ & c_{i_1}^{(1)} \mathcal{F}_{i_1}^{(1)}([S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\})]_{B_{i_1}^{(1)}}) \\ & g(\mathbf{K}_0, h_1) g(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\}}, h_1) \\ &= \left( \sum_{i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_S^{(1)}} c_{i_1}^{(1)} \mathcal{F}_{i_1}^{(1)}([S]_{B_{i_1}^{(1)}}) \right) g(\mathbf{K}_0, h_1) g(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\}}, h_1) \end{aligned} \quad (7.83)$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that since  $S, S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\}) \in [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}$ , it must be the case from (7.81) that for all  $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_S^{(1)}$ , we have that  $S, S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\}) \in [S]_{B_{i_1}^{(1)}}$ .

Equations (7.82), (7.83) together with the fact that  $\Psi_1(S) \neq 0$  implies that:

$$\Psi_{h_1}(S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\})) \neq 0. \quad (7.84)$$

It is then straightforward to check that the proof proceeds identically to that in section 7.4 above with the substitutions in that proof of:

$$i \rightarrow \hat{\rho} \quad (7.85)$$

$$\Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i}(S) \rightarrow \Psi_{h_{\hat{\rho}}}(S). \quad (7.86)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\vec{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} E(\vec{\epsilon}, \vec{N}) \Psi_{B, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i}(S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_B}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\})) \\ &= \mathcal{F}_i([S]_B) g(\mathbf{K}_0, h_i) \alpha_i \\ & \rightarrow \lim_{\vec{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0} E(\vec{\epsilon}, \vec{N}) \Psi_{h_{\hat{\rho}}}(S_{\mathbf{K}_0, [S]_{B_j^{(1)}}}(\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\})) \end{aligned} \quad (7.87)$$

$$= \left( \sum_{i_{\hat{\rho}} \in \mathcal{I}_S^{(\hat{\rho})}} c_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})} \mathcal{F}_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})}([S]_{B_{i_{\hat{\rho}}}^{(\hat{\rho})}}) \right) g(\mathbf{K}_0, h_{\hat{\rho}}) \alpha_{\hat{\rho}} \quad (7.88)$$

where as indicated above, the kink set  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_{i'}, \epsilon_{i'}, p_{i'}, u_{i'}, v_{i'}, N_{i'}, \delta_{i'}(N_{i'}), i'=1, \dots, m'\}\}}$  is defined so that the Lemma of section 7.3 applies with respect to the set of metric labels  $\{h_{\hat{\rho}}\}$ . In particular, we first show that  $a_{\hat{\rho}=1}$  vanishes and then through reiteration that  $\{a_{\hat{\rho}} = 0, \hat{\rho} = 2, \dots, n\}$ .

Q.E.D

Let  $\mathcal{L}_h$  be the finite linear span of states, each of the form  $\Psi_{B_i, \mathcal{F}_i, h}$ , for the same metric label  $h$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the finite linear span of states each of the form  $\Psi_{B_i, \mathcal{F}_i, h_i}$  where the metric labels  $h_i$  are not necessarily the same for all  $i$ . It follows from the above statement of linear independence that any element of  $\mathcal{L}_h$  cannot admit a decomposition into a finite set  $\mathcal{S}$  of basis states in which any element of the set  $\mathcal{S}$  which is labelled by a metric label distinct from  $h$  contributes non-trivially. This implies that any element of the finite span  $\mathcal{L}$  can be *uniquely* written as a finite linear combination of states

$\Psi_{h_\alpha} \in \mathcal{L}_{h_\alpha}$ . Since the dual constraint action on each such  $\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  employs the RNC's associated with  $h_\alpha$  it follows that this dual constraint action is unambiguous on  $\mathcal{L}$ .

It then follows that we can express the contents of section 4 in terms of continuum limit operator actions on domains as follows. Consider the linear span  $\mathcal{L}$  defined above. Within this define the finite linear span  $\mathcal{L}^0$  of basis states for which  $\mathcal{F}$  is determined by a  $C^r$  function  $f$  through (3.11) on  $\Sigma$ , and the finite linear span,  $\mathcal{L}^I$ , of states for which  $\mathcal{F}$  is of the form corresponding to the action of a single continuum limit Hamiltonian constraint (4.39) (see section 7.4 for a discussion on how the constraint action yields functions of the form  $\mathcal{F}$ ). Then referring to the continuum limit Hamiltonian constraint with lapse  $M$  as  $\hat{H}(M)$  we may rephrase the results of sections 4, 5 and 6 as follows. Define  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{L}^0 \cup \mathcal{L}^I$  and  $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{L}^0$ . Then  $\hat{H}(M) : \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  and  $\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N) : \mathcal{D}_0 \subset \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ , the latter action leading to anomaly free commutators.

## 7.6 Inclusion of Physical states

The results of the previous section pertained to the finite span of off shell states. Here we extend these results to the vector space sum of this finite span and the vector space of physical states. The following Lemma plays a key role in this extension.

**Lemma:** Given a finite set of metrics  $M = \{h_\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $M \subset \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ , there exists a diffeomorphism  $\psi$  such that  $\psi(M) \cap M = \emptyset$  where  $\psi(M) = \{\psi^*h_\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, n\}$ .

**Proof:** Recall that the elements of  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  have no (conformal) symmetries and are diffeomorphic images of each other. It follows straightforwardly from this fact that given  $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there exists a unique diffeomorphism  $\phi_\alpha^{(\beta)}$  such that  $h_\alpha = (\phi_\alpha^{(\beta)})^*h_\beta$ . Let  $L_\beta = \{\phi_\alpha^{(\beta)}, \alpha = 1, \dots, n\}$ . It then also follows from this uniqueness that for fixed  $\beta$ , any diffeomorphism  $\psi_\beta \notin L_\beta$  we have that

$$\psi_\beta^*h_\beta \notin M \quad (7.89)$$

Let  $L := \cup_{\beta=1}^n L_\beta$ . Equation (7.89) implies that for any diffeomorphism  $\psi \notin L$ , we have that:

$$\psi^*h_\alpha \notin M \forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (7.90)$$

which proves the Lemma.

Next consider a state  $\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  of the form (7.79). From the definition of the dual action of  $\hat{U}(\phi)$  it follows that the amplitude of the state  $\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  on a spin net  $S$  is the same as the amplitude of the state  $\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  on  $S_{\phi^{-1}}$  so that non-triviality of the former implies non-triviality of the latter. This, in turn, yields the implication:

$$\Psi_{h_\alpha} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{h_\alpha} \neq 0 \quad (7.91)$$

The explicit action of  $\hat{U}_\phi$  on  $\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  for any diffeomorphism  $\phi$  may be computed from (7.79) and (7.65). We obtain:

$$\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{h_\alpha} = \sum_{i_\alpha=1}^{n_\alpha} c_{i_\alpha} \Psi_{B_{i_\alpha}, (\mathcal{F}_{i_\alpha})_{\phi^{-1}, \phi^*(h_\alpha)}}. \quad (7.92)$$

The form of above expression implies that the metric label of the state  $\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  is  $\phi^*(h_\alpha)$ . To emphasise this fact we denote  $\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  by  $\Psi_{\phi^*(h_\alpha)}^{(\phi)}$ ; this notation will prove useful below.

Next we prove the following statement:

**Statement** Let  $\Psi_{h_\alpha} \neq 0$  be as defined in (7.79) with  $\{h_\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, n\}$  being distinct metric labels. Let  $a_\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, n, b$  denote complex numbers. Let  $\Psi$  be a diffeomorphism invariant state. Then

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha \Psi_{h_\alpha} + b\Psi = 0 \Rightarrow a_\alpha = 0, i = 1, \dots, n, b = 0. \quad (7.93)$$

**Proof:** Let the diffeomorphism  $\psi$  be chosen as in the Lemma above so that (7.90) holds. Denote the unitary operator corresponding to  $\psi$  by  $\hat{U}_\psi$ . The action of  $\hat{U}_\psi$  on the condition

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha \Psi_{h_\alpha} + b\Psi = 0 \quad (7.94)$$

yields:

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha \Psi_{\psi^* h_\alpha}^{(\psi)} + b\Psi = 0 \quad (7.95)$$

where we have used the diffeomorphism invariance of  $\Psi$  and the notation introduced above. Subtracting (7.95) from (7.94) yields:

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha \Psi_{h_\alpha} - \sum_{\alpha=1}^n a_\alpha \Psi_{\psi^* h_\alpha}^{(\psi)} = 0. \quad (7.96)$$

Equations (7.90), (7.91) together with the results of section 7.5 ( see the Statement therein) imply that

$$a_\alpha = 0, \text{ for } \alpha = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7.97)$$

Equation (7.97) then implies that  $b = 0$  in the linear independence condition in (7.93), thus proving the Statement.

Next, note that any physical state must be diffeomorphism invariant so that the (7.93) holds. Further any physical state is annihilated by the Hamiltonian constraint. From these facts together with the operator domain based rephrasing of constraint actions at the end of section 5.16, it is immediate that this rephrasing can be extended to accomodate physical states as follows.

Let  $\mathcal{L}_h, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^0, \mathcal{L}^I$  be as in section 5.16. Let the vector space of physical states be  $V_{phys}$  with  $V_{phys}$  being a subset of the algebraic dual space to the finite span of spin network states. Let  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} \oplus V_{phys}$ . Any element of  $\mathcal{L}'$  can be *uniquely* written as a finite linear combination of states  $\Psi_{h_\alpha} \in \mathcal{L}_{h_\alpha}$  together with an element of  $V_{phys}$ . Since the dual constraint action on each such  $\Psi_{h_\alpha}$  employs the RNC's associated with  $h_\alpha$  and since the dual constraint action kills elements of  $V_{phys}$ , it follows that this dual constraint action is unambiguous on  $\mathcal{L}'$ . Define  $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{L}^0 \oplus \mathcal{L}^I \oplus V_{phys}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'_0 := \mathcal{L}^0 \oplus V_{phys}$ . Then  $\hat{H}(M) : \mathcal{D}' \subset \mathcal{L}' \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'$  and  $\hat{H}(M)\hat{H}(N) : \mathcal{D}'_0 \subset \mathcal{D}' \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'$ , the latter action leading to anomaly free commutators.

Note that in the above phrasing we have defined physical states as diffeomorphism invariant states annihilated by the constraint action. Since the constraint action is defined through a continuum limit of finite approximants and since each of these approximants rely on RNCs associated with some metric  $h, h \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ , the question arises as to which  $h$  to use in defining the action of the constraint on physical states. We could arbitrarily choose some such  $h$ , fix it once and for all and demand that physical states be diffeomorphism invariant and killed by the constraint action regulated with respect to this fixed  $h$  without affecting any of the statements made hitherto. However, the physical state space would then be expected to carry an imprint of this choice of  $h$ . Hence as

in [2] we shall define a physical state  $\Psi$  to be a diffeomorphism state which is annihilated by the continuum limit actions of the  $h$ - dependent regulated Hamiltonian constraint *for all*  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  i.e.  $\Psi \in V_{phys}$  iff:

$$\hat{U}(\phi)\Psi = \Psi \text{ for all semianalytic diffeomorphisms } \phi \quad (7.98)$$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi(\hat{H}_\epsilon(M)|s) = 0 \quad \forall M, |s\rangle \quad (7.99)$$

where (7.99) holds for the regulated actions  $\hat{H}_\epsilon(M)$  with respect to all choices of regulating metrics  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ . We discuss this definition and related issues in section 9.1.

## 7.7 Discussion of Property (iv)

With regard to the satisfaction of property (iv) there are two possibilities. The first is that property (iv) is a consequence of the properties detailed in section 3.2. The second possibility is that property (iv) is independent of these properties so that permissible Bra Sets need to be suitably enlarged so as to satisfy property (iv) in addition to (i)-(iii) of section 3.2. We shall first discuss how property (iv) may follow from (i)-(iii) and then discuss a specific enlargement of permissible Bra Sets which accomodates property (iv).

Let  $B$  be subject to (i)-(iii) section 3.2 and let  $S \in B$ . Property (ii) section 3.2 implies that we can move the kinks in  $S$  ever so slightly so as to avoid any given set of points  $\{p_i\}$  and still remain in  $B$ . Call the resulting spin network  $S' \in B$ . Let  $\mathbf{K}_0$  be the kink set of  $S'$ . Repeated action of the constraint at the vertices of  $S'$  creates ‘diffeomorphism’ type children with a nest around each vertex of an ever increasing number of kink triplets. Using diffeomorphisms of the type discussed in Appendix D, together with path connectedness of  $\Sigma$  we conjecture that it should be possible to move these kinks around to other locations in  $\Sigma$  without moving the vertices of  $S'$ . This together with any other deformations which preserve property (ii), section 3.2 suggests that we may be able move these triples to appropriate locations and deform the graph structure while remaining in  $B$  so as to yield the kink set  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$  and satisfy property (iv)(a) with property (iii) section 3.2 enforcing property (iv)(b). We leave the fleshing out of these ideas into a putative proof that (iv) follows from (i)-(iii) for future work.

In the event that (iv) does not follow from (i)-(iii), a detailed specification of a rich collection of Bra Sets which satisfy properties (i) to (iv) is as follows. The arguments at the end of section 3.2 show that properties (i)-(iii) hold if we choose as our Bra Set, the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d}$  defined in 9, section 3.1, with  $\gamma_{0c}, d$  chosen so that:

- (a) All vertices of valence greater than 3 are embedded as GR vertices.
- (b) Any vertex of valence 3 is embedded either as GR vertex or as a trivalent kink.

Consider as Bra Sets, the family of sets  $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d}\}$  for all for all (i.e. non-isomorphic) choices of  $\gamma_{0c}$  and, for each fixed  $\gamma_{0c}$ , all distinct choices of  $d$  subject to (a),(b). We now show that this family of sets satisfies property (iv).

First recall that the elements of each  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d}$  with fixed  $\gamma_{0c}, d$  are orthogonal to each other. Second note that any element of  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d_1}$  is orthogonal to any element of  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d_2}$  if the decorations  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are distinct. Finally, note that the elements of the sets  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d_1}^{(1)}, \mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d_2}^{(2)}$  based on non-isomorphic asymmetric colored graphs  $\gamma_{0c}^{(1)}, \gamma_{0c}^{(2)}$  are also orthogonal to each other. This orthogonality implies that (iv)(b) is automatically satisfied as Bra Sets are either identical or have no overlap. It remains to show that (iv)(a) holds.

Consider one of the elements  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d}$  of the family of sets  $\mathcal{E}$ . Clearly for any  $S \in \mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d}$  there exists a spin net  $S' \in \mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c}, d}$  such that  $S'$  is obtained by:

(1) removing all  $C^0$  loops from  $S$ , (2) moving the kinks in the remaining non-loop component of  $S$  ever so slightly so as to avoid the coincidence with any element of a given set of a finite number of points  $\{p_i\}$  without changing the embeddable abstract spin network which embeds to  $S$ .<sup>30</sup> Next consider the set  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$ ;  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\{x\}_i, \epsilon_i, p_i, u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i(m_i)\}}$  is a finite set of distinct points with locations specified approximately (i.e. upto a certain order in the small parameters  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  (see section 7)) and which can therefore be arranged not to intersect  $S'$ . Next, from the specification of the positions of the elements of this set, it is straightforward to see that for small enough  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  the 3 point sets in the  $i$ th nest each lie in distinct (coordinate) spherical shells around  $p_i$ . The larger the interpoint distance the larger the radii of the inner and outer boundaries of the shell containing the 3 point set. It is clearly possible to connect the 3 points in the shell by a single piecewise analytic (with respect to  $\{x\}_i$ ) loop with bivalent  $C^0$  kinks at these points such that this loop does not intersect  $S'$  and such that this loop is confined to the shell. Using the techniques of  $C^k$  joins we may smoothen this curve in a  $C^r$  manner at all points of non-analyticity other than these 3. Finally, it is straightforward to see that with a slight modification of the smoothening procedure outlined in Appendix B.3 we can smoothen one of these points to a  $C^1$  kink and the other to  $C^2$  kink. In this manner for all small enough  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  we obtain a set of non-intersecting loops one for each 3 point set in each nest. Let there be a total of  $m$  such loops. Number them arbitrarily from 1, .. $m$ , color the  $j$ th loop so numbered by the spin  $j$  and adjoin them to  $S'$  to obtain a spin network which is an embedding of its abstract decorated counterpart on  $\gamma_{m,c,d}$  (see 9, section 3.1). The state so obtained is clearly in  $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_{0c,d}}$  and is the desired state specified by (iv)(a) so that (iv)(a) holds.

## 8 Assorted Technicalities

(i) Loop Areas in the GR case: As noted in section 2.1, control over areas of the loops  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  is required to obtain the desired numerical factors for various terms in the constraint action. As outlined in section 2.3.1, the desired areas for the Hamiltonian constraint action can be obtained by adjusting the initial kink positions prior to their movement and/or smoothening. As can be seen in Appendix B, kink movement, kink smoothening and upward conicality can be implemented with arbitrarily small change in these areas by choosing the supports of the various compactly supported functions encountered to be arbitrarily small. As outlined in the latter part of Appendix D.2, the desired loop areas generated by the action of the quantum correspondent  $\hat{O}(M, N)$  of the Hamiltonian constraint Poisson bracket can be obtained through the action of the diffeomorphisms constructed therein by a suitable choice of supports of the compactly supported functions and the iteration numbers  $N_\lambda$  which define these diffeomorphisms. The arguments provided, in our opinion, suffice at a physicists level of rigor to show that that prescribed areas can be plausibly obtained. However it would be desirable to develop an explicit demonstration that this possible. On the other hand as discussed above, prescribed loop areas *can* be obtained for the Hamiltonian constraint without recourse to the constructions of section D. Hence, it is possible to leave the loop areas in section 5 unchanged and instead alter those associated with the Hamiltonian constraint so as to achieve anomaly freedom. More in detail, let us alter the loop areas in the constraint action (2.15) by choosing  $a_{I_v}, b_{I_v}$  in (2.14) as follows (here we have used obvious notation in augmenting the edge index by the vertex subscript  $v$ ). We retain the same relation between  $a_{I_v}, b_{I_v}$  as before so that  $b_{I_v} = \frac{4}{3}(N-1)a_{I_v}$  and set  $a_{I_v} = d_{I_v}j_{I_v}(j_{I_v} + 1)$  in (2.14) (instead of  $a_{I_v} = j_{I_v}(j_{I_v} + 1)$ ), with  $d_{I_v}$  some constant. It is then straightforward to verify that the single and product constraint actions are still well defined in the continuum limit and that we obtain anomaly free commutators *without*

---

<sup>30</sup>This can be done by the action of diffeomorphisms each of which is identity outside an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the kink to be moved (see Appendix D for the construction of such diffeomorphisms).

changing the loop areas in section 5 (i.e. we set  $c_{I_v} = 1$  there instead of as in (5.54)) if we choose  $d_{I_v}$  as

$$d_{I_v} := \frac{\sqrt{128 \sum_{J_v=1}^{N_v} j_{J_v} (j_{J_v} + 1)}}{128 j_{I_v} (j_{I_v} + 1)} \quad (8.1)$$

Finally, modulo our comments above, note that even for the Hamiltonian constraint action, deformations (including those of displaced vertex movement, kink movement and cone stiffening) at different values of regulator parameter consistent with desired loop areas can be related by the action of diffeomorphisms as discussed in Appendix D.

(ii) Choice of Constraint Action in the NGR case:

(a) The constraint action is assumed, without derivation, to be of the general form (2.29). Here we show how a particular case of this general form can be derived using the considerations of [2]. The derivation of the ‘one edge at a time’ action of section 3 of [2] holds for NGR vertices  $v$ . In that derivation the curvature contribution from an edge  $e_J$  is taken to be proportional to the area of the small loop  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  [2], and, with a natural visualization of the map  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$ , this area is of  $O(\epsilon^3)$  for edges whose tangents at  $v$  are collinear with the tangent of the  $I$ th edge at  $v$ . This is a subleading contribution and so in the heuristic argumentation underlying the derivation of [2], we may drop such contributions. Thus we need to deform only those edges ‘one at time’ which have tangents at  $v$  which are non-collinear with tangent of the  $I$ th edge at  $v$ .

It remains to provide a ‘routing’ for such a deformation such that the deformed edge does not intersect any of the other undeformed edges except the  $I$ th one at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . Given such a routing prescription, we shall take the view that  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  can be identified *a posteriori* as a deformation map which implements this routing. One possibility may be to take recourse to the routing prescription for ‘extraordinary’ edges developed in Lemma 3.1 of [5]; however the detailed prescription relies on *analyticity* of edges whereas the edges of interest here are semianalytic. Instead we adopt the following routing procedure, which suitably adapts the procedure for the GR case described in Appendix B.1. In a small enough neighborhood  $U_{I,v}$  of  $v$ , we use the coordinate patch  $\{x\}_I$  and identify the kink locations  $\tilde{v}_J$  as desired on the edges of interest. Note that for small enough  $U_{I,v}$  the edges emanating from  $v$  outside of  $v$  are *analytic* in  $\{x\}_I$ .

An explicit way to locate the kinks  $\tilde{v}_J$  based on a visualization of  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  close to that of the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  of Appendix D.2 is to locate them at the intersection of  $e_J$  with the boundary of a coordinate sphere of radius of  $O(\epsilon)$  (with  $\epsilon$  small enough that this ball lies well within  $U_{I,v}$ ), this radius being such that  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is located at the intersection of the boundary of this sphere with  $e_I$  at a geodesic distance  $\epsilon$  from  $v$ . Connect these kinks so located to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  exactly as in Appendix B.1 through the straight lines  $\{l_J\}$ . Since the lines  $\{l_J\}$  are analytic in this chart and since the undeformed edges are also analytic outside  $v$  (see above), it is straightforward to see that the geometry of this configuration of lines and edges is such that:

- (1) No 2 lines intersect each other.
- (2) Since the line  $l_J$  joins  $\tilde{v}_J$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  only for those edges  $e_J$  which have tangents at  $v$  which are non-collinear with that of  $e_I$ , there exists a small enough open ball  $B$  around  $p$  such that these lines do not pass through  $B$
- (3) Analyticity of the edges away from  $v$  together with analyticity of the lines imply that the collection of intersections of  $\{l_K\}$  with  $\{e_J\}$  are isolated points away from  $v$ .

In the neighborhood of any such point we can slightly deform the relevant straight lines by ‘lifting’ them off the point of intersection one at a time either (1) by the action of a suitable diffeomorphism on the line to be ‘lifted’, of the type constructed in Appendix D.1 (which is identity outside an arbitrarily small compact set around this point), or, (2) through the replacement of a

small segment of this line containing the intersection point by a pair of segments which meet each other away from the intersection point in a kink, and with each segment meeting the remaining part of the line also at a kink, followed by smoothening these 3 kinks using the techniques of Appendix B.1.

Finally, we move the kinks  $\tilde{v}_J$  to their desired positions  $O(\epsilon^q)$  away from  $v$  using either appropriate diffeomorphisms supported in small cylindrical neighborhoods around these edges as in Appendix D.3 or through the  $C^r$  join techniques of Appendix B.2. Note that for small enough cylindrical neighborhoods in the former approach or small enough  $\delta_1$  in the latter, no other edge presents itself in the region of interest <sup>31</sup> so that there is no obstruction to the application of these techniques.

To summarise  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  is chosen to be identity on edges which have collinear tangents with that of  $e_I$  at  $v$  and deforms the remaining edges as above and thereby defines the ‘one edge at a time’ deformation. Accordingly in (2.29) we set  $B = A_I = 0, I = 1, \dots, N$  and define  $P_{\alpha_{IJ}}$  for the edges  $\{e_J\}$  through equation (3.24) of [2] with  $P_{\alpha_{IK}} = 0$  for those edges  $\{e_K\}$  which have edge tangents collinear with that of  $e_I$  at  $v$ .

(b) Based on preliminary results we anticipate that with further work it should be possible to also obtain an NGR vertex analog of the ‘Mixed Action’ for GR vertices used in this work with deformations of edges  $\{e_K\}$  with tangents collinear with that of  $e_I$  at  $v$  involving loops  $l_{IK,\epsilon}$  of areas subleading to  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$ . We leave this for future work.

(iii) An Important Technicality with regard to Semianalytic Structures: Semianalytic structures (manifolds, diffeomorphisms, hypersurfaces) play a key role in the present foundations of LQG and ensure the uniqueness of its kinematics [25]. It is not clear to us if the notion of semianalyticity has a natural and useful extension to *differential* geometric structures such as vector fields and metrics, the reason being that we are unable to demonstrate that semianalyticity of components in a semianalytic chart is invariant under change of chart due to the occurrence of Jacobian factors. Related to this, is our inability to articulate ‘the generation of semianalytic diffeomorphisms from semianalytic vector fields’ as a well defined statement due to the possible ill definedness of the semianalyticity of vector fields. Indeed, it is precisely in order to circumvent this putative obstruction that we have taken recourse to the constructions of Appendix D. An investigation into a possible natural and useful extension of the concept of semianalyticity to differential geometric structures and the establishing of the precise nature of vector field generators of semianalytic diffeomorphisms constitutes an important task for the future.

## 9 Concluding Remarks

### 9.1 Physical States and the issue of Regulator Dependence

As noted in section 7.6, the constraint action is defined through a continuum limit of finite approximants which rely on their construction on some  $h \in \mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ , raising the question as to which

---

<sup>31</sup>In a small enough neighborhood  $U_{J,v}$  of  $v$ , we may choose coordinates  $\{x\}_J$  so that  $e_J$  is along the  $z$  axis. The cylindrical neighborhood  $C_{\delta^m}$  of interest is of radius  $\delta^m, m \geq 1, \delta \ll \epsilon$  around the  $z$  axis,  $v \notin \bar{C}_{\delta^m}$ . Clearly  $\bar{C}_{\delta^m} \subset \bar{C}_{\delta} \forall m > 1$ . The  $x, y$  coordinates of any edge  $e_{K \neq J}$  are  $C^r$  functions  $x(t_K), y(t_K)$  of the parameter  $t_K$  along  $e_K$ . Let  $e_K$  intersect the cylindrical neighborhood  $C_{\delta^m}$  of interest for arbitrary large  $m$ , at parameter  $t_K^m$ . Since  $d(t_K) = (x(t_K))^2 + (y(t_K))^2$  is a continuous function of  $t_K$ , compactness of  $e_K \cap \bar{C}_{\delta}$  and the convergence of the sequence  $d(t_K^m)$  to zero implies that  $d(t_K)$  attains its infimum of zero on  $e_K \cap \bar{C}_{\delta}$  which in turn implies that  $e_K$  intersects  $e_J$  outside of  $v$  which is not the case.

particular  $h$  to use in defining action of the constraint on physical states. While an arbitrary choice does not create any inconsistency, it does raise the issue of whether the physical state space then carries an imprint of this choice. It is quite plausible to us that with enough care, we could arrange for the state deformations, generated by constraint actions defined using different elements of  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$ , to be related by diffeomorphisms given that  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  is the space of metrics diffeomorphic to  $h_0$ . In such a case, while the diffeomorphism invariance of physical states may wash away most imprints of any individual choice of  $h$ , it may still be the case that the physical state space carries an imprint of the diffeomorphism class of metrics  $\mathcal{H}_{h_0}$  and one may enquire as to whether the physical state space would change if we employed a different diffeomorphism class of metrics. Such a dependence on regulating structure conflicts with the spirit of background independence and may conceivably result in a similar unphysical dependence for the emergent classical theory. Hence we propose that physical states should be defined to be those states which are annihilated by the constraint for all choices of metric regulating structure.

In this regard note that the Bra Sets underlying the *off shell* (as opposed to physical) states do not change with change in regulating metric due to the role of abstract structures in their definition (see section 4.4 for related discussion). An obvious question is whether an appropriate recourse to abstract structures may remove any dependence of physical states on regulating metrics. For example, given the space of states annihilated by the constraint action defined with respect to some metric  $h$ , one may restrict attention to only those states for which the coefficients of their bra summands have the same value for *all* bra states which are embeddings of the same decorated abstract spin network. Note that the decorations we have defined in section 3.1 correspond to a specification of differential structure properties of edges at vertices; no global features such as knotting are specified. As a result, any solution of interest with a certain bra summand  $s$  would have to admit all possible knotted embeddings of the decorated abstract spin network which embeds to  $s$ . Since the constraint action, at least on GR vertices, does not create non-trivially knotted deformation structures, it could be the case that the restricted class of solutions is then too small. In this regard, note that the absence of non-trivial knotting of deformation structures at GR vertices remains true *irrespective* of the specific metric used; <sup>32</sup> hence it may be appropriate to enlarge the kind of decorations considered to include more global features such as knotting (and lack thereof) and then look for an appropriately restricted class of solutions which is specified by unknotted deformations at GR vertices. Indeed in practice, for example see [13] for a class of solutions to Thiemann's QSD constraint [5], we expect that solutions are built mainly with regard to their abstract connectivity and absence of knotted deformation structure. In this regard a more 'abstract' graph based physical solution space seems appealing from the viewpoint (and hope) that the fundamental quantum gravitational structures are not embedded and that their appearance as embedded structures in a manifold is emergent. We leave a detailed investigation of the structure of physical states and their possible independence from regulating metrics for future work.

## 9.2 Choice of Anomaly Free Action, Physical States and Propagation

In this work we have provided a detailed demonstration of nontrivial anomaly free constraint commutators in vacuum Euclidean LQG for the specific choice of constraint action (2.34). This action is completely specified on GR vertices by the first two lines of (2.34) and is left partially unspecified on NGR vertices in the third line. We anticipate that similar demonstrations exist for a more general and equally valid choice of constraint actions for Euclidean LQG, the common

---

<sup>32</sup>As we shall see in section 9.2, it may be possible to define solutions based only on deformations of GR vertices through an appropriate choice of kink differentiability.

feature of these choices being that the graph deformations they generate have at their core the finite transformations  $\phi_{I,\epsilon}$  generated by the Electric Shift.

These generalizations rely on changes in the size of the loops  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  and the placement and choice of type of kinks as follows. First note that the factor of  $\frac{1}{4}$  in the first line of (2.34) arises from the specific choice of  $a_I, b_I$  outlined immediately after (2.14), the freedom in this choice arising from the choice of size of the loops  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$ . We anticipate that alternate choices of  $a_I, b_I$  which result in a replacement of this factor of  $\frac{1}{4}$  by any factor less than unity would also provide an anomaly free action. To see this, note that the specific placement of kinks outlined in Appendix C yields exactly a factor of  $\frac{1}{4}$  from the kink contraction behavior of the interkink distance function  $g$ . This conspires with the factor of  $\frac{1}{4}$  in (2.34) to yield the derivative terms in the continuum limit action (4.37), any mismatch of these factors leading to an ill defined continuum limit. Hence an alternate choice of factor in (2.34) could presumably be compensated with a corresponding choice of placement of kinks so as to yield an identical compensating factor under kink contraction from  $g$ , thereby rendering the continuum limit constraint action well defined and resulting in anomaly free commutators. A second set of generalizations consists in the choice of the differentiability level of these kinks. We believe that the current demonstration of anomaly free action appropriate for the generation of  $C^0$  kinks by electric diffeomorphism type deformations can be suitably modified so as to go through for  $C^k$  kinks, for any choice of  $k < r$ . One may even choose distinct kink types for the ‘diffeomorphism’ and ‘propagation’ deformations, as well as for the GR and non GR cases.

This second class of generalizations is expected to have profound effects on the nature of physical states, a discussion of which we turn to next. Our discussion will be qualitative, the intention being to convey a flavor of the issues involved and set the stage for a more detailed analysis in the future, such an analysis being out of the scope of this paper. In what follows, we shall assume some level of familiarity with References [26, 27, 28, 13]. The particular property of physical states which we shall focus on is that of *propagation*. The issue of propagation in the context of LQG quantizations was first noted in [26] and a mechanism for propagation in this context was first uncovered in [27]. We refer the reader to these and subsequent discussions of propagation [28] and, especially, [13] which discusses propagation in the context of Thiemann’s QSD Hamiltonian constraint [5]. Here we recall that a *key necessary* condition for propagation, first noted in [27] is that of *non-unique parentage*. Referring to the (diffeomorphism class of) spin net being acted upon by the constraint as a ‘parent’ and the (diffeomorphism classes of) deformed states generated by this action as ‘children’, non-unique parentage refers to the phenomenon of children having more than one (diffeomorphically) distinct parent. We shall say that (the diffeomorphically) distinct states  $c_1, c_2$  are siblings if  $c_2$  is the offspring of a (not necessarily unique) parent of  $c_1$ . If the parentage of  $c_1$  is not unique, we shall say that the collection of ancestors and off spring of  $c_1, c_2$  are all linked by non-unique parentage.

Recall that physical states are obtained as a formal sum over kinematic states. It is expected that the summands in a physical state are related by heredity and that, generically, given one such summand all summands related to it through parent-child relations are also present in the sum. Clearly the number of such relations increases with non-unique parentage and finding the coefficients of this increasing number of summands so that the sum is a physical state becomes more complicated. Thus the structural richness of physical states as well as the difficulty of solving the constraint equations are expected to be proportional to the extent of non-unique parentage. This structural richness is directly responsible for the encoding of propagation by physical states. From this point of view, more non-unique parentage leads to vigorous propagation. On the other hand too much non-unique parentage carries the risk that almost all states are related by such parentage leading to a possible undesirable decrease in the size of the physical state space. As a result it seems crucial to have a constraint action which leads to an optimal level of non-unique parentage.

In the action (2.34) one vigorous channel of non-unique parentage is through the state deformations of the type (2.17).<sup>33</sup> We provide a pictorial demonstration of this fact in Figure 7.




FIGURE (7): The figure depicts the phenomenon of non-unique parentage via state deformations of the type (2.17). The vertex on the left of graphs depicted is understood to be the vertex  $A$  and the one on the right, vertex  $B$ .  $H_A$  signifies the action of the Hamiltonian constraint on vertex  $A$  of the (part of a) parent spin net on the top left of the figure to yield the child on its right. Upto a diffeomorphism this child is also generated by the action of the constraint  $H_B$  on the right vertex,  $B$ , of the (part of the) spin network depicted at the bottom right of the Figure.

For more details on this type of non-unique parentage, the interested reader may consult Reference [28]. The extent of non-unique parentage, with all its attendant repercussions, can also be seen to be closely related to the choice of kink type alluded to above. For example, if different kink types are specified for deformations of GR and NGR vertices, it is straightforward to see that we can block the possibility of NGR vertices creating children of GR ones i.e. of non-unique parentage involving GR and NGR vertices. Even within the context of only GR parental vertices, different kink type choices for ‘diffeomorphism’ and ‘propagation’ type children can cut down on conceivable non-unique parentage. To see this, consider the action of a ‘propagation’ deformation of the type displayed in Figure 2a in the case in which the  $I$ th and  $K$ th edges carry the same spin label  $j$ . The deformation drags part of the  $K$ th edge along the  $I$ th one between  $v$  and  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  so that the Clebsch-Gordon decomposition of the product of two identical spin  $j$  edges, namely the  $I$ th edge and this dragged part of the  $K$ th edge admits a vanishing spin representation. If this is consistent with the intertwiner at  $v$  as depicted in Figure 2a,<sup>34</sup> then we have the situation depicted in Figure 8 in the case when  $v$  is 4 valent and the deformation generates the pair of kinked edges with total of 3 kinks.

<sup>33</sup>Non-unique parentage through state deformations of the type (2.18) also seems possible; preliminary analysis indicates the strong possibility of a mechanism of propagation similar to that encountered in [13].

<sup>34</sup>Checking this consistency involves an analysis involving edge colorings and intertwiners which is beyond the scope of this paper; here we simply assume such consistency as our aim is only to provide the reader with a flavor of the issues involved.




FIGURE (8): The figure depicts the generation of a child with 3 kinks on the right from the 4 valent parental vertex  $v$  on the left through the action of the Hamiltonian constraint  $H$  on this parental vertex. We depict only the relevant part of the parent and child states. The deformation is of type (2.17). Modulo the caveats mentioned in Footnote 34, the vertex on the left is annihilated with the creation of the triplet of kinks on the right. As indicated in the main text, the (part of the) child state on the right could also be created in the course of a ‘diffeomorphism’ type deformation of an appropriate parent.

It is straightforward to see that if the parental structure on the left is part of an appropriately defined parental state  $p$  this deformation structure consisting of a pair of kinked edges can also be seen as a subset of the deformation structure which arises in the process of a ‘diffeomorphism’ type deformation on a distinct parental vertex  $v'$  in a distinct parental state  $p'$ . Let the vertex  $v'$  be an undepicted part of the parental graph  $p$  with one of the two edges colored with  $j_1$  together with one of the two edges colored with  $j_2$  ending at  $v'$ . Call these edges  $e_{1a}, e_{2a}$  respectively and call the remaining pair of edges at  $v$  in  $p$  as  $e_{1b}, e_{2b}$  with  $e_{1b}, e_{2b}$  being colored with  $j_1, j_2$  respectively. Further, let  $e_{1a}$  contain a single kink and  $e_{2a}$ , no kink in  $p$ . Consider a distinct parent  $p'$ , the only difference between  $p, p'$  being that in the latter the 4 valent vertex  $v$  of  $p$  is replaced by a smooth join between  $e_{1a}, e_{1b}$  to yield a single edge  $e'_1$  and a distinct smooth join between  $e_{2a}, e_{2b}$  to yield  $e'_2$ . Assuming an appropriately upward conical structure at  $v'$  in  $p, p'$ , a diffeomorphism type deformation of  $v'$  in  $p'$  would then deform these edges by adding an extra kink to each of them, thereby producing the desired child graph structure upto the action of diffeomorphisms. Clearly the deformation structure in the child has this non-unique parentage under the assumption that the kinks created by propagation type deformations and those created by diffeomorphism type deformations are *identical*  $C^0$  type. If the kink type for propagation and diffeomorphism type deformations was distinct, this type of ‘kink merger’ based non-unique parentage would be blocked.

The example of Figure 8 also touches on the proposal to demand invariance of physical states under ‘extended diffeomorphisms’ [14]. Since such extended diffeomorphisms generate bivalent kinks in edge interiors there is a danger of ‘too much’ non-unique parentage due to the possible existence of parental vertices obtained by the merger of such kinks. Perhaps a more appropriate choice would be to demand invariance under the kind of extended diffeomorphisms generated by the constraint action in this work in conjunction with a specification of distinct kink types for propagation and diffeomorphism type deformations so as to reduce excess non-unique parentage. Indeed it may be that this restricted set of extended diffeomorphisms, through the mechanism of appropriate non-unique parentage, serve to render the continuous moduli of Reference [16] irrelevant, thereby restoring separability of the physical state space.

We leave a detailed analysis of these and other matters for future work, our purpose here only being to point out the key role played by seemingly insignificant choices of deformation ‘microstructure’ generated by the constraints.

### 9.3 Other avenues for future work and improvement

(1)  $U(1)^3$  model: This toy model was introduced by Smolin [12] and its classical dynamics has been studied further in [29]. Recently the work of Barbero and collaborators [30] suggests the possibility, as originally envisaged by Smolin, of making contact with Euclidean gravity through a perturbation

expansion about the  $U(1)^3$  model. The model was studied in an LQG type quantization in 2+1 [31] and 3+1 dimensions [9, 10, 11] with a view towards constructing an anomaly free quantum constraint algebra. The construction in Reference [11] is quite baroque in its use of complicated networks of coordinate patches as well as certain not very natural structures called ‘interventions’. In contrast, in this work we use Riemann Normal Coordinates and avoid the use of interventions. The technical modification relative to [11] which allows us to avoid interventions is the implementation of upward conicality (see section 2.3.3). Another significant breakthrough in this work is the ability to handle multivertex off shell states; this is in contrast to [11] which restricts attention to single vertex off shell states. It is therefore of interest to revisit the  $U(1)^3$  model and construct its quantization in the simpler and more powerful manner outlined here.

(2) Better Off Shell States: The off shell states in this work are designed to trivialize the contribution of the propagation part of the action. Intuitively this choice corresponds to off shell states which are not sufficiently ‘dynamical’. It would be of interest to search for off shell states which support an anomaly free action but which do not trivialise the ‘quantum propagating degrees of freedom’ so brutally. Indeed, this issue seems to be of crucial relevance to (3) below.

(3) Lorentzian General Relativity: As envisaged by Thiemann [6] (see also [7, 8]), vacuum Lorentzian gravity can be related to vacuum Euclidean gravity by a phase space dependent Wick rotation generated by a ‘complexifier’ function on phase space. Preliminary calculations suggest that the quantum complexifier has a trivial action on the off shell (but *not* on shell) states presented in this work and this putative triviality is intimately connected with the trivialization of propagation by off shell states indicated in (2). If these calculations hold up, perhaps the implication is that these off shell states should be improved upon as suggested in (2). In this regard we are in the initial stages of exploring the viability of a strategy based on the use of density weight one constraints, modifications of both the constraint action and the off shell states, and the implementation of the ‘right hand side’ operator  $\hat{O}(N, M)$  as a generator of electric, as opposed to purely semianalytic, diffeomorphisms. In any case these issues are clearly in need of clarification.

(4) Inclusion of Cosmological Constant: It is straightforward to check that the higher density weight of the constraint used in this work precludes a continuum limit action of the cosmological constant term. As indicated in (3), we are exploring a possible return to the use of density weight one constraints which, if successful, could then potentially allow for a generalization to the case of a cosmological constant.

Notwithstanding the desirability of the improvements suggested in (2), (3), we believe that the work in this paper provides significant support for the physical relevance of the class of constraint actions developed in [2] as well as herein through a detailed demonstration of anomaly freedom, this demonstration being intimately tied to the incorporation, into the quantum dynamics, of the Electric Shift mediated transformations underlying the classical dynamics of gravity [1].

**Acknowledgements:** I am very grateful to Fernando Barbero for his detailed comments on a draft version of this paper and for his kind help with the figures and to Abhay Ashtekar for his comments on the initial part of this manuscript. I thank Abhay Ashtekar, Fernando Barbero and Jorge Pullin for their constant encouragement and support through the years.

## Appendix

### A Determinant of the Jacobian between RNCs at nearby points

Let the RNCs centered at the point  $p$  be  $\{x\}$ . Consider a point  $p_\epsilon$  which is a coordinate distance  $\epsilon$  from  $p$  (as measured by the  $\{x\}$  coordinates). Let the RNCs centered at the point  $p_\epsilon$  be  $\{\bar{x}\}$ . We are interested in computing the determinant of the Jacobian  $J(q)$  between the unbarred and the barred coordinates at the point  $q = p_\epsilon$ . Here the matrix components of the matrix  $J(q)$  are:

$$J^i{}_j(q) := \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial \bar{x}^j}(q). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Denoting the metric components in the barred and unbarred coordinates by  $\bar{h}_{ij}, h_{ij}$  we have that:

$$\bar{h}_{ij}(q) = J^k{}_i(q) J^l{}_j(q) h_{kl}(q) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which, in matrix notation reads:

$$\bar{h}(q) = J^T(q) h(q) J(q) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $J^T$  denotes the transpose of  $J$ . Next recall that the metric is  $C^{r-1}$  as are the RNCs so that the metric components in the RNCs are  $C^{r-2}$  functions of their arguments [32]. For  $r$  large (as assumed in this work), the metric components can be Taylor expanded to leading order in  $\epsilon^2$ . Recall that the RNCs centered at a given point are designed so as to render the Christoffel symbols to vanish at that point. It is straightforward to see that the vanishing of the Christoffels implies the vanishing of all first derivatives of metric components at that point. Taylor expansion of  $h_{ij}$  around  $p$  then yields:

$$h_{ij}(p_\epsilon) = \delta_{ij} + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where we have used  $h_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$  by virtue of the defining property of RNCs. On the other hand, by this very same property applied to the barred RNCs centered at  $p_\epsilon$  we have that

$$\bar{h}_{ij}(p_\epsilon) = \delta_{ij}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Setting  $q = p_\epsilon$  in (A.3) and using (A.4), (A.5) yields:

$$\mathbf{1} = J^T(\mathbf{1} + O(\epsilon^2))J \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{1} = (\det J)^2(1 + O(\epsilon^2)) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\Rightarrow \det J = 1 + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Here, we obtain (A.7) by taking the determinant of both sides of (A.6). The desired result (A.8) follows straightforwardly from (A.7) together with an implicit choice of handedness of RNCs so that they are *righthanded* with respect to the orientation of the manifold.

### B Polynomial $C^r$ joins

#### B.1 Setup

Let  $v, v_{I,\epsilon}, \tilde{v}_J$  be as in section 2.3.2 so that  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is at an RN coordinate distance of  $\epsilon$  from the GR vertex  $v$  and the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$  is at coordinate distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon)$  from  $v$  along  $e_J$ . In section B.2 we show how to shift the position of  $\tilde{v}_J$  as close to  $v$  as desired without changing the area of the loop to leading order in  $\epsilon$  through the procedure of polynomial  $C^r$  joins. The same procedure will be seen

to be applicable to kink smoothening as desired in section 2.3.2. Before we describe the procedure, it is essential to specify the construction of the deformed edge  $\tilde{e}_J$  which connects  $\tilde{v}_J$  to  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  a bit more precisely than in section 2.3.2. We proceed as follows.

For small enough  $\epsilon$  fix a semianalytic coordinate system  $\{x_I\}$  around  $v$  such that the  $I$ th edge is a coordinate straight line along the  $z_I$  axis (the existence of such coordinates follows from the definition of a semianalytic edge [25]). Join  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  to  $\tilde{v}_J$  by a coordinate straight line  $l_J$  in these coordinates. Note that  $e_J$  is not necessarily a coordinate straight line in these  $x_I$  coordinates so that  $l_J$  may intersect  $e_J$  in more than one isolated point. The intersections are isolated as  $l_J$  cannot overlap with  $e_J$  because the GR nature of  $v$  and the  $C^r$  nature of the edges implies that their tangents at intersection points are distinct. Moreover, it is straightforward to see that the GR nature of  $v$  and the  $C^r$  nature of the edges also imply that the coordinate distance of any such intersection point from  $\tilde{v}_J$  is of  $O(\epsilon^2)$ .

Redefine  $\tilde{v}_J$  to be the first point of intersection between  $l_J$  and  $e_J$  as we proceed from  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  towards  $e_J$ . Define  $\tilde{e}_J$  to be the part of  $l_J$  connecting  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  to  $\tilde{v}_J$  so redefined. By virtue of the GR property of  $v$ , the  $C^r$  nature of  $e_J$ , the  $C^{r-1}$  property of the RNCs at  $v$  and the  $C^r$  semianalyticity of the  $x_I$  coordinates, it follows that the area of the loop  $l_{I,J\epsilon}$  is of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$  as measured by the RNCs at  $v$  and by adjusting the initial choice of location of  $\tilde{v}_J$ , we may obtain any desired area of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$ .

To summarise: We do not know if the RNCs are semianalytic. Therefore we choose convenient semianalytic coordinates to construct the deformed edges  $\{\tilde{e}_J\}$  so as to ensure that these edges are themselves semianalytic. Since  $r \gg 1$ , the  $C^{r-1}$  property of the RNCs ensures loop areas of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$  both in the RNCs as well as the  $x_I$  coordinates. The precise area desired can then be obtained by adjustment of the kink position  $\tilde{v}_J$ .

## B.2 Kink shifting

In this section we show how to move the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$  along  $e_J$  to a location as close as desired to  $v$ . For small enough  $\epsilon$  choose semianalytic coordinates  $\{\vec{x}\} \equiv (\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  around  $v$  such that the part of  $e_J$  relevant to our considerations below is along the  $\bar{x}$  axis and its outward orientation from  $v$  coinciding with increasing  $\bar{x}$ .

Denote the (unshifted) kink position  $\tilde{v}_J$  by  $p_0$  so that  $\tilde{e}_J$  connects  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  with  $p_0$ . Let the desired (shifted) position of the kink be  $p_1$ . Denote the part of  $e_J$  between  $p_0$  and  $v$  by  $\gamma_1$ . Let  $\bar{p}_2$  be a point on  $\tilde{e}_J$  which is a coordinate distance  $\delta_1 \ll \epsilon$  away from  $p_0$  in the  $\{\vec{x}\}$  coordinates. Let  $B_{\delta_1}(p_0)$  be a ball of coordinate radius  $\delta_1$  centered at  $p_0$ . Denote  $\tilde{e}_J \cap B_{\delta_1}(p_0)$  by  $\gamma_2$ .

By employing an appropriate  $GL(3, R)$  transformation we additionally restrict  $\{\vec{x}\}$  to be such that the outward edge tangent to  $\gamma_2$  at  $p_0$  is  $(\frac{d}{d\bar{y}})^a$ . Since  $\gamma_2$  is  $C^r$ , it follows straightforwardly that  $\gamma_2$  is confined within a cone of solid angle  $\mathbf{O}(\delta_1)$  around a line parallel to the  $\bar{y}$  axis emanating from  $p_0$ . Let  $\tilde{\gamma}_1$  be the straight line in the barred coordinates joining  $p_1$  to  $\bar{p}_2$ . Choosing  $\bar{x}$  to parameterize  $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ , it is straightforward to see that for small enough  $\delta_1$ , the tangent to  $\tilde{\gamma}_1$  has coordinate components  $(1, \delta_1 + O(\delta_1^2), O(\delta_1^2))$  in the barred coordinates. Semianalyticity of  $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \gamma_2$  and the fact that these edges are, respectively, almost along the  $\bar{x}, \bar{y}$  directions then implies that these two edges intersect in at most a finite number of isolated points all within a distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\delta_1^2)$  of  $\bar{p}_2$ . Denote the intersection point first encountered going along  $\tilde{\gamma}_1$  from  $p_1$  to  $\bar{p}_2$  by  $p_2$ .

Next, note that, by virtue of its semianalyticity, for small enough  $\delta_1$ ,  $\gamma_2 - p_0$  is *analytic* in the barred coordinates. Hence there exists a small enough coordinate sphere  $B_{p_2}(\delta)$  around  $p_2$  of size  $\delta \ll \delta_1$  such that  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 \cap (\gamma_2 \cap B_{p_2}(\delta)) = p_2$  and such that  $(\gamma_2 \cap B_{p_2}(\delta))$  is analytic in the barred coordinates. For sufficiently small  $\delta$ , from Lemma 3.1 of [5], there exist coordinates  $\{\vec{x}''\}$  centered at  $p_2$  and analytically related to  $\{\vec{x}\}$  such that within  $B_{p_2}(\delta)$ ,  $\gamma_1 = (x'', 0, 0)$  and  $\gamma_2 = (0, y'', 0)$ . Through an appropriate  $GL(3, R)$  transformation on these ‘double primed’ coordinates we define

linearly related coordinates  $\{\vec{x}'\}$  such that  $\gamma_1$  remains along the  $x'$  axis and  $\gamma_2$  is a line in the  $x'$ - $y'$  plane at an angle of 135 degrees with the  $x'$  axis. Next, we remove a small ball around the origin in the primed system of radius  $\sqrt{2}\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \ll \delta$ . Our task is then to join the point  $q_2$  with primed coordinates  $(-\alpha, \alpha, 0)$  on  $\gamma_2$  to the point  $q_1$  with primed coordinates  $(\sqrt{2}\alpha, 0, 0)$  by a semianalytic curve which joins in a  $C^r$  manner with  $\gamma_2$  at  $q_2$  and  $\gamma_1$  at  $q_1$ . This can be done through an application of a lemma which we prove below.

*Lemma:* Consider a coordinate system  $(x, y)$  in  $\mathbf{R}^2$ . Let  $\gamma_1$  be the line along and oriented opposite to the  $x$ -axis with end point at  $x = \sqrt{2}\alpha$ . Let  $\gamma_2$  be the line at angle 135 degrees with respect to to the  $x$ -axis with beginning point  $(-\alpha, \alpha)$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , and orientation in the direction of increasing  $\alpha$ . Then there exists a semianalytic curve  $\gamma$  which joins the end point of  $\gamma_1$  to the beginning point of  $\gamma_2$  such that the curve  $\gamma_2 \circ \gamma \circ \gamma_1$  is  $C^r$ .

*Proof:* We parameterize  $\gamma$  by  $-x$ , with  $-\sqrt{2}\alpha \leq -x \leq \alpha$  and set

$$\gamma^x(-x) = x \tag{B.1}$$

$$\gamma^y(-x) = -f(x)x \tag{B.2}$$

where  $f$  is a  $C^r$  semianalytic function defined as follows. Let  $\tau \ll \alpha$  and define  $f$  to be such that:

$$f(x) = 1, \quad -\alpha - \tau \leq x \leq -\alpha + \tau, \tag{B.3}$$

$$f(x) = 0, \quad -\tau < x \tag{B.4}$$

$$0 \leq f(x) \leq 1, \quad -\alpha - \tau \leq x \tag{B.5}$$

It is straightforward to infer the existence of such  $f$  [25, 18] from the fact that there always exists a semianalytic partition of unity subordinate to any finite open cover of a compact manifold  $\Sigma$ . The  $C^r$  semianalytic nature of  $f$  ensures that  $\gamma$  is semianalytic and the behavior of  $f$  near the end points of  $\gamma$  ensures that the joins to  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  at these end points are  $C^r$ .

Identifying  $x' \equiv x$ ,  $y' \equiv y$ , an application of the Lemma immediately leads to the desired semianalytic curve with  $C^r$  join at  $q_1, q_2$ .

### B.3 Kink Smoothing

In this section we show how to smoothen the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$ . Exactly as in section B.2 fix  $\{\vec{x}\}$  coordinates around  $p_0$ . Using the same notation as in that section, for small enough  $\delta_1$ ,  $B_{2\delta_1}(p_0)$  lies within the barred coordinate patch so that within this ball  $\tilde{e}_J$  is confined within a cone of angle  $O(\delta_1)$  about the  $\bar{y}$  - axis and  $e_J$  is along the  $\bar{x}$  axis. Let  $\bar{p}_2 \in \partial B_{\delta_1}(p_0) \cap \tilde{e}_J$ , let  $p_1 = \partial B_{\delta_1}(p_0) \cap e_J$ , let the straight (coordinate) line joining  $p_1$  to  $\bar{p}_2$  be  $\bar{l}$  and let  $p_2$  be the first point of intersection between  $\bar{l}$  and  $\tilde{e}_J$  when moving along  $\bar{l}$  from  $p_1$ . Similar to section B.2 the confinement of  $\tilde{e}_J$  within a cone of angle  $O(\delta_1)$  about the  $\bar{y}$  - axis ensures that this line intersects  $\tilde{e}_J$  at  $p_2$  transversely. Call part of  $\bar{l}$  joining  $p_1$  to  $p_2$  as  $l$ .

Next, note that semianalyticity of  $\tilde{e}_J$  ensures that for small enough  $\delta_1$ ,  $\tilde{e}_J \cap B_{2\delta_1}(p_0) - p_0$  is analytic in the barred coordinates. Using the construction in [5] augmented with a suitable  $GL(3, R)$  transformation, there exists a small enough neighborhood of  $p_2$  with chart  $\{\vec{x}'\}$  analytically related to  $\{\vec{x}\}$  and a ('primed') coordinate ball  $B_\tau(p_2)$  such that for small enough  $\tau \ll \delta_1$  :

- (i) the part of  $\tilde{e}_J$  emanating from  $p_2$  towards the displaced vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  within  $B_\tau(p_2)$  is a coordinate straight line along the  $x'$  axis
- (ii)  $l \cap B_\tau(p_2)$  is at an angle of 135 degrees with respect to  $x'$  axis in the  $x'$ - $y'$  plane.

A straightforward application of the Lemma in section B.2 then allows the replacement of  $l \cap B_\tau(p_2)$  by a semianalytic curve which  $C^r$  joins at  $p_2$  and at  $l \cap \partial B_\tau(p_2)$ . Noting that at  $p_1$ , both  $l$  and  $e_J$  are straight lines in the barred coordinates, a similar application of this Lemma allows the replacement of  $l$  in a small neighborhood of  $p_1$  by a semianalytic curve with a  $C^r$  join at  $p_1$  with  $e_J$  and a similar join with the part of  $l$  outside this neighborhood.

The final result of these 2 sets of joins in arbitrarily small neighborhoods of  $p_2, p_1$  ensures the removal of the kink  $\tilde{v}_J$ .

#### B.4 Upward Conicality

Let  $B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  be coordinate ball of size  $\delta \ll \epsilon$  around  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in the  $\{x_I\}$  coordinates of section B.1. It is straightforward to see that through a suitable translation and rotation of the coordinate system  $\{x_I\}$  we may define, for small enough  $\epsilon, \delta \ll \epsilon$ , a coordinate system in  $B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  with origin at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in which  $e_I \cap B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  is along the  $y$ -axis and  $\tilde{e}_J \cap B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  is a straight line in the  $x$ - $y$  plane. Denoting  $\tilde{e}_J \cap B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  by  $l$ , this implies that the coordinates  $(l^x, l^y, l^z)$  of points along  $l$  can be written as:

$$l^x = \alpha t \quad l^y = \beta t \quad l^z = 0 \quad t \in [0, t_1] \quad \alpha \neq 0 \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where  $t_1 = \mathbf{O}(\delta)$ . We remove the part of  $l_0$  of  $l$  between parameter values  $0, t_0$ , with  $t_0 \ll t_1$ . Note that  $t = 0$  labels the point  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . We seek to replace  $l_0$  by a semianalytic curve  $\gamma$  in the  $x$ - $y$  plane which joins in a  $C^r$  manner to  $l - l_0$  at the point on  $l$  with parameter value  $t_0$  and which has the desired tangent at the point  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . We define  $\gamma : [0, t_0] \rightarrow \Sigma$  through its  $x, y$  coordinates  $\gamma^x, \gamma^y$  as:

$$\gamma^x = \alpha t \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$\gamma^y = \beta t + b_{r+1}(t - t_0)^{r+1} + b_{r+2}(t - t_0)^{r+2}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Equations (B.7), (B.8) ensure that the join is  $C^r$  at the point  $l(t_0) = \gamma(t_0)$ . For upward conicality at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  we require that:

$$\gamma^y(t=0) = 0 \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\left. \frac{d\gamma^y}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \eta^{-1} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where  $0 < \eta \ll 1$  is a small positive parameter. It is straightforward to solve for the coefficients  $b_{r+1}, b_{r+2}$  so as to impose (B.9), (B.10) and substitute back into (B.8) to obtain:

$$\gamma^y(t) = t\{\beta + [(\eta^{-1} - \beta)(1 - \frac{t}{t_0})^{r+1}]\}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Equation (B.11) implies that for sufficiently small  $\eta$ ,

$$|\gamma^y(t)| < t_0(|\beta| + |\eta^{-1} - \beta|) < 2\eta^{-1}t_0. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Choosing  $t_0 \ll \eta$  ensures that  $\gamma$  is confined within  $B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  and (B.7) ensures that  $\gamma$  does not intersect  $l - l_0$  except at  $l(t_0)$  and does not intersect  $e_I \cap B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  except at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . Moreover, the GR property of  $v$  and the setup of section B.1 ensures that no intersections ensue (other than at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ ) with any  $\tilde{e}_{K \neq J}$  nor with their upward conical modifications (these modifications being constructed along the lines above).

From (B.9)-(B.10) we have that at  $v_{I,e}$

$$\frac{\dot{\gamma}^y}{\dot{\gamma}^x} = (\alpha\eta)^{-1} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

which implies the same ratio of the  $y$  and  $x$  components of the *unit* (with respect to the metric  $h_{ab}$ ) tangent  $\hat{\gamma}^a$  to  $\gamma$  at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . This, together with the fact (see above) that  $e_I \cap B_\delta(v_{I,\epsilon})$  is along the  $y$  axis, implies that the unit tangent to  $\gamma$  at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  takes the form:

$$\hat{\gamma}^a = \hat{e}_I^a|_{v_{I,\epsilon}} + \mathbf{O}(\eta)\omega^a \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where  $\hat{e}_I^a|_{v_{I,\epsilon}}$  is the unit (with respect to  $h_{ab}$ ) tangent to the edge  $e_I$  at the point  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  and  $\omega^a$  is some ( $J$  dependent) vector of norm of  $\mathbf{O}(1)$ . Clearly we may choose  $\eta \ll \epsilon^m, m > 2$  to obtain (2.26).

## C Relative kink placement for $\frac{d_{min}}{d_{max}} = \frac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon^q)$

We prove a series of subsidiary results and lemmas from which the desired result follows. All points under consideration are assumed to be in a single Convex Normal Neighborhood (CNN) with respect to the metric  $h_{ab}$ . RN Coordinates centered at the point  $v$  are denoted by  $\{x\}$  and any reference to coordinates is to these coordinates which we fix once and for all.

1. Let  $v, v_1, v_2$  be vertices of a triangle with sides  $vv_1, vv_2, v_1v_2$  of lengths  $ar, br, cr$  for some  $r > 0$ . Let the angle between  $vv_1, vv_2$  be  $\theta$  so that:

$$c^2 = a^2 + b^2 - 2ab \cos \theta. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Let  $\theta_\delta$  be such that

$$\cos \theta_\delta = \cos \theta_0 + O(\delta) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

for some  $\delta$  independent angle  $\theta_0$ .

*Case (i):* Let the range of  $\theta_0$  be

$$\pi > \theta_0 \geq \cos^{-1} \frac{1}{4}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Let  $a = 1$  and  $b$  be such that:

$$b^2 - 2b \cos \theta_0 = 3. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

It follows straightforwardly from (C.1) with  $\theta := \theta_\delta$  that  $c = 2 + O(\delta)$ , and from (C.4) that  $1 < b \leq 2$ , from which it follows that the ratio  $R$  of the smallest to the largest side lengths of the triangle  $v_1vv_2$  is:

$$R = \frac{1}{2} + O(\delta). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

*Case (ii):* Let the range of  $\theta_0$  be

$$0 < \theta_0 < \cos^{-1} \frac{1}{4}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Let  $a = 1, b = 2$ . It follows straightforwardly from (C.1) with  $\theta := \theta_\delta$  that

$$c^2 = 5 - 4 \cos \theta_0 + O(\delta) \quad (\text{C.7})$$

It is straightforward to check that in the range (C.6), we have that

$$1 < 5 - 4 \cos \theta_0 < 4. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

From (C.7) and (C.8) it follows that, identical to (C.5),

$$R = \frac{1}{2} + O(\delta). \quad (\text{C.9})$$

**2. Lemma:** Let  $e_1, e_2$  be a pair of semianalytic edges emanating from the point  $v \in \Sigma$ . Let each of  $v_1, v_2$  be located at a coordinate distance of  $\mathbf{O}(\delta)$  from  $v$  along  $e_1, e_2$  respectively. Let the angle as measured in the coordinates  $\{x\}$  between the unit edge tangents  $\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2$  at  $v$  be  $\theta_0$ . Then the angle  $\theta$  at  $v$  between the coordinate straight lines from  $v$  to  $v_1$  and from  $v$  to  $v_2$  is such that

$$\cos \theta_\delta = \cos \theta_0 + O(\delta). \quad (\text{C.10})$$

*Proof:* We are given that:

$$\cos \theta_0 = \delta_{\mu\nu} \hat{e}_1^\mu \hat{e}_2^\nu \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Let  $e_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  have semianalytic parameterization by the parameters  $\bar{t}_i$ <sup>35</sup> with the beginning point  $v$  of  $e_i$  located at  $t_i = 0$ . By appropriate rescaling by a constant we choose  $t_i$  to be such that  $\frac{dx^\mu}{dt_i}|_{\bar{t}_i=0} = \hat{e}_i^\mu$ . Let  $v_i$  be located at parameter value  $\bar{t}_i = t_i$  along  $e_i$ . Taylor expansion along  $e_i$  yields:

$$x^\mu(v_i) = t_i \hat{e}_i^\mu + O(t_i^2) \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where we have set  $x^\mu(v) = 0$  in the RNCs centered at  $v$ .

$$\Rightarrow |\vec{x}(v_i)| := \sqrt{\delta_{\mu\nu} x^\mu(v_i) x^\nu(v_i)} = t_i + O(t_i^2) \quad (\text{C.13})$$

which implies that:

$$\mathbf{O}(t_i) = \mathbf{O}(\delta). \quad (\text{C.14})$$

It then follows straightforwardly from (C.12)- (C.14) that:

$$\frac{x^\mu(v_i)}{|\vec{x}(v_i)|} = \hat{e}_i^\mu + O(\delta) \quad (\text{C.15})$$

from which we have, using (C.11) that:

$$\cos \theta = \delta_{\mu\nu} \frac{x^\mu(v_1)}{|\vec{x}(v_1)|} \frac{x^\nu(v_2)}{|\vec{x}(v_2)|} = \cos \theta_0 + O(\delta). \quad (\text{C.16})$$

**3. Lemma:** Let  $v, v_1, v_2$  be located as in **2.** above. Let  $vv_i, i = 1, 2$  be coordinate straight lines from  $v$  to  $v_i$ . Let  $v_1v_2$  be the coordinate straight line from  $v_1$  to  $v_2$  and let  $\Delta\vec{x} := \vec{x}(v_2) - \vec{x}(v_1)$ . Denoting the coordinate length of  $\Delta\vec{x}$  by  $|\Delta\vec{x}|$ , we have from **2.** that  $\Delta\vec{x} = \mathbf{O}(\delta)$ . For small enough  $\delta$  let the geodesic distance between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be  $d$ . Then:

$$d = |\Delta\vec{x}|(1 + O(\delta)). \quad (\text{C.17})$$

*Proof:* Let the geodesic  $e_{12}$  between  $v_1, v_2$  be parameterized by its metric length and let the tangent at  $v_1$  to this geodesic so parameterized be  $\hat{e}_{12}^a$ . Taylor expansion at  $v_1$  implies that:

$$\Delta x^\mu = d \hat{e}_{12}^\mu + O(d^2). \quad (\text{C.18})$$

Using the fact that  $\hat{e}_{12}^a$  is unit with respect to the metric  $h_{ab}$  at  $v_1$ , equation (C.18) implies that:

$$h_{\mu\nu}(v_1) \Delta x^\mu \Delta x^\nu = d^2(1 + O(d)). \quad (\text{C.19})$$

---

<sup>35</sup>Since we do not know if the RNCs are semianalytic charts, we do not know if they are semianalytic functions of  $\bar{t}_i$ . Since the proof only uses the  $C^{r-1}$  property of RNCs together with the  $C^r$  property of the semianalytic edges  $e_1, e_2$ , it is unaffected by this lack of knowledge.

Taylor expansion of metric components  $h_{\mu\nu}$  around  $v$  in conjunction with the property of RNCs implies that

$$h_{\mu\nu}(v_1) = \delta_{\mu\nu} + O(\delta). \quad (\text{C.20})$$

Using  $|\Delta\vec{x}| = \mathbf{O}(\delta)$  in (C.18) implies that

$$d = \mathbf{O}(\delta). \quad (\text{C.21})$$

It is then straightforward to see that (C.18)-(C.20) imply the desired result.

**4. Lemma:** Denote the geodesic distance between points  $p, q$  by  $d(p, q)$ . Let  $v_3$  be located at geodesic distance of  $O(\epsilon^p)$  from  $v$  and let  $v_1, v_2$  be at a geodesic distance of  $O(\epsilon^q)$  from  $v$  with  $p \gg q$ . Then for  $i = 1, 2$ :

$$d(v_3, v_i) = d(v, v_i) + O(\epsilon^p). \quad (\text{C.22})$$

*Proof:* This immediately follows from the fact that for two points in a CNN, the geodesic connecting them is the shortest distance path between the two points.

**5.** Recall that in the RNCs centered at a point  $p$ , the coordinate line from  $p$  to any point  $q$  in the CNN around  $p$  is a geodesic and its metric length coincides with the coordinate length.

The desired result follows from **1.- 5.** To see this, let the three kinks be  $v_i, i = 1, 2, 3$  with  $v_3$  placed at a coordinate distance of  $O(\epsilon^p)$  from the vertex  $v$  and  $v_1, v_2$  placed in accordance with **1.** with  $r = \epsilon^q, p \gg q \gg 1$ . Then **2.** holds with  $\delta = \epsilon^q$ . **1.** then implies that the ratio of the smallest to largest coordinate distances between  $v, v_1, v_2$  is  $\frac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon^q)$ . **5.** and **3.** imply that the same result holds for geodesic distances between these three points. Finally this together with **4.** implies that the same result holds for the geodesic distances between the points  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  which proves the desired result mentioned in the section header.

## D Semianalytic diffeomorphisms of compact support

Section D.1 constructs a useful class of semianalytic diffeomorphisms of compact support. Sections D.2-D.4 apply the construction method to obtain the results described by their title headers.

### D.1 General Construction

*Lemma:* Equip  $R^n$  with a  $C^r$  semianalytic structure. Fix, once and for all, a global semianalytic chart  $\{x\}$  on  $R^n$ . Let  $U, V$  be open neighborhoods of the origin with  $\bar{V} \subset U$ . Let  $f^\mu, \mu = 1, \dots, n$  be an  $n$ -tuple of semianalytic functions compactly supported in  $\bar{V}$ . Define  $\phi : R^n \rightarrow R^n$  by

$$x'^\mu = \phi_\lambda(x) = x^\mu + \lambda f^\mu. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Then there exists  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that  $\forall \lambda$  such that  $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ , the map  $\phi_\lambda$  is a  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphism of  $R^n$ .

*Proof:* Since  $f^\mu$  is  $C^r$ , we have that  $\frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial x^\nu}$  is bounded in  $U$  and vanishes outside  $U$  for  $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, n$ . The Jacobian matrix  $J$  between  $\{x'\}$  defined through (D.1) and  $\{x\}$  is:

$$J^\mu_\nu := \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\nu} = \delta^\mu_\nu + \lambda \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial x^\nu}. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Since  $f^\mu$  is  $C^r$ , we have that  $\frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial x^\nu}$  is bounded in  $U$  and vanishes outside  $U$  for  $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, n$ , it is straightforward to see that there exists small enough  $\lambda_0$  such that for all  $\lambda \leq \lambda_0, \lambda \geq 0$ , and all  $x^\mu$ ,

$$\det J \neq 0. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

The inverse function theorem then implies that  $\phi_\lambda$  is ‘locally’ a diffeomorphism. More precisely, given any  $p \in R^n$ , there exists an open neighborhood  $O_p$  of  $p$  in which  $\phi_\lambda : O_p \rightarrow \phi_\lambda(O_p)$  is a diffeomorphism.

Next, we note that for any compact set  $K \subset R^n$  we have that  $\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K)$  is compact. To show this we proceed as follows. Since  $K$  is compact, it is closed and bounded. We have that:

$$\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K) = (\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K) \cap (R^n - \bar{V})) \cup (\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K) \cap \bar{V}). \quad (\text{D.4})$$

From (D.1) we have that  $\phi_\lambda$  is the identity map on  $(R^n - \bar{V})$ . It follows that  $(\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K) \cap (R^n - \bar{V})) \subseteq K$ . Boundedness of  $K$  then implies that  $(\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K) \cap (R^n - \bar{V}))$  is bounded. Next, note that  $(\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K) \cap \bar{V})$  is bounded by virtue of the boundedness of  $\bar{V}$ . Hence equation (D.4) implies that  $\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K)$  is bounded. Since  $K$  is closed and  $\phi_\lambda$  is continuous,  $\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K)$  is closed. Hence  $\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K)$  is closed and bounded and hence compact as asserted.

The local diffeomorphism nature of  $\phi_\lambda$  and the compactness of  $\phi_\lambda^{-1}(K)$  together with Hadamard’s theorem (see Theorem 6.2.3 of [33]) imply that  $\phi_\lambda$  is globally one to one and onto. Since  $\phi_\lambda$  is explicitly a  $C^r$  semianalytic map, it is a  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphism. This completes the proof of the Lemma.

Next, note that (D.1) implies that the semianalytic diffeomorphism  $\phi_\lambda$  is the identity outside  $\bar{V}$  so that  $\phi(\bar{V}) = \bar{V}$  from which our final result below clearly holds:

Let  $V, U \subset \Sigma$  be open sets with  $\bar{V} \subset U$ . Let  $U$  be such that it is covered by a single  $C^r$  semianalytic chart  $\{x\}$ . Let  $f^\mu, \mu = 1, 2, 3$  be  $C^r$  semianalytic functions supported exclusively in  $\bar{V}$ . Then there exists  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that for all positive  $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$  we have that  $\psi_\lambda : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  is a  $C^r$  semianalytic diffeomorphism where  $\psi_\lambda$  is defined through:

$$\psi_\lambda(p) = p, \quad p \notin \bar{V} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

$$x^\mu(\psi_\lambda(p)) = x^\mu(p) + \lambda f^\mu(p), \quad p \in \bar{V}. \quad (\text{D.6})$$

## D.2 Construction of $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$ in section 5.2

From the definition of a semianalytic edge [25], there exists a small enough neighborhood  $O$  of  $v$ , and semianalytic patch  $\{x\}$  thereon such that  $v$  is at the origin and  $e_I \cap O$  is along the 3rd coordinate (i.e.  $z$  axis). Rescale the  $z$  coordinate if so required so that  $(\frac{d}{dz})^a$  coincides with the (metrically) unit edge tangent  $\hat{e}_I^a$  at  $v$ :

$$\left(\frac{d}{dz}\right)^a|_v = \hat{e}_I^a|_v \quad (\text{D.7})$$

For small enough  $\epsilon$  set  $V$  in (D.5) to be  $V := B_{2\epsilon}(v) \subset O$ , where  $B_\delta(v)$  denotes the coordinate ball of radius  $\delta$  centered at  $v$  in the coordinates  $\{x\}$ . Let  $f$  be a  $C^r$  semianalytic, compactly supported function such that:

$$f(p) = 1, \quad p \in B_{2\epsilon-\tau}(v), \tau \ll \epsilon \quad (\text{D.8})$$

$$f(p) = 0, \quad p \notin B_{2\epsilon}(v), \tau \ll \epsilon \quad (\text{D.9})$$

$$0 \leq f(p) \leq 1, \quad p \in \Sigma. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

It is straightforward to infer the existence of such  $f$  [25, 18] from the fact that there always exists a semianalytic partition of unity subordinate to any finite open cover of  $\Sigma$ . Set

$$f^\mu = f\delta_3^\mu. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

The vector field  $e_{I,\epsilon}^a$  of section 5.2 is then identified with the vector field  $f^a$  with components  $f^\mu$  given by (D.11). The results of section D.1 imply that there exists  $\lambda \ll \tau$  such that  $\psi_\lambda$  as defined by (D.5) is a semianalytic diffeomorphism which corresponds to a point dependent translation in the  $z$  direction. In particular  $v$  is translated along  $e_I$ . Clearly there exist  $\lambda, N_\lambda$  such that the repeated action  $(\psi_\lambda)^{N_\lambda}$  of  $\psi_\lambda$  a total of  $N_\lambda$  times translates  $v$  to the desired position  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . It follows from (D.7) and the fact that  $z$  provides a semianalytic parameterization of  $e_I$  in the neighborhood  $O$  of interest, together with (4.34), that

$$N_\lambda \lambda = \epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (\text{D.12})$$

The analysis of Reference [2], repeated here, indicates that we translate the point  $v$  by an affine parameter  $\epsilon$  along the integral curves of the vector field  $e_{I,\epsilon}^a$ . In this regard (D.12) implies that the diffeomorphism  $(\psi_\lambda)^{N_\lambda}$  translates the point  $v$  by an affine amount  $\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)$ . Since we are interested in leading order in  $\epsilon$  behavior this choice of  $N_\lambda$  is acceptable.

Accordingly we set

$$\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon} := (\psi_\lambda)^{N_\lambda}. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

It is straightforward to see that, for a GR vertex  $v$ , the action of  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  produces loops  $\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}, J \neq I$  of coordinate area of  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$  in the coordinates  $\{x\}$ . The coordinate area of these loops in the RNCs at  $v$  is then also  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$  by virtue of their  $C^{r-1}$  nature. From (D.10)- (D.13), the deformed edges lie within  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$ .

For our purposes in the main text, we need to be able to change the areas of the loops  $\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}, J \neq I$  by  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$  without altering the position of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . In what follows we construct such diffeomorphisms. These diffeomorphisms are arranged to be the identity at the locations of the edges  $e_J, e_I$  and will move segments of the deformed edges transverse to themselves either towards or away from the  $z$ -axis thereby increasing or decreasing the loop areas. We proceed as follows. Note that for small enough  $\epsilon$ ,  $B_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(v)$  lies within the domain of the coordinate patch  $O$ . Also note that by virtue of the GR nature of  $v$ , each of the loops  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  can be enclosed by an angular wedge  $W_{\alpha_{J,\epsilon}}$  of azimuthal angular width  $\alpha_{J,\epsilon} = \mathbf{O}(\sqrt{\epsilon})$  around the  $z$ -axis. More precisely,  $W_{\alpha_{J,\epsilon}}$  refers to the part of the infinite coordinate wedge which lies in  $B_{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(v)$ .<sup>36</sup> For small enough  $\epsilon$ , the GR nature of  $v$  implies that the angular wedges  $\{W_{\alpha_{J,\epsilon}}, J \neq I\}$  intersect each other only along the  $z$ -axis.

Let  $C_{\epsilon^m}, m \gg 1$  be the cylinder of radius  $\epsilon^m$  around the  $z$ -axis (more precisely, the part of the cylinder in the domain  $O$  of the coordinate chart). Set  $U_J = W_J \cap (\Sigma - \bar{C}_{\epsilon^m})$  i.e.  $U_J$  is obtained by removing a small (closed) cylindrical neighborhood of the  $z$  axis from  $W_J$ . The GR nature of  $v$  then ensures that for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ ,

$$e_I \cap U_J = \emptyset = U_J \cap U_K, J \neq K. \quad (\text{D.14})$$

Let  $V_J \subset U_J$  be an open set containing a segment of  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)$  which is away from its end points and which does not intersect  $e_J$ . Let  $f_J$  be a semianalytic function compactly supported in  $\bar{V}_J$ . Similar to (D.10) let  $f_J$  take values in  $[0, 1]$  with  $f_J = 1$  in the vicinity of a neighborhood  $V'_J$  of this segment of  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)$ ,  $V'_J \subset V_J$ . Let  $v_J^\mu$  be a coordinate vector field transverse to  $\bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}(e_J)$ . Set  $V \equiv V_J, f^\mu \equiv f_J^\mu = f_J v_J^\mu$  in (D.6) to obtain  $\psi_\lambda := \psi_{J,\lambda}$ . With appropriate choices of the segment to be moved, of the open sets  $V_J, V'_J$ , of the parameter  $\lambda = \lambda_J$ , of the iteration number  $N_{\lambda_J}$  of  $\psi_{J,\lambda}$ , and of  $v^\mu$ , the area of the loop  $\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}$  can be decreased or increased in a controlled manner. Combining the action of several such diffeomorphisms, the RNC measured area of the loop  $\bar{l}_{IJ,\epsilon}$  can be adjusted to its desired value. Denote the resulting diffeomorphism by  $\psi_J$ .

<sup>36</sup>Since we desire the freedom to change the loop area by  $\mathbf{O}(\epsilon^2)$ , diffeomorphisms of interest could displace the deformed edge outside  $B_{2\epsilon}(v)$ . This is the reason we introduce the  $\sqrt{\epsilon}$  even though  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  constructed through (D.10)- (D.13) are contained in a wedge of smaller angle  $\epsilon$ .

It follows that  $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon}$  may be constructed as  $\bar{\phi}_{I,c_I,\epsilon} = \left(\prod_{J \neq I} \psi_J\right) \bar{\phi}_{I,\epsilon}$  where the ordering in the product is irrelevant due to the choice of non-intersecting  $\{U_J, J \neq I\}$ .

### D.3 Construction of $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$ as diffeomorphic images of each other

Given a construction of  $l_{IJ,\epsilon_0}$  through a definition of  $\phi_{I,\epsilon_0}$  we seek, in this section, to construct  $l_{IJ,\epsilon}$  for  $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$  as diffeomorphic images of  $l_{IJ,\epsilon_0}$  which map the set of undeformed edges  $\{e_J\}, J = 1, \dots, N$  at  $v$  to themselves. We assume that for all but 3 of these edges, the kinks at the intersection of these edges with their deformed counterparts have been smoothed using the the constructions of section B.3. Clearly by choosing  $f^\mu := -f_I \delta_\mu^3$  with  $f_I$  supported in the narrow cylindrical neighborhood  $C_{\epsilon^m}$  (see section D.2), we may move  $v_{I,\epsilon_0}$  to its desired position  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  through a suitable number of iterations of the resulting  $\psi_\lambda$  for appropriately chosen  $\lambda$ . The area of the loop  $l_{IJ,\epsilon_0}$  is affected only to  $O(\epsilon^{m+1})$ .

Next, recall that 3 of the edges have kinks. Let  $e_{J_i}, i = 1, 2, 3$  be these edges. Let  $\tilde{v}_{J_i}$  be the kink on  $e_{J_i}$  located at the intersection of  $e_{J_i}$  and its deformed image  $\tilde{e}_{J_i}$ . Using a similar construction as in the paragraph before this, by choosing a small cylindrical neighborhood of each  $e_J$  we may move the kink  $\tilde{v}_{J_i}$  to its desired position close to  $v$  with an arbitrarily small change in the area of  $l_{IJ_i,\epsilon_0}$ . Finally, we may decrease the area of the resulting loops as well as the loops  $\{l_{IK,\epsilon_0}, K \neq J_1, J_2, J_3\}$  to their desired values of  $O(\epsilon^2)$  through wedge supported constructions of diffeomorphisms similar to that of the previous section.

### D.4 Cone Stiffening through diffeomorphisms

Given a construction of upward conical edge tangents through the  $C^r$  join techniques of section B.4 at parameter  $\epsilon = \epsilon_0$  we show, in this section, how to obtain the required ‘stiffening’ of this configuration at any  $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$  by the action of diffeomorphisms. As noted in section D.3, the vertex  $v_{I,\epsilon_0}$  can be moved to its desired position  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  by the action of appropriate diffeomorphisms. Since these diffeomorphisms act as rigid translations in the vicinity of  $v_{I,\epsilon_0}$ , the upward conicality of the edge tangents is left unaffected. Using the same coordinate patch as in that section, the  $I$ th edge emanating from  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  is along the  $z$ -axis. For small enough  $\tau \ll \epsilon$ , set  $V$  in (D.5) to be  $V := B_\tau(v_{I,\epsilon}) \subset O$ , where  $B_\tau(v_{I,\epsilon})$  denotes the coordinate ball of radius  $\tau$  centered at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  in the coordinates  $\{x\}$ . Let  $f$  be supported in  $\bar{V}$  with  $0 \leq f \leq 1$  similar to section D.2 with  $f = 1$  in a small neighborhood  $B_{\frac{\tau}{2}}(v_{I,\epsilon})$  of  $v_{I,\epsilon}$ . Set  $f^\mu = f G^\mu{}_\nu x^\nu$  where the matrix  $G$  is defined as

$$G^\mu{}_\nu = 0 \text{ for } \nu \notin \{1, 2\} \tag{D.15}$$

$$= -\delta_j^\mu \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2\}. \tag{D.16}$$

$$\tag{D.17}$$

It is easily checked that for  $p \in B_{\frac{\tau}{2}}(v_{I,\epsilon})$  we have

$$x(\psi_\lambda(p)) = x(p)(1 - \lambda), \quad y(\psi_\lambda(p)) = y(p)(1 - \lambda), \quad z(\psi_\lambda(p)) = z(p). \tag{D.18}$$

Note that  $\psi_\lambda(v_{I,\epsilon}) = v_{I,\epsilon}$  and that  $\psi_\lambda$  maps  $e_I$  to itself. By choosing  $\lambda$  appropriately and iterating the transformation an appropriate number of times, we obtain the desired stiffening of the edge tangents at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  such that the metrically unit edge tangents at  $v_{I,\epsilon}$  satisfy the desired conditions described in section 2.3.3.

## References

- [1] A. Ashtekar and M. Varadarajan, *Universe* **7** 13 (2021)
- [2] M. Varadarajan, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **38** 135020 (2021)
- [3] A. Ashtekar, *Phys.Rev.* **D36** 1587 (1987).
- [4] A. Laddha, e-Print: 1401.0931 [gr-qc].
- [5] T. Thiemann, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, **15** 839 (1998).
- [6] T. Thiemann, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **13** 1383 (1996).
- [7] A. Ashtekar, *Phys.Rev.* **D53** 2865 (1996).
- [8] M. Varadarajan, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **36** 015016 (2019)
- [9] C. Tomlin and M. Varadarajan, *Phys.Rev. D* **87** 044039 (2013)
- [10] M. Varadarajan, *Phys.Rev.* **D87** 044040 (2013).
- [11] M Varadarajan, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 106007 (2018).
- [12] L. Smolin, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **9** 883 (1992)
- [13] T. Thiemann and M. Varadarajan, e-Print: 2112.03992 [gr-qc]
- [14] W. Fairbairn and C. Rovelli, *J.Math.Phys.* **45** 2802 (2004).
- [15] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, *Nucl.Phys.* **B442** 593 (1995), Erratum: *Nucl.Phys.***B456** 753 (1995);
- [16] N. Grot and C. Rovelli, *J.Math.Phys.* **37** 3014 (1996)
- [17] E. Bianchi, *Nucl.Phys.* **B 807** 591 (2009)
- [18] T. Thiemann, *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press (2007)
- [19] J. Baez, *Adv.Math.* **117** 253 (1996)
- [20] A. Ashtekar and J.Lewandowski, *Adv.Theor.Math.Phys.* **1** 388 (1998).
- [21] A. Ashtekar, J.Lewandowski, D. Marolf, J. Mourão and T. Thiemann, *J.Math.Phys.***36** 6456 (1995).
- [22] I. Makinen, e-Print: 1910.06821 [gr-qc]
- [23] A. Laddha and M. Varadarajan, *Class.Quant.Grav.***28** (2011) 195010
- [24] R. M. Wald, *General Relativity*
- [25] J. Lewandowski, A. Okolow, H. Sahlmann and T. Thiemann, *Commun.Math.Phys.***267** 703 (2006).
- [26] L. Smolin, e-Print: gr-qc/9609034

- [27] M. Varadarajan *Class.Quant.Grav.* **34** 015012 (2017)
- [28] M Varadarajan, *Phys.Rev.* **D100**, 066018 (2019)
- [29] S. Bakhoda and T. Thiemann, e-Prints: 2010.16351 [gr-qc], 2011.00031 [gr-qc]; S. Bakhoda, H. Shojaie and T. Thiemann, 2010.16359 [gr-qc].
- [30] J.F. Barbero G., M. Basquens, B. Diaz and J.S.Villasenor, ‘Consistent and non-consistent deformations of gravitational theories’. In preparation.
- [31] A. Henderson, A. Laddha and C. Tomlin, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** 044028 (2013); *Phys.Rev.D* **88** (2013) 4, 044029.
- [32] D. Deturck and J. Kazdan, *Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure*, **14**, 249 (1981)
- [33] S.G. Krantz and H. R. Parks, *The Implicit Function: History, Theory and Applications*, Birkhauser (2003)